

APPENDIX B

SCOPING

APPENDIX B

SCOPING

Table of Contents

A. Public and Agency Scoping B-3

B. Scoping Issues of Concern B-7

C. Government to Government and Tribal Comments B-29

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

A. PUBLIC AND AGENCY SCOPING

SUMMARY OF TRANSFORMATION SCOPING MEETINGS (FEBRUARY 25 - MARCH 1, 2002)

Agency Meetings

Anchorage – Sheraton Inn Conference Room (1-3 PM, 2/25/02)

Letters were sent to state (Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation) and federal agencies (BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). No agency personnel attended. Representing CSU-CEMML were Cal Bagley, Amanda Herzog, Gary Larsen, Roger Sayre, Robert Shaw, and Patrick Whitesell. Kevin Gardner represented USARAK.

Fairbanks – Chena River Convention Center (9-11 AM, 3/1/02)

Representatives from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service attended the meeting. CEMML-CSU representatives included: Cal Bagley, Amanda Herzog, Gary Larsen, Roger Sayre, Robert Shaw, Gail Skaugstad, and Patrick Whitesell. USARAK was represented by Kevin Gardner, Gary Larsen, and Doug Johnson.

Kevin Gardner of USARAK provided a slide presentation describing transformation. Over the next 90 minutes agency personnel raised several issues or questions about transformation [USARAK answers are in parentheses].

Number of new troops expected.

[Increase by a couple of hundred-approximately 10%]

Access to fish and wildlife recreational opportunities on installations.

[Would still be allowed, but access would likely be decreased at times.]

Would more roads be established?

[More roads probably would be built]

Would troops be more concentrated or dispersed?

[More dispersed]

How would land use change over time?

[Land use would be more extensive, but less intensive. The goal would be to use more of the available lands, but in a more dispersed and rotational use pattern. Fort Greely (Donnelly Training Area) would have larger high intensity activity, probably on a quarterly basis (major maneuvers during spring, summer, fall, and winter-which would last for a couple of weeks a time.) On the other hand, troops at Fort Wainwright and Fort Richardson would be used with smaller but highly dispersed groups. Gerstle River and Black Rapids would be used more than they have been in the past].

What kinds of equipment besides the LAV (Stryker) would be used?

[The Army would expect to use more electronic devices, and would rely on electronic towers and transmitters.]

How would permitting, for access, change?

[The Army would stay with general permitting.]

New 404 wetlands permits expected?

[None expected]

New shooting ranges.

[No longer in clear cuts. Will use natural vegetation to ensure reality based training.]

Public Open Houses

An open house format was used for all meetings. Attendees were asked to sign an attendance sheet, and they were offered a fact sheet a comment sheet, and a newsletter (Appendix Table 1.7.a). Sixteen posters were displayed, and these explained transformation, and resource values of USARAK lands. Kevin Gardner of USARAK provided a briefing and slide presentation at 1 PM, 4 PM, and 7 PM at each of the public meetings (except 7 PM in Anchorage, because no one was in attendance at that time).

Appendix Table 1.7.a. Text of fact sheet and newsletter article used during Transformation EIS scoping period, 2002.

U. S. Army Alaska Transformation Fact Sheet

What: A force transformation envisioned by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Army in order to meet the demands of the 21st century.

Why: The Army has served our country in peace and war for over two centuries, however, the security environment in the future will be more complex, uncertain, and challenging than today. The 21st century demands an Army that is more strategically responsive and dominant in order to provide a broad range of options for both peacetime and warfighting operations.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 requires federal agencies to consider the environmental impacts of major actions, solicit public comments, and develop reasonable alternatives. The resulting document, and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is used by agencies as a decision making tool.

The Department of the Army has produced a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), which discusses the Army transformation. Separate EIS's will be completed at each of the installations selected for transformation.

Where: The 172nd Infantry Brigade (Separate) in Alaska has been proposed to undergo transformation. The Transformation EIS will include Army lands at Fort Richardson, Fort Wainwright, and outlying training areas including Gerstle River, Black Rapids, Tanana Flats Training Area, Yukon Training Area, and Donnelly Training Area (formerly Fort Greely).

When: The transformation will occur after public consultation is sought, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is prepared, and a decision is made as to how transformation should occur. The decision is proposed for autumn 2003, but will be no sooner than 30 days from the publication of the Final EIS to allow for public comment.

How: This transformation is proposed to occur in three phases, which would result in the complete transformation of the U.S. Army in 30 years.

The first phase involves transformation activities taking place at Fort Lewis in Washington. Fort Lewis is now testing and evaluating procedures to be used at various installations around the country for the second phase in transformation.

The second phase will involve the transformation of the 172nd Infantry Brigade at Forts Wainwright and Richardson, and the Donnelly Training Area, as well as several other U.S. Army installations. The 172nd Infantry Brigade will transform into an **Interim Brigade Combat Team (IBCT)**, which will be a transition from the current force structure to an Objective Force.

The final phase of the transformation will be development of the Objective Force. Procedures and components of the Objective Force will evolve over time, but will have the characteristics of being more responsive, deployable, agile, versatile, lethal, survivable, and sustainable in all operations.

Environmental Resources Newsletter

February 2002: Volume 2, Number 1

http://www.cemml.colostate.edu/alaskaeis/news_er21.htm

Army Transformation Is Proposed

Army leaders have identified the need to transform the Army to meet the changing demands of the 21st century. Transformation from heavy or light forces to Interim Brigade Combat Teams (IBCTs) would ensure a rapidly deployable and sustainable force structure that could dominate in any operational environment throughout the world. The proposed transformation will occur in three phases. The **Initial Phase** will involve transformation at Fort Lewis, Washington, where the Army will test and evaluate concepts, tactics, techniques, and procedures to develop a brigade combat team (BCT). During the **Interim Capability Phase**, selected brigades-including USARAK's 172nd Infantry Brigade-have been proposed to transform into IBCTs. Over the next 30 years the IBCTs will evolve and the entire Army will transform into an **Objective Force**, which will be more responsive, deployable, agile, versatile, lethal, survivable, and sustainable.

Notice of Intent Published in Federal Register

The Army has submitted a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for proposed transformation of the 172nd Infantry Brigade (Separate) to an IBCT. Transformation would result in restructuring of the 172nd Infantry Brigade, and could affect associated ranges, facilities and infrastructure. Proposed locations include Fort Richardson, Fort Wainwright, the Donnelly Training Area (formerly Fort Greely), and outlying areas (e.g., Gerstle River and Black Rapids).

Preliminary Alternatives to be Considered

1. *No Action. The 172nd Infantry Brigade would not be transformed, and the existing unit structure and training activities would not change.*
2. *The 172nd Infantry Brigade would transform to an IBCT using the existing ranges, facilities, and infrastructure as they are currently configured.*
3. *Transformation of the 172nd Infantry Brigade to an IBCT with the addition of new ranges, facilities and infrastructure to support mission sustainability.*
4. *Total transformation of the USARAK activities and capabilities. This would include the near-term transformation of the 172nd Infantry Brigade to an IBCT, followed by continued development to meet Objective Force capabilities.*

Other alternatives that may be raised during scoping will be considered.

Open House For Transformation EIS

The public is invited to participate in an informational open house. USARAK will present information on the proposed transformation of the 172nd Infantry Brigade to an IBCT. Each open house will run from 12 noon to 8 PM. Poster presentations will describe the transformation process and the affected environment. A USARAK representative will provide a brief presentation at 1:00, 4:00, and 7:00 at each location. Public comments will be accepted. Open house locations and times are listed below.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>February 26 12 noon to 8 PM Anchorage Elks Lodge 717 W. 3rd Ave. Anchorage</p> | <p>February 27 12 noon to 8 PM Fairbanks Carlson Center Pioneer Room 2010 2nd Avenue Fairbanks</p> | <p>February 28 12 noon to 8 PM Delta Junction Community Center 2288 Deborah Street Delta Junction</p> |
|---|--|---|

For more information regarding each open house, contact the U.S. Army EIS Coordinator, Kevin Gardner at 907-384-3331.

Anchorage – Elks Lodge (12-8 PM, 2/26/02)

The attendees from the public included potential contractors and people looking for contract work. No one made comments regarding concerns about transformation.

Fairbanks – Carlson Center (12-8 PM, 2/27/02)

About 15 people from the public (i.e., not involved with USARAK, CEMML, or the transformation EIS project) attended the open house.

General issues brought up by attending people included:

- Airboat access at Tanana Flats Training Area.
- Fire issues, including access to fire fighting due to heightened security.
- Access to fishing, hunting, and recreational opportunities.
- The positive influence of the social-economic aspects of the Army.
- Impact of IAVs (i.e. Strykers on terrain; composition of SBCT's (e.g., soldiers, vehicles).

Specific written comments, and comments to the court reporter are provided for the Fairbanks meeting.

Delta Junction – Delta Community Center (12-8 PM, 2/28/02)

Approximately 15 people not involved with the transformation EIS project attended the open house. These people brought up a number of issues and concerns. Some were not directly related to the transformation per se (i.e., location of ranges). Nevertheless, the issues included:

- Location of the ranges. There was high concern about the impacts of establishing a range on 33-Mile Loop, or anyplace east of the Richardson Highway, which could result in increased fire danger, more noise, and reduced public access.
- Firing of ordnance into waterways, which could result in contamination of heavy metals in the rivers or water table.
- Some brought up concerns about the impact of having a drop zone near the bison calving areas.
- Air space restrictions could affect commercial and recreational use of the airplanes.
- Access limitations to roads could affect tourism, hunting, and wildlife viewing.
- Large convoys traveling through town are disruptive and potentially dangerous. The public needs to know when these will occur.
- Cumulative impacts with the missile defense system.
- General concern about reduced public access to hunting and fishing.

Specific written comments and comments given to the court reporter for the Delta Junction meeting are provided in the sections below.

B. SCOPING ISSUES OF CONCERN

The verbal and written comments received during the scoping period from the public and agencies were used to help determine specific issues of concern to the public. Potential issues were determined to be significant to the analysis of the proposed action if they fell within the scope of the proposed action, if they suggested different actions or mitigation, or if they influenced the decision on the proposed action. Impact analysis was completed for each significant issue to determine the consequences of the alternatives as presented in Chapter 4. Based on public and agency comments, the significant issues of concern analyzed in this EIS are:

Access (Issue A) – Impacts on access to fishing or hunting opportunities, and recreational activities, especially wildlife viewing and airboating. The impacts of military activities on access to stocked lakes, specifically the potential loss of access to lakes, were identified as public concerns. Issue A is evaluated in Section 4.14, Public Access and Recreation.

Traffic (Issue B) – Impacts of Army vehicle convoys on highway safety and potential risks of accidents, increased Army vehicle drive times on local highways, and the potential degradation of highways and unpaved roads from military vehicles. Issue B is evaluated in Section 4.17, Human Health and Safety.

Wildlife and Habitat (Issue C) – Potential impacts to wildlife, fish, and their habitats. The species of greatest concern were large game mammals, especially bison and moose. Issue C is

evaluated in Section 4.9, Wildlife and Fisheries, Section 4.14, Public Access and Recreation, and Section 4.7 Wetlands.

Maneuver (Issue D) – Impacts of military vehicles to off-road areas. Issue D is evaluated in Section 4.4, Soil Resources and Section 4.7, Wetlands.

Fire Management (Issue E) – Impacts of military training on forest fires and the ability to put out fires on military lands. Issue E is evaluated in Section 4.11, Fire Management.

Cultural Resources (Issue F) – Impacts of maneuvers and exploded ordnance on cultural resources. Issue F is evaluated in Section 4.12, Cultural Resources.

Scoping Issues Outside the Extent of this EIS

All of the concerns and comments that were presented during the scoping process have been included in the scoping summary. Issues that fell outside of the proposed action of transformation were eliminated from further review.

The location of new firing ranges was an issue that received the most comments. Many individuals attended the transformation scoping meetings to express their concern over this issue. These new range construction projects are considered mission-essential, that is, they would take places regardless of transformation. Location decisions were therefore, assessed in separate environmental assessments and are not considered a transformation activity in this EIS (see Chapter 2). New firing ranges were considered as ongoing USARAK activities, and are included under the cumulative impacts sections for each installation. The new ranges would support increased use under transformation. Increased use of the ranges was assessed in this EIS.

Fairbanks Scoping Meeting Proceedings

A court reporter was present at both the Fairbanks and Delta Junction public scoping sessions. The court reporter proceedings are provided below. Each comment received by the court reporter was highlighted and assigned a comment number. The comment reply is provided in Table 1.7.b. Comments in the table are referred to by their corresponding comment number.

(Statement commenced at: 4:27 p.m., February 25, 2002).

THE REPORTER: Please state your name and address.

MR. KENNETH ALT: I'm Kenneth Alt. And my address is P.O. Box 10104, Fairbanks, Alaska 99710. And I represent Trout Unlimited. We are a national organization, and we have about 80 to 90 members in Fairbanks.

- 1 And we are concerned with the quality of fisheries recreation that is available to people in interior Alaska; more specifically, regarding an issue of the transformation of the 172nd brigade. We are concerned with the additional impact to stocked lakes in interior Alaska. We feel that there will be a cumulative effect of the light brigade transformation, the buildup relating to the
- 2 missile defense system, and the increased use of the training center at Fort Greely by military forces from around the world. We feel this will create additional impacts on stocked lakes in interior Alaska, especially near Delta Junction. We already have problems with the water source at existing hatcheries near Anchorage and, in the short term, there's a

possibility that numbers of fish promised to be stocked in interior waters will decrease. Our group has written letters to the Alaska congressional delegation requesting the construction of a hatchery in interior Alaska to alleviate current problems. We are hoping that a new hatchery in interior Alaska will provide enough fish to satisfy needs of current fishermen as well as anticipated increases in anglers related to military buildup in Alaska.

(Statement concluded at: 4:30 p.m., February 27, 2002)

(Statement commenced at: 4:51 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

THE REPORTER: Please state your name and address.

MR. DAVE CRUZ: Dave Cruz, 3001 Industrial Avenue, Fairbanks, 99701. My statement is I'm supportive of this whole project.

(Statement concluded at: 4:52 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

(Statement commenced at: 6:37 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

THE REPORTER: Please state your name and address.

MR. BILL BROPHY: My name is Bill Brophy. I work at Usibelli Coal Mine here in the Fairbanks office. My position is vice president of customer relations. I should identify that I served in the U.S. military for 28 years and retired approximately two years ago. I would like – the comment I would like to address is in regard to the presentation that is presented to us this evening and the information that is available on the placards and documentation in regards to IBCT Environmental Impact Statement. I've reviewed the material and found a significant absence of information regarding the abundance of military training lands, air – an abundance of military training grounds, let me just leave it at that, over one and a half million acres of land, an abundance of air space for air maneuver, one of the largest in our military. I also see an absence of information regarding the many soldiers. What is the strength of our military forces currently existing in Alaska?

- 3 And in regard to the environmental impact, what will the Inner Brigade Combat Team provide for the communities in Alaska? What will be the impact? Will it be an increase in manpower? Which I'm assuming that it would be. Will it be an increase in vehicles and equipment that consequently have requirements and demands for repair parts, fuel, services, that may be available here in the interior of Alaska through the local economy? So I think there is considerable amount of information that could be added to the array of information which is very informative, but I believe that there is an absence of the information that would tell us more about the social, political, and economic impacts in regards to IBCT.
- 4

It's just basically to say that we have a tremendous amount of resources available for training for very rigorous

conditions, arctic conditions, summer conditions, over long distances, employing multiples of types of weapons systems, all comprehensively in one environment. Both air forces and Army land forces will be employed all in the same training space, training area. And I believe it to be unique in our military. We have the greatest opportunities to do difficult, hard, realistic training in Alaska as compared to anywhere else. I am totally in favor of the IBCT concept coming to the state of Alaska. I support the Inner Brigade Combat Team deployment to Alaska.

(Statement concluded at: 6:44 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

(Statement commenced at: 6:55 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

THE REPORTER: Please state your name and address.

MS. KELLEY HEGARTY: My name is Kelley, K-E-L-L-E-Y, H-E-G-A-R-T-Y. And I reside at 1320 Gull Road, Fairbanks. And I guess I would just like to say that I thought that the newsletter was very well-done and that it's nice to see that there's some coordination between the INRMP project and the EIS project. And I was especially pleased to see that the Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the Corps of Engineers are all cooperating with the Army and their EIS contractor.

- 5 And I think it will be very important to the public to understand the distinction between sensitive wetlands and low-function wetlands. And it would have been - it will be nice to see a map distinguishing between the two instead of just a map distinguishing between wetlands and uplands. Great open house. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

(Statement concluded at 6:57 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

(Statement commenced at: 7:28 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

THE REPORTER: Please state your name and address.

- 6 COL. HUNTER: Ollie Hunter. Last name is Hunter. O-L-L-I-E. I'm an Army colonel here at post. And the subject is the unmanned aerial vehicles, unmanned aerial vehicles called UAVs. And curious what the impacts will be because the UAV comes with the IBCT. There's like four UAVs that come with the IBCT. And they're flown out of both already constructed air fields, you know, formal concrete tarmac air fields, plus tactical air fields which will need to be built out in the woods somewhere. And what I want to do is - - you're writing that up to cause them to think of that. I don't think anybody has thought of that.

(Statement concluded at: 7:30 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

(Statement commenced at: 7:43 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

- 7 MALE SPEAKER: My comment is I would like to have the military explain to the public what – the munitions and weapons that they are going to fire and how it affects the recreational areas, the Tanana River, and what the danger zones are, and how they will minimize the impact. That's my comment.

(Statement concluded at: 7:44 p.m., February 27, 2002.)

Delta Junction Scoping Proceedings

Reported by: CAROL A. McCUE, RMR, Heartland Court Reporters

(Statement commenced 3:04 p.m., February 28, 2002.)

THE REPORTER: First would you state your name and spell it for me.

MR. FRONTY PARKER: My name is Fronty, F-R-O-N-T-Y, Parker, P-A-R-K-E-R.

THE REPORTER: And your address, please.

MR. FRONTY PARKER: Box 1035, Delta Junction, 99737.

THE REPORTER: I'm ready any time you are.

MR. FRONTY PARKER: Okay. I'm here to make a few comments on the proposed change. I'm not sure what the – to call it, other than the transformation, I guess. Is that what you're saying?

- 8 My understanding is there's a fairly large footprint of a firing range that's going to be installed somewhere in Delta. There was three proposed locations, two of them that I hear are east of the Richardson Highway, and one west of the highway near some existing firing ranges already; namely, Texas and Washington range. And of those three, if – if these are proposals by the Army, then my recommendation would be to stay as close as possible to the existing firing ranges, which would be near Texas and Washington range. Any selection of lands for a firing range west of the Richardson Highway would be – would have a lot of biological implications. And there's some real concerns, I think, not only for myself, but in the community, that it would impact those
- 9 wildlife populations, which certainly are very good, and a lot of people value those things here in Delta Junction.

- Given my recommendation for a firing range near the existing ranges, of course, near the Delta River, there are some access areas; namely, Meadows Road, that the public has been able to use for quite some years, and the Department of Fish and Game has stocked a lot of the lakes in that area with fishery sources. And
- 10 so my concern is, is that whatever the firing range blueprint is in that area, that it would allow access to those lakes along the existing roads. And if this can't be accomplished, that the Army be able to do whatever they can to be able to provide access to those lakes and try to keep them open as much as possible.

11

Along with that, I have a concern that anything other than this location would have more of an impact on restricted airspace. There is restricted airspace already near the Delta River. Allowing this firing range to be near the Delta River would not impact more airspace in the Delta area, so I would be in favor of the firing range in that area for that reason.

I think that - I would like to mention that the Army's been a good neighbor here in Delta Junction, and you know, I'm not opposed to any establishment of a firing range. I think that we need to make sure that it's put in in the right location.

I think that this location probably has the least impact on wildlife populations, and there's a lot of wildlife populations in this area. Certainly this one down by the river would impact bison, but not as significantly as if it would be west of the Richardson Highway. I guess it would be the east training area.

And that pretty much sums up my comments. That's it.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. FRONTY PARKER: You're welcome.

(Statement ended 3:05 p.m., February 28, 2002.)

(Statement commenced 3:18 p.m., February 28, 2002.)

THE REPORTER: Would you please state your name and spell it for me.

MR. DARELL DARLAND: Darell Darland. D-A-R-E-L-L, last name is D-A-R-L-A-N-D.

THE REPORTER: And state your address, please.

MR. DARELL DARLAND: Box 468, Delta Junction, Alaska.

THE REPORTER: Thank you. Go ahead.

12

MR. DARELL DARLAND: Okay. Basically, after having read the Environmental Resources Newsletter, the only alternative that I would think - that I would consider would be probably 3, transformation of the 172nd Infantry Brigade to an IBCT with the addition - oh, no, that's not right. It would be 2. The 172nd Infantry Brigade would transform to an IBCT using existing ranges, facilities, and infrastructure as they are currently configured. Basically, my main concern is that the community will have a very heavy impact of traffic, firing, further development in wildlife areas, and very little economic gain.

The Army basically closed Ft. Greely, sent the people to Ft. Wainwright, Ft. Rich, but they expect us to put up with all of the traffic, all of the hassles that go with all of these maneuvers that they want to have down here. And my thinking is, is that if

they want a base down here, if they want a post down here, put a post down here; and if they don't, pick up your toys and go home.

- 13 Other issues. The proposed sites will probably impact the bison greatly, especially on Ft. Greely in the Texas range area. Bison summer calving grounds. The Army has had substantial real estate out there for some time, it's basically been dedicated to bison habitat, hasn't taken care of it. It was basically absorbed into Ft. Greely as a bivouac area. And I guess last, but not least,
- 14 I would like to see the Army use land that they have already impacted instead of developing new areas. They have got 7 million acres, I don't think they need more. Thank you.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

(Statement ended at 3:21 p.m., February 28, 2002.)

(Statement commenced 7:54 p.m., February 28, 2002.)

THE REPORTER: Would you please state your full name and spell your last name for the record.

MS. SUSAN KEMP: Susan Kemp, K-E-M-P.

THE REPORTER: And your mailing address.

MS. SUSAN KEMP: P.O. Box 4849, Delta Junction, Alaska, 99737.

THE REPORTER: Go ahead with your statement.

- 15 MS. SUSAN KEMP: I'm concerned about noise levels. I operate a motel, and I'm concerned about what the hours will be for firing on the ranges. And from an economic standpoint, that's been a problem for me in the past. And I'm concerned with increased activity out there. It could be even worse, and it is detrimental to the motel business to have firing going on at night.

- 16 And I'm concerned about the traffic between Fairbanks and Ft. Greely. The roads are narrow and they are not in the best of shape, and it becomes very difficult when the large convoys moving back and forth, I think it increases the danger of accidents. It's not a very friendly environment to try to drive between here and Fairbanks, especially when a 2-hour trip becomes a 4-hour trip because of the impact of the convoys.

- 17 And I'm also concerned with access and how that's going to impact the local community and the historical use that they have had of the roads and the areas out around where the ranges are going to be. I think that pretty much covers it.

THE REPORTER: Thank you very much.

MS. SUSAN KEMP: Thank you.

(Statement ended at 7:56 p.m., February 28, 2002.)

Appendix Table 1.7.b Responses and references to public comments given to the court reporter.

| Comment Number | Response /Reference | Issue Code |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------|
| 1 | The impact to recreational fishing opportunities was identified as a major issue of concern and is referred to as Issue A, Access. Impacts to fisheries quality is referred to as Issue C, Wildlife and Habitat. Information related to these issues is located in sections 3.9, 3.14, 4.9, and 4.14. | A, C |
| 2 | Cumulative impacts to fisheries management and recreational opportunities are addressed in the cumulative impacts section of Public Access and Recreation, Section 4.14. | A |
| 3 | Background information about the military's social and economic influence on the region is provided in Section 3.13, Socioeconomics. Predicted impacts to the regions social and economic influence are provided in Section 4.13, Socioeconomics. | None |
| 4 | Descriptions of proposed equipment changes are provided in Chapter 2, Section 2.1.2, Systems Acquisition. The impact to social and economic properties of the region is assessed in Section 4.13, Socioeconomics. | None |
| 5 | A map distinguishing sensitive and low-function wetlands has been provided. It is located in Appendix A, Figures 3.8.a, 3.8.b, 3.8.c, and 3.8.d. | None |
| 6 | Information regarding the location of UAV airstrips is provided in Appendix D, Construction Project Descriptions. | None |
| 7 | Descriptions of the proposed changes to weapons and munitions are provided in Chapter 2, Section 2.1.2. Weapons training impact to recreation is provided in Section 4.14, Public Access and Recreation. | A |
| 8 | It is assumed the speaker is referring to the Donnelly Training Area Range Expansion Project. This project is considered USARAK mission-essential and would take place regardless of transformation. It is, therefore assessed in an Environmental Assessment. This comment was considered in that assessment. The range expansion activities are considered as a cumulative impact and are assessed under the cumulative impacts section of this EIS. | None |
| 9 | Transformation impacts to wildlife are described in Section 4.9, Wildlife and Fisheries. | C |
| 10 | See responses to comment numbers 8 and 1. | A, C |
| 11 | See response to comment number 8. Transformation's impacts to airspace are described in Section 4.19, Infrastructure. | None |
| 12 | Impacts to traffic are a major issue of concern by the public and are referred to as Issue B, Traffic. Information is provided in Section 4.17, Human Health and Safety. Noise impacts from weapons training are described in Section 4.16, Noise. Concerns about wildlife are grouped into Issue C, Wildlife and Habitat. Impacts to wildlife are described in Section, 4.9, Wildlife and Fisheries. Economic impacts to the region are provided in Section 4.13, Socioeconomics. | B, C |
| 13 | Transformation impacts to wildlife are described in Section 4.9, Wildlife and Fisheries. | C |
| 14 | No new impact areas are proposed under transformation. Acquisition of additional land is also not proposed as a transformation activity. See Chapter 2. | None |
| 15 | Predicted noise impacts are provided in Section 4.16, Noise. | None |
| 16 | Traffic concerns are referred to as Issue B and considered a major issue of concern by the public. Traffic impacts are described in Section 4.17, Human Health and Safety. | B |
| 17 | Access is considered as a major issue of concern and is referred to as Issue A. Impacts to access are provided in Section 4.14, Public Access and Recreation. | A |

Written Comments

04/08/2002 05:15 FAX 9073539867

FWA ENV RES

+ CEMML

004

U.S. ARMY ALASKA TRANSFORMATION ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SCOPING COMMENT SHEET

DATE: 3-18-02 MEETING LOCATION: CARLSON CTR, FAIRBANKS, ALASKA
COMMENTOR'S NAME: CAROL GELVIN-FREYNIER
COMMENTOR'S ADDRESS: CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGER

COMMENTOR REPRESENTING: SELF _____ ORGANIZATION X
ORGANIZATION NAME: TANANA CHIEFS CONFERENCE, INC.
ORGANIZATION ADDRESS: 122 1ST AVE STE 1000
FAIRBANKS, AK 99701

PLEASE SEND ME: DRAFT EIS X SUMMARY REPORT _____

COMMENTS: IT HAS BEEN MADE CLEAR
THAT "TRANSFORMATION" OF THE ARMY
IN THE NEAR FUTURE WILL IMPACT ARMY
LANDS TO A GREATER DEGREE THAN IN THE
PAST - DUE TO CHANGES IN TRANSPORT
VEHICLES AND INCREASES IN FREQUENCIES

P. 03

FAX NO. 9074281186

APR-05-2002 FRI 04:54 PM FT RICHARDSON DPM

04/09/2002 05:16 FAX 9073539867

FWA ENV RES

+ CEMML

005

18

IN THE USE OF THOSE VEHICLES.
WE STRONGLY URGE THAT THE ARMY
CONTINUE TO MAKE EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY
AND PROTECT CULTURAL RESOURCES
FROM DESTRUCTION. THESE RESOURCES,
SOMETIMES LOCATED VERY NEAR THE
SURFACE, ARE IRREPLACEABLE. TRACKED
VEHICLES, HEAVY VEHICLES, AND EXPLODED
ORDNANCES THAT CONTACT THE GROUND'S
SURFACE ALL HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO
DESTROY SITES — STEPS MUST BE
TAKEN TO INSURE THAT AREAS WITH
SITES ARE NOT IN THE PATH OF
THE NEW, HEAVIER TRANSPORT MACHINES
AND THAT OPERATORS OF THESE MACHINES
UNDERSTAND THE CONSEQUENCES OF STRAYING
INTO THESE DESIGNATED AREAS.
RETURN THIS COMMENT FORM TO:

Directorate of Public Works
ATTN: APVR-RPW-EV (Kevin Gardner)
730 Quartermaster Road Bldg. 730
Fort Richardson, AK 99505-6500

OR SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS AND MAILING REQUESTS VIA E-MAIL OR
THE INTERNET:

USARAK_EIS@cemml.colostate.edu
<http://www.cemml.colostate.edu/AlaskaEIS/Comments>

COULD NOT FIND
TELL ON LINE AT
YOUR SITE

P. 04

FAX NO. 9074281186

APR-05-2002 FRI 04:54 PM FT RICHARDSON DPM

04/05/2002 09:40 FAX 907/4574124

FAX 457 4124

+ CABLE

002

NO. 745 P. 1

PER. 4.800 8:22:41 0050 SPORT FISH DIV FBK

19

Trout Unlimited
"Midnight Sun Chapter"

February 15, 2002

Senator Ted Stevens
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Stevens,

The Midnight Sun Chapter of Trout Unlimited seeks your support in obtaining the placement of a hatchery in the interior of Alaska to meet the anticipated increase of the military presence in the interior.

Our Chapter recognizes the importance of the Fish & Game lake stocking program to anglers of interior Alaska. We do not have access to anadromous runs of fish as they do in other parts of Alaska. This program provides much of the angler effort and harvest in waters of interior Alaska. Another important benefit is the conservation function provided by alleviating pressure on resident stream species.

Recent water problems with existing Sport Fish Division hatcheries near Anchorage have contributed to the poor condition of hatchery fish by the time they are trucked to interior Alaska lakes. For example, fingerling rainbow trout stocked in Quartz Lake have a survival rate of less than 1%.

Coupled with problems at the Anchorage area hatcheries, we see increased demands on stocked lakes especially in the Delta Junction area. The continued work on the Missile Defense System, the use of Greely Training Center by military forces throughout the world, and the deployment of an Infantry Brigade (Light) at Fort Wainwright will place additional pressure on fish in stocked lakes.

Possible hatchery sites include the Healy Power Station, Clear Air Force Station, Fairbanks Aurora Utility, Fort Wainwright, and Greely Training Center. If the hatchery was built in a location (Fairbanks) where it could also be used as an educational and research facility, CAPA Funding could be sought to cover a portion of the cost.

Your assistance in obtaining impact funding for a new hatchery in the interior would be greatly appreciated by the citizens of interior Alaska.

Sincerely,



Kenneth T. Alt, President, 907-457 4124

Re: 172 IB

Subject: Re: 172 IB

Date: Sun, 14 Apr 2002 19:14:12 -0600

From: "Calvin F. Bagley" <cbagley@cemml.colostate.edu>

To: Thomas_Liebscher@nps.gov

CC: "Larsen, Gary" <gary.larsen@richardson.army.mil>,
"Gardner Kevin R DPW CA SPEC(n)" <kevin.gardner@richardson.army.mil>,
Roger Sayre <rsayre@cemml.colostate.edu>

Tom - No changes to the aerial extent of existing MOA's is currently planned. All new activities would occur within the existing MOA's. Please call Kevin Gardner at Fort Richardson if you need more info. He is the project manager and knows the most about the vehicles.

cal

Thomas_Liebscher@nps.gov wrote:

>Hi Cal, It has been a while. I changed federal agencies once again late
>last summer. Have a few questions on the notice of intent for the 172 IB.
>The description on the web page mentions an increase "of over 300 vehicles
>and probable additions of several unmanned aerial vehicles". Can you
>articulate further of what that means? As I read the supplementary
>information, it does not indicate any use for those aerial vehicles over
>existing MOA's. Am I correct with that assumption? Thanks Cal. Hope all is
>well. Take care.....tom
>
>Thomas J. Liebscher
>Chief of Resources
>Gates of the Arctic National Park & Preserve
>Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve
>phone 907-455-0620, Fax 907-455-0601
>
>
>
>

20

DELTA JUNCTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Regular Meeting February 27, 2002

I. Call to Order: Darrel Darland called The Feb. 27, 2002 advisory committee meeting to order at 7:18 pm.

II. Role Call

Members Present: Michael Bender, Clint Crisberg, Don Quisberg, Al Awwager, Darrel Darland, Tom Geyer, Tony Williams, Robert Lee (S present)

Members Absent: Dean Cummings Sr., Dean Cummings Jr., Donald Dranselmeier, Philip Nagels, and Larry Fern

Members Excused: Ross Pinkleman, Tim Webb, Na Good, Richard McDonald.

III. Minutes of the previous meeting read by Darland.

Department Personnel: Freddy Parker (SF), Steve Dubois (WC), and Rick Swanson (P&WS).

Comments from the Public: None. Darrel Darland filling in as chairman tonight since Felt and Pinkleman are not present.

IV. Reading and Approval of Meeting Agenda: Approved

V. Introduction of Guests and Agency Representatives: Gary Larson (US Army), Doug Johnson (US Army), Jeff Mason (US Army), and Cal Skaugstad (SF - FBS).

Also guest from public: Jim Cummings, Robert Lee, Ann Rasmussen, and Marvin Rasmussen.

Old Business:

A. Two representatives from the US ARMY were invited to inform the committee about a new firing range at Ft. Greely. Doug Johnson and Gary Larson are from the Army environmental section and spoke to the committee. They are also holding a public meeting in Delta tomorrow at the Delta Community Center from noon to 8pm. An EIS being developed for the transformation of the current light infantry brigade to an "Infantry Brigade (medium infantry) Combat Teams (IBCT's)". This involves deployment of 1,000 - 1,500 armored vehicles that will conduct exercises on a newly constructed firing range. The concerns of the Fish and Game advisory committee are:

1.) This number of vehicles traveling to Delta and around Delta Junction will impact the community. There are concerns about the traffic and degradation of highway. Depending on the location of the location of the firing range (Donnelly Flats, 33-mile loop area, and Texas Range); additional congestion would be experienced for example, if vehicles used the 33-mile loop entrance from the Alaska Highway.

22

2). Concern voiced about creating a new impact area, which does not necessarily cover ammunition laying on the ground but land disturbance and loss of wildlife habitat. The greatest concern is east of the Richardson Highway where there is a good hunting opportunity. Committee was told, "there would be no added impact area", meaning there will be no ordinance left in the area. The army is not allowed to create new impact areas. The Army will create this range and keep the area in its natural state to better simulate "real fighting" conditions. The question still remains how can this many vehicles not cause physical damage to the land? Best if new range is located where firing ranges already exist.

23

3). Question was raised if airspace would be restricted over the new range? The answer was yes. Especially with the proposed Missile Defense System, there will be too much restricted airspace. This concern should be addressed by keeping the restricted space to already existing restricted areas (along Delta River). The new firing range is thought to be about 4km x 3km.

24

4) Will this new activity override the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan? Answer is yes; the purpose of the Army lands is for their activities. The committee would like to be on record that the Army adheres to the INRMP as much as possible. Comment from F&G members is there will be conflicts with moose, Bison, and caribou present in the area and that selection of the range should be based on biological data provided by appropriate agencies such as the Alaska Fish and Game Department.

5) If habitat or access is lost or restricted then the Army is responsible to replace it. If habitat for bison for example is lost, then replacement of that habitat elsewhere is mitigated.

6) Comment that past mitigation with the Army has gone wrong because there is no apparent communication with the soldiers doing the training. The use of the land intended for animal habitat becomes an opportunity to be used as something else. For example, some bison feeding plots created to replace lost habitat elsewhere, became a camping area, because it was a piece of cleared land.

7) If security for the firing range is such that it involves fencing, then there will be large impact with the movement of animals.

B. Fisheries: Cal Skaustad gave a report about Ft. Rich hatchery and the reduction of stocking fish produced. The Army at Ft. Richardson and Elmendorf is buying power from local utilities and not producing its own, which means no warm water to grow fish faster. The current level of fish stocking is essentially cut in half as a result. Cal wants to hear about any changes in fishing stocked lakes. Cal told the committee about an idea for a new hatchery in interior and the advantage to stocking programs if there was one.

C. Jim Cummings asked the committee why the committee did not support the kid's hunt. The committee does not support the proposal. No action taken.

New Business

A. Clint Clausberg was elected to represent the committee at the BOG meeting in Fairbanks

B. Election for officers: Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Secretary. Daniel Dahlund was elected as Chairman, Mike Bender was elected as Vice Chairman, and Nat Good was re-elected as Secretary.

C. It was brought before the committee's attention that last meeting election of officers by was not adequately advertised. Furthermore, the notification by mail indicated elections were to be held at tonight's rather than at the last special meeting on Feb 13. A motion was made by Mr. Bender and seconded by Mr. Quarberg to accept election results of Feb 13th even if they weren't properly advertised. Passed 8-0.

VIII. Next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 27th in the ADF&G conference room.

An update concerning the Army firing range is on the agenda for next meeting.

IX. Meeting was adjourned at 10:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Nat Good
Secretary

Subject:
Alaska Transformation EIS Comments
Date:
Fri, 1 Mar 2002 16:24:30 -0700
From:
www@lamar.colostate.edu
To:
USARAK_EIS@cemml.colostate.edu

This information was submitted from the web page.

Date: 3/1/02

Meeting location: Delta Junction

Commentor's Name: Fronty Parker
Commentor's Address: BOX 1035

DELTA JCT, AK 99737
Commentor's E-Mail: fronty_parker@hotmail.com

Commentor Representing Self: ON
Commentor Representing Organization:

Organization Name:
Organization Address:

Please Send Me Draft EIS: ON
Please Send Me Summary Report: ON

Comments: Dear Sir or Madam,
I attended the EIS meeting in Delta and gave comments while I was there; I remembered a few additional comments, which are below.

25

1). It is important not to restrict access along meadows road more than what is restricted already (training exercises). If more restrictions (days of no public use) because of a new firing range, then lakes stocked by the department of Fish and Game for the public may be dropped from the stocking program. Alternatively, if Meadows road is blocked to public use of stocked lakes, by the new range, then alternate routes should be considered.

26

2). A new range should only be considered west of the Richardson Highway preferably within existing ranges West of Meadows road. This area, west of Meadows Road, is already restricted year round by the Army as well as the air space. By utilizing this area west of Meadow Road would cause less impact to the area's resources.
3). Numbers of vehicles involved in this Brigade is staggering to think about. I believe if these vehicles were not stored here in Delta it would cause massive traffic problems every time they are on the roll. Perhaps once these vehicles get here they should stay here.

Fronty Parker
Box 1035
Delta Junction, AK 99737
907-895-4632 (wk)

172nd

Subject: 172nd

Date: Fri, 01 Mar 2002 14:56:17 -0900

From: "Nat & Cher Good" <alaskanat@wildak.net>

To: USARAK_EIS@cemml.colostate.edu

CC: Fronty Parker <fronty_parker@fishgame.state.ak.us>,
Steve Dubois <steve_dubois@fishgame.state.ak.us>

27

I support options 3 and 4. The Donnelly Training Area of Fort Greely is a good alternative, but I would hope the military would do what it can to protect both moose and buffalo which frequent this area, at times in very high concentrations. It would be wise to either fence the area so they cannot get in, or drive them away prior to concentrated fire. The paper refers to 'formerly Fort Greely' which does not make much sense to me. If Fort Greely has a new boundary, what is it? The Donnelly area is to us on the southeast corner of Fort Greely.

28

I would also hope that the Gerstle River Test Site area not be used. It is currently an area which supports both moose and buffalo, and is an area used by local hunters in large numbers. Regardless of the official designation, this is a highly used local recreational area. Use of this area would have an extremely adverse impact on moose and bison, and highly restrict access to local hunting of Dall Sheep, as well as access to State land located to the south of the Gerstle River Test Site.

After examination, I think you will also reject the Black Rapids area as the Richardson Highway runs through it, and the terrain is all too visible from the highway. The Donnelly area of Fort Greely would be better as it does restrict public view.

Although I am a member of the Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee as well as the Delta Junction City Council, these comments reflect my personal viewpoint.

Nat Good
Box 827
Delta Junction, AK 99737

**U.S. ARMY ALASKA TRANSFORMATION
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

SCOPING COMMENT SHEET

DATE: _____ MEETING LOCATION: Delta

COMMENTOR'S NAME: Tom Brice

COMMENTOR'S ADDRESS: Alaska Works Partnership
P.O. Box 71428
Fairbanks, AK 99701

COMMENTOR REPRESENTING: SELF ☒ ORGANIZATION _____

ORGANIZATION NAME: _____

ORGANIZATION ADDRESS: _____

PLEASE SEND ME: DRAFT EIS _____ SUMMARY REPORT ☒

COMMENTS: On construction projects
Contractors should be required to
implement Federally registered apprenticeship
opportunities for individuals within the
local area so they can develop the skills
necessary to be qualified for the trades
jobs.

29

From the Desk of:

Shann Paul Jones

920 6th Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99701
March 19, 2002

Calvin Bagley
Ctr. for the Env. Mgmt. of Military Lands
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1490

Dear Mr. Bagley,

30

At this time, I would like to voice my concern as to the impact of the construction and manning of the National Missile Defense System at Fort Greely, Alaska, on sport fishing and hunting resources in Interior, Alaska.

First, let me say as six-year Army veteran, I am in full support of the missile defense program. That being said, with its construction and manning, there will be an additional 600 to 1,500 people in the Delta Junction area. This necessitate that a hatchery be built in Interior Alaska to help provide additional sport fishing opportunities in the many lakes on Fort Greely. These lakes were heavily stocked when installation was active. I had seen this first-hand during my service at Ft. Greely from 1986 through 1990.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (907) 474-5468.

Sincerely,



Shann Paul Jones

04.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|------------|---|
| Post-it® Fax Note | 7671 | Date | 7/2/02 | # of pages | 1 |
| To | Gary Larson | From | Roger Sayre | | |
| Co./Dept. | | Co. | CEMRL | | |
| Phone # | | Phone # | 970-491-3394 | | |
| Fax # | | Fax # | | | |

DER

002

Box 468
Delta Junction Alaska 99737

Delta Fish & Game Advisory Committee

April 2, 2002

Directorate of Public Works
Attn: Doug Johnson

Dear Sir:

Thank you for the briefing on the proposed range complex to be built at Ft. Greely. Our committee again discussed the issue at our 24 March 2002 meeting. As we noted in our minutes that were sent for record, the Delta Junction Fish & Game Advisory Committee is opposed to developing a new range that would further impact fish & wildlife, reduce or eliminate hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing opportunity.

After further review of the proposed sites we believe that all of the sites listed will have serious and long lasting effects on wildlife and the environment. Specific concerns are as follows.

1. Elimination or disruption of bison calving and forage areas. Disrupting the herd will only exacerbate bison/farm owner conflicts. The bison situation is complex and if the herd is disrupted, planting new food plots may not resolve the problem. We would like to see this issue studied and remedied "before" the existing range is impacted.
2. The Macomb Caribou herd frequents the proposed sites and spends a good portion of the year in the areas. The Macomb Caribou herd is intensively managed to maintain the existing population. Disruption of the range could have dire consequences for this herd.
3. Moose heavily use all of the proposed sites especially in winter when it is assumed maneuver activity would be at it highest.
4. Further study of the Delta River should be initiated as the mouth of Delta River is one of the most important salmon spawning areas in the Tanana River drainage.
5. People who attended the February 28, 2002 open house were disappointed about the lack of information available. The committee to this date has not been informed of the types of weapons and amount of ordinance to be used.
6. We, at this time, do not support any of the proposed sites but encourage the use of existing ranges and facilities as already exist (Preliminary Alternative #2).

Sincerely,



Darrell Darland
Chairman Delta Junction Advisory Committee

Appendix Table 1.7.c Responses and references to independent written public comments provided during or after scoping.

| Comment Number | Issue | Issue Code |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------|
| 18 | SBCT impacts on cultural resources on USARAK properties, including archaeological sites, are addressed in sections 3.12 and 4.12. | None |
| 19 | Impacts to fishing and stocking in the area can be found in sections 3.9, 3.14, 4.9, 4.13, and 4.14. | C |
| 20 | Impacts of the unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) on airspace are addressed in Section 4.14, Public Access and Recreation. | A |
| 21 | Concern was voiced regarding the number of vehicles in the SBCT (possibly based on an artificially high prediction of vehicles), and subsequent traffic problems. Traffic impacts are described in Section 4.17, Human Health and Safety. | B |
| 22 | Information on new mission-essential and SBCT ranges and impact areas, and subsequent wildlife impacts, can be found in sections 3.9, 3.19, 4.9, and 4.19. | C |
| 23 | Airspace restrictions can be found in sections 3.19 and 4.19. | A |
| 24 | SBCT impacts to wildlife including moose, bison, and caribou, can be found in Section 4.9, Wildlife and Fisheries. | C |
| 25 | Access along Meadows Road was addressed as a concern. Reduced access possibly leading to removal of stocked lakes along Meadows Road from the AK Department of Fish & Game program was voiced as a concern. Information related to these issues is located in sections 3.9, 3.14, 4.9, and 4.14. | A, C |
| 26 | SBCT impacts on local traffic were addressed as a concern. It was suggested that vehicles be stored at Donnelly Training Area. Traffic impacts are described in Section 4.17, Human Health and Safety. | B |
| 27 | See Comment 24 above. | C |
| 28 | Impacts to access and wildlife on Gerstle River Training Area were a concern. Impacts to wildlife and public access are described in Section 4.9, Wildlife and Fisheries, and 4.14, Public Access and Recreation. | A, C |
| 29 | Interest was voiced in seeing construction on Donnelly Training Area require apprenticeships with the local populace. This is outside the scope of the EIS process. However, sections 3.13 and 4.13 on Socioeconomics address socioeconomic conditions and impacts. | None |
| 30 | Concern regarding construction and manning impacts on local fishing and hunting resources from SMDC at Fort Greely. These impacts are outside the scope of this EIS. | C |
| 31 | See Comment 24 above. | C |
| 32 | See Comment 24 above. | C |
| 33 | See Comment 24 above. | C |
| 34 | Impacts to the Delta River and salmon spawning were brought up. Current and expected impacts to water and fish populations are described in sections 3.5, 3.9, 4.5, and 4.9. | C |

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

C. GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT AND TRIBAL COMMENTS

The following are preliminary comments solicited from tribal representatives in attendance at informative meetings held in August 2002. USARAK is continuing to work with interested tribes to gain meaningful input into the proposed SBCT Environmental Impact Statement.

U.S. ARMY ALASKA/ GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT
STRYKER BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM TRANSFORMATION AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

WESTMARK HOTEL CONFERENCE ROOM,
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA
AUGUST 9, 2002

RE: RESPONSE SHEET

NAME OF TRIBE _____

NAME OF EVALUATOR _____

This response sheet provides a framework for evaluating concerns that you may have regarding the Stryker Brigade Combat Team Transformation proposal. U.S. Army Alaska will incorporate these and any future comments you may have to ensure that Tribal concerns are addressed in the development of the final EIS.

If you would like to return these or any other comments to U.S. Army Alaska, please address them attention to Kirsten Anderson, (Directorate of Public Works, Attn: APVR-RPW-EV (K. Anderson), 730 Quartermaster Road, Fort Richardson, AK 99505-6500; fax: 907.384.3047) at your convenience.

1. Please share your concerns/questions regarding any of the following areas that are being addressed in the development of the SBCT Project and associated Environmental Impact Statement:

- Land & Air Use *see Water Resources, Soil Resources + Subsistence.*

*How will your airborne pollution affect lichen + thus caribou?
Elders are already very concerned about cancer-ridden animals.*

- Climate *None*

- Air Quality

- Geology Resources *see Soil Resources*

- 36
- Soil Resources Take responsibility for the mess you create - stop passing the buck!
Hire local villages first for clean-up/remediation - no more Lower-48 companies. If a local village cannot handle the job, hire the next capable Native tribe/organization.
- 37
- Water Resources Monitor stream + underground water quality before activities are started in the area + monitor every 4-6 months. Publish all water quality reports in local newspapers, your websites, and fax to all surrounding + downstream villages. The public does not want another Jarr's Creek.
- 38
- Wetland Resources
- 39
- Biological Resources Train local people to monitor + report biological resources activities. Create an incentive to not under/over report.
- 40
- Cultural Resources Make sure you are Not impacting any sacred sites. You need to stop making decisions before asking the Tribes for input. Treat us as equals! We will stop your progress, if necessary, on this project.
- Fire Management Notification of state + BLM/WAFB fire fighters, each spring, of potentially hazardous substances + ordinance in areas they may be attacking wildlifes - the public does Not want a repeat of the Ft. Greely fiasco.
- Socioeconomic Resources

41

- Subsistence The data you are using is missing the majority of subsistence resources being harvested. Until you gain the community's trust, you will not get accurate information.

42

- Noise No fly-overs during the Spring calving season & Fall hunting seasons.

- Human Health & Safety see water resources

- Environmental Justice informing (being honest & trust worthy) tribes before action is taken & treating tribes as equals will keep you out of court & save money in the long run.

2. Please evaluate the preliminary Government-to-Government consultation meeting attended on August 5, 2002 at Fort Richardson. Please feel free to suggest ways in which USARAK can improve this process in the future:

Consultation \neq making a decision and then letting tribes know what you are going to do.

Why wasn't Pt White here? Subsistence is one of the most obvious impacted areas.

You must give tribes a copy of the draft report & wait for their comments, & then incorporate those comments.

No meetings or comment deadlines during hunting season.

Share the results of comments on these sheets (from all participants) with Col. Lehman & his successors.

U.S. ARMY ALASKA/ GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT
STRYKER BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM TRANSFORMATION AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

WESTMARK HOTEL CONFERENCE ROOM,
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA
AUGUST 9, 2002

RE: RESPONSE SHEET

NAME OF TRIBE

Chalkyitsik, AK 99788

NAME OF EVALUATOR

Shirley Nosal

This response sheet provides a framework for evaluating concerns that you may have regarding the Stryker Brigade Combat Team Transformation proposal. U.S. Army Alaska will incorporate these and any future comments you may have to ensure that Tribal concerns are addressed in the development of the final EIS.

If you would like to return these or any other comments to U.S. Army Alaska, please address them attention to Kirsten Anderson, (Directorate of Public Works, Attn: APVR-RPW-EV (K. Anderson), 730 Quartermaster Road, Fort Richardson, AK 99505-6500; fax: 907.384.3047) at your convenience.

1. Please share your concerns/questions regarding any of the following areas that are being addressed in the development of the SBCT Project and associated Environmental Impact Statement:

- Land & Air Use

We were just concerned about large vehicles running over our land.
We are 63 miles North of Fort Yukon on the Black River.
located

- Climate

Our summers are hot with many, many mosquitos.
Into fall it starts to rain quite alot.
Winters are long and cold.
Spring is wet + slushy

- Air Quality

We have good air quality, except for in the summers
there is alot of dust from all terrain vehicles and smoke
from burn barrels in the village.

- Geology Resources ?

- Soil Resources

Our soil is rich and great for growing vegetables.

- Water Resources

Our water is clean and is used for drinking purposes and recreational uses.

- Wetland Resources

We have extensive wetland resources, lots of ducks, geese, cranes, muskrats, beavers, fish, frogs + bugs.

- Biological Resources ?

- Cultural Resources

We have a rich cultural history as hunters and gatherers which is still in effect today.
Everybody hunts and fishes + gathers berries to sustain a main part of our diet.

- Fire Management

Fire management is maintained by the Alaska Fire Service and the Bureau of land management.
There hasn't been a big burn in our area for many years.

- Socioeconomic Resources

We do not have many economic resources. High unemployment.
Trapping has gone ~~down~~ down because of the low fur prices.
Arts + Crafts are done by some members of the tribe to be sold. The school employs 4 positions, the clinic 2, and the Village council about 15 and the P.O. one. Our total pop. is 83.

- Subsistence

We rely on subsistence hunting and gathering for the main part of our diet.

- Noise

We live in a very quiet peaceful environment.

- Human Health & Safety

We have a low incidence of accidents or deaths. The adults keep a close eye on ~~on~~ all the children of the community.

- Environmental Justice

We have just got our tribal court in operation for any concerns or help the members may need.

2. Please evaluate the preliminary Government-to-Government consultation meeting attended on August 5, 2002 at Fort Richardson. Please feel free to suggest ways in which USARAK can improve this process in the future:

8/9/02 - I think this meeting went well and it doesn't seem from the question I asked that Chalkyitsik will be impacted in any way.

Shirley Nosal
PO Box 5
Chalkyitsik, AK
99788



U.S. ARMY ALASKA/ GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT
STRYKER BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM TRANSFORMATION AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

WESTMARK HOTEL CONFERENCE ROOM,
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA
AUGUST 9, 2002

RE: RESPONSE SHEET

NAME OF TRIBE

Gwich'in Gwich'in Fort Yukon

NAME OF EVALUATOR

Nancy James 2nd Chief

This response sheet provides a framework for evaluating concerns that you may have regarding the Stryker Brigade Combat Team Transformation proposal. U.S. Army Alaska will incorporate these and any future comments you may have to ensure that Tribal concerns are addressed in the development of the final EIS.

If you would like to return these or any other comments to U.S. Army Alaska, please address them attention to Kirsten Anderson, (Directorate of Public Works, Attn: APVR-RPW-EV (K. Anderson), 730 Quartermaster Road, Fort Richardson, AK 99505-6500; fax: 907.384.3047) at your convenience.

1. Please share your concerns/questions regarding any of the following areas that are being addressed in the development of the SBCT Project and associated Environmental Impact Statement:

- Land & Air Use
- Climate
- Air Quality
- Geology Resources

3. Additional Comments:

2nd Chief Comments this is very
good beginning for Dribes. Dribes / to
Dribes Relationship & Communication
is the Key Open! Thank You!

Appendix Table 1.7.d Responses and references to written comments provided during or after Native consultation meetings.

| Comment Number | Issue | Issue Code |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------|
| 35 | Transformation's effects on air quality and airborne pollutants or contaminants are addressed in sections 3.2 and 4.2. | None |
| 36 | Interest was voiced in seeing local tribes hired and trained for remediation and cleanup efforts. This is outside the scope of this EIS, however socioeconomics are discussed in sections 3.13 and 4.13. | None |
| 37 | Water quality on USARAK lands, and potential SBCT impacts, are discussed in sections 3.5 and 4.5. Proposed mitigation includes expansion of the USARAK water monitoring program. | None |
| 38 | Consultation identified interest in having local residents trained and responsible for monitoring and reporting biological resources and impacts. While outside the scope of this EIS, socioeconomics are discussed in sections 3.13 and 4.13, and vegetation and wildlife are discussed in sections 3.8, 3.9, 4.8, and 4.9. | C |
| 39 | Concerns were raised regarding cultural resources and Traditional Cultural Properties. These are discussed in sections 3.12 and 4.12, along with proposed mitigation measures. | F |
| 40 | Fire management is addressed in sections 3.11 and 4.11. | E |
| 41 | Subsistence resources are addressed in sections 3.15 and 4.15. Wildlife is addressed in sections 3.9 and 4.9. | C |
| 42 | Noise impacts to wildlife were voiced as concerns. Noise issues, and potential impacts, are discussed in sections 3.16 and 4.16. Wildlife is discussed in sections 3.9 and 4.9. | C |
| 43 | SBCT impacts to soils, vegetation, and wildlife, are discussed in sections 3.4, 3.8, 3.9, 4.4, 4.8, and 4.9. Expected range of SBCT impacts on USARAK properties are addressed in sections 3.19 and 4.19. | D |

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.