

FINAL

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
FOR
NAVAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS TRAINING
IN THE
STATE OF HAWAII**



MAY 2021



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
2000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20350-2000

5090
Ser N45/ 21U132530
13 May 2021

From: Director, Energy and Environmental Readiness Division (N45)
To: Commander, Naval Special Warfare Command

Subj: FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR NAVAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS
TRAINING IN THE STATE OF HAWAII ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Ref: (a) OPNAVINST 5090.1E

Encl: (1) Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
(2) Notice of Availability of FONSI and Environmental Assessment (EA)

1. This office has reviewed the subject EA and signed the enclosed FONSI pursuant to reference (a). Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required. Accordingly, with implementation of the requirements set forth in the following paragraph and any mitigation measures described in enclosure (1), Naval Special Warfare Command may move forward with the project.
2. The Council on Environmental Quality regulations require public notification of the availability of the EA and of the decision not to prepare an EIS. Enclosures (1) and (2) are provided for your use in implementing this requirement. Please publish enclosure (2) in local newspapers and mail enclosure (1) to any interested parties. Provide verification of local publication to OPNAV (N454) upon implementation. Retain the EA in project files for possible future use.
3. As required by reference (a), please upload the final EA and signed decision document to the OPNAV (N45) Environmental Planning and Compliance Library website.
4. My point of contact is Ms. Gloria Kupstas, OPNAV (N454), who can be reached via phone at (703) 695-5213 or by email at Gloria.Kupstas@navy.mil.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "S. T. Goodfellow".

S. T. GOODFELLOW
By direction

Copy to:
DASN (E)
OLA
CHINFO

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR NAVAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS
TRAINING IN THE STATE OF HAWAII

The United States (U.S.) Naval Special Warfare Command (NSWC) gives notice of an Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared to analyze the environmental impacts of Naval Special Operations (NSO) training in the state of Hawaii, and the determination that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required. Preparation of the EA is pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500–1508), and in accordance with U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy) regulations (32 CFR 775) and Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 5090.1E, *Environmental Readiness Program* (3 September 2019).

The proposed action is to conduct small-unit beginning, intermediate, and advanced land-, water-, and air-based training activities for NSO personnel in the coastal nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations throughout the state of Hawaii prior to advancing to more challenging, colder weather environments. Proposed training activities include occasional inclusion of other U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) personnel. The proposed action will increase the tempo of current training and add new NSO training within the nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations on the islands of Oahu, Kauai, and Hawaii; and in nearshore waters of the islands of Maui, Molokai, and Lanai. The training includes the following activities, either independently or in combination: launch and recovery of small watercraft and submersibles; insertion and extraction of trainees and/or equipment using small watercraft; diving/swimming; moving on foot over the beach; special reconnaissance (using observation techniques in pre-arranged scenarios); simulated building clearance; high-angle climbing; training with unmanned underwater vehicles and small unmanned aircraft systems (sUAS); and aircraft utilizing drop zones or landing zones for parachute or rope suspension training activities. Proposed air-based training would take place only on Department of Defense (DoD) and U. S. Coast Guard (USCG) property in selected coastal nearshore waters and on selected shoreline and inland locations throughout the state of Hawaii. Training would start in 2021 pending receipt of appropriate real estate agreements or right of entry permits from property owners of, or managers for, proposed training areas located on non-DoD property.

The purpose of the proposed action is to ensure that special operations forces acquire and master individual and team skills in the marine, terrestrial, and aviation aspects of NSO in order to progress to more advanced training and to be combat-ready when called to conduct special operations in support of USSOCOM. NSO personnel must be ready for a variety of military operations--from large-scale conflict to maritime security and humanitarian assistance/disaster relief--to respond to the dynamic, social, political, economic, and environmental issues that may arise.

The need for the proposed action is to meet requirements under Title 10 U.S. Code [USC] Section 167 for the Commander, USSOCOM to provide combat ready forces. NSO training requires personnel to successfully complete beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels of training in Hawaii's warm maritime climate prior to advancing to more challenging colder weather environments. Current NSO training in the state of Hawaii does not meet the full range

of training activities, locations, and duration needed to satisfy NSO mission training requirements and effectively prepare personnel to conduct operations and activities in support of USSOCOM and U.S. national interests. NSWC needs to train NSO units in full mission profile training that mimics real world mission scenarios in diverse training environments and includes all actions NSO units would typically have to accomplish during a mission. The trainees learn skills needed to avoid detection with the goal of leaving no trace of their presence during and after training activities. In this regard, the proposed action furthers the NSWC's execution of its congressionally mandated roles and responsibilities under Title 10 USC Section 167.

To facilitate NSO training in a variety of ocean, land, and air conditions, NSWC identified proposed training sites on or near six of the main Hawaiian Islands. The training study area includes 10 regions: Oahu Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam (JBPHH); Oahu Windward; Oahu North; Oahu South; Oahu West; Island of Hawaii; Kauai; Maui; Lanai; and Molokai. The training study area encompasses the nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations within the five regions on Oahu; the nearshore waters, selected shoreline, and inland locations within three sites on or near the Island of Hawaii region; and the nearshore waters (including harbors and bays) at one site off the Maui region, two sites off the Molokai region, and two sites off the Lanai region. No land- or air-based training is proposed within the Maui, Molokai, and Lanai training study areas.

Training activities would occur on DoD and USCG property and on non-DoD property (i.e., state, county, city, and private land) pending appropriate approvals. Not every non-DoD site would be used every year and the total training events proposed on DoD property would be distributed throughout the property within the training study area. Some locations would not be used for training during certain times of the year when weather, currents, scheduled public events, or protected natural resources concerns are present. Other sites may be used intermittently throughout a year or may not be used at all during a given year. No public properties would be closed to the public during proposed training activities. The size of the study area allows this flexibility, and also helps to prevent overuse. Training on non-DoD lands would only occur where a right of entry or other real estate agreement with a property owner or property manager is received.

A training event may consist of one or multiple training activities (e.g., launch and recovery, diver/swimmer, and/or over the beach). During a typical training event, there would be up to 20 trainees and up to 26 support personnel (up to 46 people in total) at a training site within the training study area. In a few instances, there could be up to 24 trainees; however, total personnel would never exceed 46. Support personnel would be divided up to assist both the in-water training activity and the terrestrial training activity. Not all 26 support personnel would be in the water or on land at any given time because they would be dispersed between the two areas.

Training events are progressive in nature and would range between 2 and 72 hours in duration depending on the activity. As training activities are scheduled, compatible sites within the training study area would be selected to support each training objective. To sustain the highest level of training value and avoid trainee familiarity with specific sites, site selections are made to create the most challenges for the trainees and be responsive to training requirements and

training qualifications. Not all sites within the training study area would be utilized over a 1-year period. Site selection would also consider seasonal conditions (e.g., high surf, strong currents, or high winds) and site conditions (e.g., scheduled public events or protected natural resources considerations).

The travel of personnel and equipment from the staging area located at JBPHH to the individual training sites is incorporated into the overall training scenario and would utilize government and public waterways and roads. This minimal travel may include military support vehicles towing small boats and safety and maintenance equipment. It could also include transportation of military personnel involved in the safety and training phases of the event. Waterborne transportation would similarly include the movement of training vessels (e.g., small surface support vessels, jet skis), safety equipment, and military personnel from the staging base to the event location. Typically, submersibles are launched from boat ramps or surface support ships near the site where training activities are scheduled.

The alternatives evaluated include the No Action Alternative and two Action Alternatives:

- Under the No Action Alternative, the water-, land-, and air-based baseline training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations as currently approved under event-based Records of Categorical Exclusion (CATEX), as applicable, and the October 2018 Final Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Activities EIS/Overseas EIS (HSTT EIS/OEIS). Training locations available in the state of Hawaii would continue to be restricted to a limited number of sites. To date, four event-based Records of CATEX have been approved to support NSO training on non-DoD land and four Records of CATEX have been approved to support NSO training on DoD land on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii. All eight Records of CATEX signed to date cover personnel swimming, over the beach training, high-angle climbing, and the use of small ships, boats, and submersibles on a limited number of sites in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii. Except for training at small arms ranges on DoD land, other NSO training is considered at-sea training, which is covered in the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS. Under the No Action Alternative, NSO training activities for a typical year include approximately 10 events per year on all non-DoD property and approximately 50 events per year on all DoD and USCG property. Training scenarios at the limited number of existing approved sites on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii are not sufficiently diverse to support the requirements for warm-weather NSO training and training progression and, therefore, do not adequately support the requirements to achieve combat readiness. NSWC did not select the No Action Alternative because it would not meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action since NSO units would not conduct, or meet, the full mission profile training requirements.
- Under Alternative 1, proposed training activities would occur within the training study area, which includes the nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations on the islands of Oahu, Hawaii, and Kauai; and the nearshore waters and two harbors at Maui; the nearshore waters and two harbors at Molokai, and one harbor and a nearshore area at Lanai. Land- or air-based training are not proposed on Maui, Lanai, and Molokai. Within the training study area, each training site on the proposed non-DoD properties would be used for a maximum of 6 events per year (pending receipt of real estate agreements/right-of-entry

permits). The maximum number of events across all non-DoD land training sites would not exceed 198 events per year and would not exceed 52 events per year across all DoD and USCG training sites. Training on land would only occur on proposed non-DoD training sites where a right of entry permit or other real estate agreement with a property owner or property manager is received and on DoD and USCG properties on Oahu and Kauai. NSWC did not select Alternative 1 because it was not as flexible as Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative) due to fewer proposed training events across all proposed DoD, USCG, and non-DoD training sites.

- Under Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative), the same proposed training study area and all activities described under Alternative 1 would occur; however, there would be an increase in the maximum number of training events conducted per year. Within the training study area, each proposed non-DoD training site would be used for a maximum of 10 events per year (pending receipt of real estate agreements/right-of-entry permits). The maximum number of events across all non-DoD land training sites would not exceed 330 events and would not exceed 265 events per year across all DoD and USCG properties.

The increased frequency of training under Alternative 2 best meets the purpose of and need for the proposed action. Increasing the frequency of training under Alternative 2 allows greater flexibility to support training and demand requirements that are driven by emergent national defense needs. Alternative 2 best supports special operations forces as they acquire and master individual and team skills in the marine, terrestrial, and aviation aspects of NSO in order to progress to more advanced training and to be combat-ready when called to conduct special operations in support of USSOCOM Combatant Commanders. Therefore, Alternative 2 is the preferred alternative as it best achieves the requirement that training be varied and diverse, and as realistic as possible, to prepare NSO personnel to achieve their mission and ensure their success and survival when deploying on missions.

The proposed action will have no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to the following resources: air quality, land use/recreation, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and public health and safety.

In accordance with the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), the Navy completed the Federal Coastal Consistency Determination (CCD) process in coordination with the Hawaii Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020, and February 17, 2021, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning concurred with the Navy's determinations that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program based on the following conditions that the Navy will implement:

1. The proposed activity shall be carried out as represented in the CCD and all supporting materials and information provided to the Hawaii CZM Program. Any changes to the proposed activity shall be submitted to the Hawaii CZM Program for review and approval. Changes to the proposed activity may require a full CZM federal consistency review, including publication of a public notice and provision for public review and comment. This condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed activity is implemented as reviewed by the Hawaii CZM Program.

Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) Chapter 205A "CZM", is the federally approved enforceable policy of the Hawaii CZM Program that applies to this condition.

2. The proposed activity shall be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurrence of "no adverse effect to historic properties," issued May 29, 2020, for the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation. In addition, the Navy will comply with SHPO requirements resulting from the HRS Chapter 6E "Historic Preservation" review. HRS Chapter 6E is the federally approved enforceable policy of the Hawaii CZM Program that applies to this condition.
3. The proposed activity shall not obstruct or preclude public engagement in or access to ocean recreation in/on non-DoD areas. This condition is necessary to ensure consistency with the recreational resource policies contained in HRS Chapter 205A "CZM", which is the federally approved enforceable policy that applies to this condition.
4. The proposed activity shall be conducted in compliance with the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), Division of Aquatic Resources, recommendations of September 24, 2019, and October 11, 2020, that were agreed to by the Navy as transmitted and indicated in the June 18, 2020, letter and October 19, 2020, email to the Office of Planning.

The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a *de minimis* usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 *Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA*. Pursuant to the 2009 *de minimis* activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed *de minimis* activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions.

On January 23, 2019, the Navy submitted a Negative Determination for proposed training activities on Oahu at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanies Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area. After a thorough assessment, the Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. The Navy has determined that the implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanies Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii.

In addition, on March 25, 2021, the Navy submitted an addendum to the January 23, 2019, Negative Determination to address U.S. Air Force-leased lands on Oahu at the Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station (KPSTS). After an assessment was conducted, the Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. The Navy has determined that the implementation of the proposed NSO training on U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii.

The Navy initiated the NHPA Section 106 process on August 22, 2018. The Navy consulted with the Hawaii SHPO to assess the effects of the proposed action on historic properties. The

Section 106 consultation included coordination with Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic preservation non-governmental organizations, and the public. The Navy determined that the proposed undertaking as described in Alternative 2 would have no adverse effect to historic properties in accordance with NHPA Section 106. Since the proposed training activities will be ongoing, the Navy has agreed to brief SHPO annually regarding effects to historic properties, if any, as well as locations of training in accordance to Operational Security requirements. In addition, the Navy shall review the Section 106 consultation with the SHPO seven years following receipt of SHPO's concurrence letter. Prior to the seven-year review, reinitiation of the Section 106 process would be warranted if there is a change in the undertaking or the area of potential effect. On May 29, 2020, the Hawaii SHPO concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect, completing the Navy's Section 106 process for this undertaking.

As required by the Endangered Species Act (ESA) section 7(a)(2), the Navy initiated consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on November 19, 2018. The Navy prepared a Biological Evaluation (BE) and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on the following ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat: five plant species (*Panicum niuhauense* and critical habitat, *Sesbania tomentosa* and critical habitat, *Abutilon menziesii*, *Cyperus trachysanthos*, *Marsilea villosa*), orangeblack damselfly, two yellow-faced bee species, Hawaiian coot, Hawaiian common gallinule, Hawaiian duck, Hawaiian stilt, Hawaiian goose, Hawaiian hawk, band-rumped storm petrel, Hawaiian petrel, Newell's Townsend's shearwater, Hawaiian hoary bat, and nesting green turtle, hawksbill turtle, and olive ridley turtle. On March 14, 2019, the USFWS issued a letter of concurrence with the Navy's findings that implementation of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction.

After submission of the BE and receipt of the letter of concurrence from the USFWS, the ESA-listed endangered plant *Bidens amplexans* was found to occur within the KPSTS training study area (West Oahu region). On November 30, 2020, Navy requested consultation and concurrence from USFWS on the Navy's determination of may affect, not likely to adversely affect for the federally endangered *Bidens amplexans* in the KPSTS training study area on Oahu. On March 16, 2021, the USFWS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's determination.

As required by ESA section 7(a)(2), the Navy initiated consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on December 13, 2018. The Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on the following ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat: Main Hawaiian Island insular false killer whale and critical habitat, Hawaiian monk seal and critical habitat, Central North Pacific green turtle, hawksbill turtle, olive ridley turtle, oceanic whitetip shark, and giant manta ray. On April 30, 2020, NMFS issued a letter of concurrence with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction.

As required by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), the Navy initiated consultation with NMFS on December 13, 2018. The Navy prepared an Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Assessment to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. On June 28, 2019, NMFS issued a letter of concurrence stating that

implementation of Alternative 2 would not adversely affect EFH within the training study area with implementation of conservation recommendations. The Navy responded on November 21, 2019 and agreed to implement the following conservation recommendations.

1. Conduct surveillance and site-specific training reconnaissance as described in the proposed best management practices (BMPs).
2. Training exercises within areas designated as Marine Life Conservation Districts (MLCDs) on Oahu and Lanai will be modified to avoid impacts to marine resources. No motorized vessels (e.g., submarine, zodiacs, or jet-skis) will be utilized in either MLCD. All vessels/crafts will be left at the outer boundary of the MLCDs. Self-contained underwater breathing apparatus (scuba) diving, an approved activity within the MLCDs, will be conducted within both MLCDs. Over-the-beach training is allowed at the Pupukeya MLCD, Oahu; however, over-the-beach training will not be conducted at the Hulopo'e Bay MLCD, Lanai.
3. Ensure no anchors, equipment, tools, and personnel are in contact with any organism, especially coral; instead place anchors in soft sediment in unconsolidated bottom habitats only.
4. All vessels should operate at "no wake/idle" speeds at all times while in water depths where the draft of the vessel provides less than a 6-foot (2 meter) clearance.
5. When conducting activities in shallow water, all vessels should employ a dedicated and qualified "lookout" to assist the pilot with avoiding large coral colonies and other benthic organisms.

Consultation for EFH under the MSA was completed on December 2, 2019, with receipt of a letter of concurrence from NMFS.

Marine mammal species with the potential to occur in the training study area include the Main Hawaiian Islands Insular false killer whale Distinct Population Segment (DPS), blue whale, fin whale, sei whale, sperm whale, humpback whale, short-finned pilot whale, bottlenose dolphin, and spinner dolphin, and Hawaiian monk seal. The Hawaii DPS for humpback whales was recently delisted by NMFS (81 Federal Register 62260); however, this species is still protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) (as are all marine mammals). Pursuant to the MMPA, the Navy determined that the proposed action will not result in the unintentional taking of marine mammals incidental to those activities, as defined by the MMPA and, therefore, consultation under the MMPA is not required. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes) and would not be considered Level A or Level B harassment. NSWC will employ BMPs, standard operating procedures (SOPs) (e.g., activity-specific protection measures, including watch-out and avoidance procedures), and comply with established boating laws and reduce speed in accordance with established safety procedures, avoiding contact and proximity to marine mammals. Submersibles use a sonar device to report depths to aid in navigation during a training activity. These devices have similar specifications to commercially available "fish finders" and other hand-held sonar devices, which typically generate frequencies over 200 kilohertz and source levels less than 160 decibels reference 1 micropascal. NMFS considers devices with these specifications *de minimis* sources of sound in the water that are unlikely to cause behavioral or injurious effects on marine mammals.

Regarding public health and safety, the proposed action includes areas used by the public for recreational, commercial, or institutional activities. Navy policy requires that training activities ensure the safety and health of personnel and the public. NSWC will delay, move, or cancel proposed action training activities if there is a question about the safety of the public. NSWC will incorporate several BMPs and SOPs into different types of training, including having safety vessels and support personnel on site during the training to ensure the safety of trainees and the public.

Proposed training activities would not include use of live-fire weapons or explosives; however, in three locations (Puuloa Range Training Facility, Pearl City Peninsula, and Marine Corps Base Hawaii [MCBH] - Kaneohe Bay Range Training Facility), live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges. These three locations are within DoD property with limited and restricted public access and are authorized live-fire training areas.

To further ensure public safety in all other areas of the training study area, trainees would not carry loaded weapons or explosives during training events and NSWC would coordinate with the USCG to issue Notices to Mariners (NOTMARs), when necessary. For air-based activities, including the use of aircraft and sUAS, NSWC will continue to observe all Navy and DoD safety regulations, including issuance of Notices to Airmen, and comply with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) safety regulation and DoD's Memorandum of Agreement with the FAA and the Naval Air Training and Operating Procedures Standardization program. NSWC will coordinate with the FAA to obtain a Certificate of Authorization (COA) for sUAS operations over DoD properties. Proposed sUAS operations will operate safely within the COAs to avoid and prevent any potential safety impacts with other users of airspace. Proposed sUAS activities would only occur above DoD installations.

All training events on state, county, city, or private lands and harbors would be conducted in accordance with rights of-entry and real estate agreements and approvals. A safety buffer would be established around water- and land-based training areas, and a vehicle would be dedicated for emergency response during training events. NSWC would coordinate with the USCG to issue NOTMARs and will also coordinate with local police departments and law enforcement prior to conducting training activities.

Transportation vehicles, vessels, aircraft, and training equipment associated with proposed training activities would generate emissions but would have a negligible impact on the ambient air quality of the region. Although implementation of Alternative 2 would produce criteria pollutant emissions that exceed Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Significant Emission Rates for volatile organic compounds and carbon monoxide pursuant to PSD permitting requirements, training activities would be distributed across the islands. The dispersive nature of the proposed training activities would prevent pollutants from concentrating in a single location and would not result in a new major source of emissions that could cause the State of Hawaii to exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards for the following six criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter (dust particles less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter and fine particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter), and lead. The State of Hawaii is designated as being in attainment for all criteria pollutants and, therefore, does not require a conformity determination. The limited amount of emissions would not likely contribute to global warming to any

discernible extent. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in a significant change from the environmental baseline and would not result in significant impacts on the regional air quality.

Land use impacts from the proposed training activities would be minimal, short-term, and temporary due to the following: relatively low intensity of the impacts; localized nature of the impacts; infrequent nature of the impacts; brief duration of the activities; and implementation of BMPs and SOPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on land use. The proposed training activities would not restrict the ability of individuals to use or access areas used for recreation, hunting, fishing, or other existing land uses. Right-of-entry permits, other real estate agreements, or use authorizations would be obtained prior to conducting training in areas where consent is needed. Minimization measures employed during training activities would limit encounters with the public during training events. Training events under the proposed action would be widely dispersed throughout the training study area and temporary in nature. As a result, not every site would be used every year, and no public or private training location would be used for more than 10 training events in any given year. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of the proposed action.

Airborne noise would be generated from small watercraft, including jet skis, land surface support vehicles, the firing of simulated munitions, sUAS, and aircraft. Activities that include firing of simulated munitions and use of sUAS and aircraft would only occur on DoD property. Training activities would generally occur away from residentially zoned areas, and the operational objective of land-based activities is to remain undetected and leave no trace of any training activities conducted. Aviation activities would occur at elevations above 2,000 feet, with the exception of activities occurring below 500 feet over DoD lands or open waters adjacent to DoD lands for short time periods (approximately 10 minutes). Therefore, potential noise impacts are avoided and minimized. Disturbances are expected to be short term and infrequent, and any impacts on noise sensitive receptors or points of interest would be minimal and short term based on the relatively low intensity of the impacts, localized and infrequent nature of the impacts, and brief duration of the activities. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts to the regional noise environment.

The NSWC coordinated with various federal, state, and local agencies during the NEPA process. State regulations require a notice in the Hawaii Office of Environmental Quality Control bulletin *The Environmental Notice* (Hawaii Administrative Rules [HAR] Section 11-200-3). NSWC published a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EA for three consecutive days (November 8 through November 10, 2018) in the *Honolulu Star Advertiser*, *Maui News*, and *West Hawaii Today*; and in the Hawaii Office of Environmental Quality Control bulletin, *The Environmental Notice*, on November 8, 2018. The NOA described the proposed action, solicited public comments on the Draft EA, provided dates of the public comment period, and announced that a copy of the Draft EA would be available for a 30-day review from November 8, 2018 through December 10, 2018. The Draft EA was made available on the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Pacific project website at <https://go.usa.gov/xUnDC> and copies were placed in the following public libraries:

1. Oahu: Hawaii State Library, 478 S. King Street, Honolulu, HI 96813;
2. Kauai: Waimea Public Library, 9750 Kaunualii Hwy, Waimea, HI 96796;

3. Hawaii Island: Kailua-Kona Public Library, 75-138 Hualalai Rd, Kailua-Kona, HI 96740;
4. Maui: Kahului Public Library, 90 School St, Kahului, HI 96732; and
5. Molokai: Molokai Public Library, 15 Ala Malama Ave, Kaunakakai, HI 96748.

Following requests for an extension to the comment period, the Navy issued a press release on December 6, 2018 and published the NOA of the Draft EA in *The Environmental Notice* on December 8, 2018 announcing a 30-day comment period extension. Therefore, the public comment period on the Draft EA was 60 days, from November 8, 2018 to January 7, 2019.

A NOA of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and EA under NEPA will be published in the same newspapers listed above and a hard copy of the documents will be available at the libraries listed above. In addition, digital copies of the documents will be available on the NAVFAC Pacific website at https://www.navfac.navy.mil/navfac_worldwide/pacific/about_us/national-environmental-policy-act--nepa--information.html.

The Navy is issuing a Final EA and this FONSI for the proposed action. As portions of the proposed action will involve the use of state, county, or city lands, pursuant to HRS Chapter 343 and its implementing regulations, a separate determination will be made by the Hawaii DLNR under the Hawaii Environmental Policy Act (HAR 11-200-6(b)(1)(A)) (HEPA) on whether to adopt the Navy's final EA and issue a HEPA notice of determination of FONSI. The Hawaii DLNR is the agency that oversees the HEPA process for the applicant (Navy).

Based on the analysis presented in the EA, the Navy has determined that the proposed action will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, there is no requirement to prepare an EIS.

The EA addressing this action may be obtained from: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific (NAVFAC Pacific), Attention: John Bigay, NAVFAC Pacific Project Manager, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii 96860-3134.

13 May 2021

Date



S.T. GOODFELLOW

Director,
Energy and Environmental Readiness Division

Abstract

Designation:	Environmental Assessment
Title of Proposed Action:	Naval Special Operations Training in the State of Hawaii
Project Location:	State of Hawaii
Lead Agency for the EA:	Department of the Navy
Cooperating Agency:	None
Affected Region:	State of Hawaii
Action Proponent:	Naval Special Warfare Command
Point of Contact:	Naval Special Warfare Command 2000 Trident Way, Bldg. 624 San Diego, CA 92155-5599 Attn: Adrienne Saboya, NSO Training in Hawaii Environmental Program Manager
Date:	May 2021

The United States (U.S.) Naval Special Warfare Command (NSWC) is the U.S. Navy's special operations force and maritime component of the U.S. Special Operations Command. NSWC has prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations; Navy regulations; Hawaii Administrative Rules Chapter 11-200; and Hawaii Revised Statutes 343. The proposed action supports small-unit beginning, intermediate, and advanced land-, water-, and air-based training activities for naval special operations (NSO) personnel. Training would occur in the nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu, Kauai, and the Island of Hawaii; and in nearshore waters (including harbors and bays) of Maui, Molokai, and Lanai. Proposed NSO training would start in 2021 on Department of Defense (DoD) and U.S. Coast Guard properties, and on non-DoD properties (i.e., state, county, city, and private land) pending receipt of appropriate real-estate agreements or right of-entry permits from property owners or managers. This EA evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with the No Action Alternative and two action alternatives (Alternatives 1 and 2) on the following resource areas: air quality, land use/recreation, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and public health and safety.

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 Proposed Action

The United States (U.S.) Naval Special Warfare Command (NSWC) proposes to conduct small-unit beginning, intermediate, and advanced land-, water-, and air-based training activities for naval special operations (NSO) personnel in the coastal nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations throughout the state of Hawaii prior to advancing to more challenging (colder weather) environments. NSWC is the U.S. Department of the Navy's (Navy's) special operations force and the maritime component of the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). The proposed training activities consist of training by NSO personnel with occasional integration of other USSOCOM components, including U.S. Army Special Operations Command, U.S. Marine Corps Special Operations Command, U.S. Air Force Special Operations Command, and Joint Special Operations Command. The occasional integration of other USSOCOM components would occur only with NSWC-led training.

The proposed training activities broadly fit into three categories: water-based training, land-based training, and air-based training. These training activities can be done independently or in combination.

- *Water-based training* generally includes NSO personnel diving/swimming, launching/recovering small vehicles designed to operate underwater (e.g., submersibles and unmanned underwater vehicles [UUVs]) as independent activities, or in combination. Water-based training may also incorporate inserting and extracting NSO personnel or equipment using watercraft as part of a training event and prior to performing a land-based training component.
- *Land-based training* would include personnel transiting over the beach on foot, simulating building clearance activities using simulated munitions, in limited areas engaging in high-angle climbing, and using observation techniques in a pre-arranged scenario (special reconnaissance operations with military role players).
- *Air-based training* would include the use of small unmanned aircraft systems (sUAS; those weighing less than 55 pounds) or aircraft utilizing drop zones or landing zones for parachute or rope suspension training activities. The proposed air-based training would take place only above Department of Defense (DoD) and U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) land in selected coastal nearshore waters and on selected shoreline and inland locations throughout the state of Hawaii.

Training would start in 2021 pending receipt of appropriate real-estate agreements or right of-entry permits from property owners of, or managers for, proposed training areas located on non-DoD property.

To facilitate NSO training in a variety of ocean, land, and air conditions, proposed training sites have been identified on or near six of the main Hawaiian Islands. The training study area includes 10 regions: Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam [JBPHH], Oahu; Oahu South; Oahu North; Oahu West; and Oahu Windward; Kauai; Maui; Lanai; Molokai; and the Island of Hawaii. Training activities would occur on DoD and USCG property as well as on non-DoD property, pending appropriate approvals.

ES.2 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the proposed action is to ensure that special operations forces acquire and master individual and team skills in the marine, terrestrial, and aviation aspects of NSO in order to progress to more advanced training and to be combat-ready when called to conduct special operations in support of USSOCOM. NSO personnel must be ready for a variety of military operations—from large-scale conflict to maritime security and humanitarian assistance/disaster relief—to respond to the dynamic, social,

political, economic, and environmental issues that may arise. The need for the proposed action is to meet requirements under Title 10 U.S. Code Section 167 for the Commander, USSOCOM to provide combat-ready forces.

ES.3 Alternatives Considered

NSWC considered three training area screening factors (training, safety, and logistics) when identifying an area that could support warm-weather NSO training and satisfy the training requirements. NSWC is considering two action alternatives that meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action, and a No Action Alternative, the baseline of current use.

Under the No Action Alternative, the NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and approved under event-based Records of Categorical Exclusion (CATEX), and the 2018 Final Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Activities Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (HSTT EIS/OEIS), as applicable. To date, four event-based Records of CATEX have been approved to support NSO training on non-DoD land and four Records of CATEX have been approved to support NSO training on DoD land on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii. All eight Records CATEX signed to date cover personnel swimming, over-the-beach training, high-angle climbing, and the use of small ships, boats and submersibles on a limited number of sites on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii. Except for training at small arms ranges on DoD land, other NSO training is considered at-sea training, which is covered in the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS. Under the No Action Alternative, NSO training activities for a typical year include approximately 10 events/year across all non-DoD properties combined and approximately 50 events/year on DoD and USCG property.

Under Alternative 1, proposed training activities would occur within the training study area, which includes the nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu, the Island of Hawaii, and Kauai, and nearshore waters and two harbors at Maui; nearshore waters and two harbors at Molokai, and one nearshore area and harbor at Lanai. Land- or air-based training is not proposed on Maui, Lanai, and Molokai. Within the training study area, each proposed non-DoD training site would be used for a maximum of 6 events/year (pending receipt of real estate agreements/right-of-entry permits). The maximum number of events across all non-DoD training sites would not exceed 198 events/year and would not exceed 52 events/year on all DoD and USCG property within the training study area. Training would only occur on proposed non-DoD training sites where a right of entry permit or other real estate agreement with a property owner or property manager is received and on DoD and USCG properties on Oahu and Kauai.

Alternative 2 is the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 2 includes the same proposed training study area and all activities in Alternative 1; however, there would be an increase in the maximum number of training events conducted per year. Under Alternative 2, each proposed non-DoD property training site would be used for a maximum of 10 events per year (pending receipt of real estate agreements/right-of-entry permits) within the training study area. The maximum number of events across all non-DoD training sites would not exceed 330 events/year and would not exceed 265 events/year across all DoD and USCG properties. Training would only occur on proposed non-DoD training sites where a right of entry permit or other real estate agreement with a property owner or property manager is received and on DoD and USCG properties on Oahu and Kauai.

For all the alternatives discussed, not every non-DoD site would be used every year. However, for any particular site within a region and alternative, the maximums as described above would not be exceeded. For all alternatives, the total training events proposed on DoD property would be distributed throughout the property within the training study area. There are multiple potential training sites within each of the 10 regional training study areas (i.e., 5 regional training study areas on Oahu, and a regional training study area on the Island of Hawaii, Maui, Lanai, Kauai, and Molokai).

Some locations would not be used for training during certain times of the year when weather, currents, scheduled public events, or protected natural resources concerns are present. Other sites may be used intermittently throughout a year or may not be used at all during a given year. All training events on non-DoD sites would be conducted in accordance with real estate agreements and approvals. NSWC would coordinate with land managers (where applicable), and property owners prior to use of property for training. No public properties would be closed to the public during proposed training activities. The size of the study area allows this flexibility, and also helps to prevent overuse.

ES.4 Summary of Environmental Resources Evaluated in the Environmental Assessment

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and Navy instructions for implementing NEPA, specify that an Environmental Assessment (EA) should address those resources potentially subject to impacts. In addition, the level of analysis should be commensurate with the anticipated level of environmental impact.

The Navy, on behalf of NSWC, has completed consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO); State of Hawaii Department of Planning, Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program; and coordinated with the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) on the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2). Correspondence between the Navy and USFWS, NMFS, SHPO, State of Hawaii Department of Planning, Hawaii DLNR, and the National Park Service is available in Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*.

As required by section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Navy prepared a Biological Evaluation (BE) and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on the following ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat: six plant species (*Panicum niihauense* and critical habitat, *Sesbania tomentosa* and critical habitat, *Abutilon menziesii*, *Cyperus trachysanthos*, *Marsilea villosa*, and *Bidens amplexens*), orangeblack damselfly, two yellow-faced bee species, Hawaiian coot, Hawaiian common gallinule, Hawaiian duck, Hawaiian stilt, Hawaiian goose, Hawaiian hawk, band-rumped storm petrel, Hawaiian petrel, Newell's Townsend's shearwater, Hawaiian hoary bat, and nesting green turtle, hawksbill turtle, and olive ridley turtle. In March 2019 and March 2021, the USFWS issued letters of concurrence stating that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and critical habitat under their jurisdiction within the action area.

As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on the following ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat: Main Hawaiian Islands Insular false killer whale Distinct Population Segment (DPS) and critical habitat, Hawaiian monk seal and critical habitat, Central North Pacific green turtle, hawksbill turtle, olive ridley turtle, oceanic whitetip shark, and giant manta ray. In April 2020, NMFS issued a letter of concurrence stating that implementation of Alternative 2 may

affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction.

Marine mammal species with the potential to occur in the training study area include the Main Hawaiian Islands Insular false killer whale DPS, blue whale, fin whale, sei whale, sperm whale, humpback whale, short-finned pilot whale, bottlenose dolphin, and spinner dolphin, and Hawaiian monk seal. Pursuant to the MMPA, the Navy determined that the proposed action will not result in the unintentional taking of marine mammals incidental to those activities, as defined by the MMPA and, therefore, consultation under the MMPA is not required. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes) and would not be considered Level B harassment. NSWC will employ best management practices (BMPs), standard operating procedures (SOPs) (activity-specific protection measures, including watch-out and avoidance procedures), and comply with established boating laws and reduce speed in accordance with established safety procedures, avoiding contact and proximity to marine mammals. Submersibles use a sonar device to report depths to aid in navigation during a training activity. These devices have similar specifications to commercially available “fish finders” and other hand-held sonar devices, which typically generate frequencies over 200 kilohertz and source levels less than 160 decibels reference 1 micropascal. NMFS considers devices with these specifications “de minimis” sources of sound in the water that are unlikely to cause behavioral or injurious effects on marine mammals.

Pursuant to the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) and implementing regulations, activities proposed under Alternative 2 that involve vessels and personnel in the water could potentially impact EFH species and habitats present in the training study area. As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and conducted consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. The Navy has determined that under Alternative 2 there would be no adverse effect on EFH within the training study area. In June 2019, NMFS issued a letter of concurrence stating that implementation of Alternative 2 would not adversely affect EFH within the training study area with implementation of conservation recommendations. The Navy responded in November 2019 and agreed to implement the following conservation recommendations, and consultation for EFH under the MSA was completed in December 2019 with receipt of a letter of concurrence from NMFS:

1. Conduct surveillance and site-specific training reconnaissance as described in the proposed BMPs.
2. Training exercises within areas designated as Marine Life Conservation Districts (MLCDs) on Oahu and Lanai will be modified to avoid impacts to marine resources. No motorized vessels (e.g., submarine, zodiacs, or jet-skis) will be utilized in either MLCD. All vessels/crafts will be left at the outer boundary of the MLCDs. Self-contained underwater breathing apparatus (scuba) diving, an approved activity within the MLCDs, will be conducted within both MLCDs. Over-the-beach training is allowed at the Pupukea MLCD, Oahu; however, over-the-beach training will not be conducted at the Hulopo’e Bay MLCD, Lanai.
3. Ensure no anchors, equipment, tools, and personnel are in contact with any organism, especially coral; instead place anchors in soft sediment in unconsolidated bottom habitats only.
4. All vessels should operate at “no wake/idle” speeds at all times while in water depths where the draft of the vessel provides less than a 6-foot (2 meter) clearance.
5. When conducting activities in shallow water, all vessels should employ a dedicated and qualified “lookout” to assist the pilot with avoiding large coral colonies and other benthic organisms.

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Navy consulted with the Hawaii SHPO to assess the effects of the proposed action on historic properties. The Section 106 consultation included coordination with Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic preservation non-governmental organizations, and the public. The Navy concluded responsibilities under Section 106 for this undertaking and fulfilled the agency official's responsibilities under Section 106. The Navy determined that the proposed undertaking for NSWC to conduct land-, water-, and air-based training activities in the state of Hawaii would result in no historic properties affected in accordance with NHPA Section 106 Implementing Regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.4(d)(1). On May 29, 2020, the Hawaii SHPO concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect, completing the Navy's Section 106 process for this undertaking.

In accordance with the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), the Navy completed the Federal Coastal Consistency Determination (CCD) process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020 and February 17, 2021, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning concurred with the Navy's determinations that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program based on the following conditions that the Navy will implement:

1. The proposed activity shall be carried out as represented in the CCD and all supporting materials and information provided to the Hawaii CZM Program. Any changes to the proposed activity shall be submitted to the Hawaii CZM Program for review and approval. Changes to the proposed activity may require a full CZM federal consistency review, including publication of a public notice and provision for public review and comment. This condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed activity is implemented as reviewed for consistency with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program. Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) Chapter 205A (Coastal Zone Management), is the federally approved enforceable policy of the Hawaii CZM Program that applies to this condition.
2. The proposed activity shall be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the Hawaii SHPO concurrence of "no adverse effect to historic properties," issued May 29, 2020, for the NHPA Section 106 consultation. In addition, SHPO requirements resulting from the HRS Chapter 6E Historic Preservation review shall be complied with. HRS Chapter 6E is the federally approved enforceable policy of the Hawaii CZM Program that applies to this condition.
3. The proposed activity shall not obstruct or preclude public engagement in or access to ocean recreation in/on non-DoD areas. This condition is necessary to ensure consistency with the recreational resource policies contained in HRS Chapter 205A, which is the federally approved enforceable policy that applies to this condition.
4. The proposed activity shall be conducted in compliance with the Hawaii DLNR, Division of Aquatic Resources recommendations of September 24, 2019 and October 11, 2020, that were agreed to by the Navy as transmitted and indicated in the June 18, 2020 letter and October 19, 2020 email to the Office of Planning.

The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a *de minimis* usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 *Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA*. Pursuant to the 2009 *de minimis* activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed *de minimis* activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on

the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions.

On January 23, 2019 the Navy submitted a Negative Determination for proposed training activities on Oahu at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanies Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area. After an assessment was conducted, the Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. The Navy has determined that the implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanies Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii.

In addition, on March 25, 2021 the Navy submitted an addendum to the January 23, 2019 Negative Determination to address U.S. Air Force-leased lands on Oahu at the Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station (KPSTS). After an assessment was conducted, the Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. The Navy has determined that the implementation of the proposed NSO training on U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii.

The Navy has issued a Final EA and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under NEPA for the proposed action. Because portions of the proposed action will involve the use of state, county, or city lands, pursuant to HRS Chapter 343 and its implementing regulations, a separate determination will be made by the Hawaii DLNR under the Hawaii Environmental Policy Act (HEPA) (Hawaii Administrative Rules [HAR] 11-200-6(b)(1)(A)) whether to adopt the final EA and issue a notice of determination of FONSI. The Hawaii DLNR is the agency that oversees the HEPA process for the applicant (Navy).

The following resource areas have been addressed in this EA: air quality, land use/recreation, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and public health and safety. The potential impacts on the following resource areas are considered to be negligible or non-existent, and therefore were not analyzed in detail in this EA:

Water Resources: The proposed action would not impound, divert, drain, control, or otherwise modify the waters of any stream or other body of water. The proposed training activities do not involve changes to drainage patterns or introduce pollutants to training study area surface waters or groundwater. Water quality is not expected to undergo a measurable impact due to the proposed action.

Geological Resources: The proposed action does not include construction on undeveloped land or ground-disturbing activities in any undisturbed areas.

Visual Resources: The proposed action does not include construction or permanent new structures over an undisturbed area and would not alter the visual landscape within the training study area. In addition, any vegetation clearing (only proposed at one location) would not change the overall composition of the landscape.

Airspace: The proposed action would not result in a permanent change of airspace designation or restriction in the existing airspace within the training study area or surrounding area. To support the sUAS training activities, a Certificate of Authorization would be obtained from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to fly sUAS over DoD and USCG property. The Certificate of Authorization would specify provisions or limitations, if necessary, as part of the approval, to ensure that sUAS can operate

safely with other airspace users. Air-based training involving aircraft would be conducted in accordance with FAA regulations and the Naval Air Training and Operating Procedures Standardization (NATOPS) program.

Infrastructure: The proposed action does not include changes to infrastructure within the training study area. There would be no disruption or change to existing transportation, wastewater, water, or telecommunication services associated with the proposed action.

Transportation: The proposed action would not change or alter transportation facilities or circulation of traffic patterns within the training study area or surrounding area.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes: The proposed action involves minimal use of machinery, equipment, or vehicles; as such, no increases in the amount of hazardous waste produced would be expected. With implementation of best management practices, including compliance with Navy Spill Prevention and Control and Countermeasure plans, hazardous materials and waste would not be released into the environment under the proposed action. Military expended material such as flares and pyrotechnics, propellants, and explosives would not be utilized as part of NSO training. Hazardous materials and wastes would not be generated or released into the environment under the proposed action and expended batteries would be recycled or disposed of properly.

Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice: The proposed action would not result in changes to the population demographics, employment, community, or socioeconomic characteristics within the training study area.

ES.5 Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences of the Action Alternatives and Major Mitigating Actions

This EA analyzes the potential impacts of actions associated with NSO in Hawaii. A full range of environmental resources were considered for evaluation at the outset of the process. Table ES-1 provides a summary of the potential impacts on the resources associated with each of the alternative actions analyzed.

ES.6 Public Involvement

The CEQ regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR part 1506.6) direct agencies to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures. State of Hawaii regulations require a notice in the Hawaii Office of Environmental Quality Control bulletin *The Environmental Notice* (HAR Section 11-200-3). NSWEC published a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EA for three consecutive days (November 8-10, 2018) in the Honolulu Star Advertiser, Maui News, and West Hawaii Today, and once in *The Environmental Notice* on November 8, 2018. The NOA described the proposed action, solicited public comments on the Draft EA, provided dates of the public comment period, and announced that a copy of the Draft EA would be available for a 30-day review (November 8, 2018 through December 10, 2018). The Draft EA was made available on the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific website (<https://go.usa.gov/xUnDC>) and copies of the Draft EA were placed in the following public libraries:

- Oahu: Hawaii State Library, 478 S. King Street, Honolulu, HI 96813
- Kauai: Waimea Public Library, 9750 Kaunualii Hwy, Waimea, HI 96796
- Hawaii Island: Kailua-Kona Public Library, 75-138 Hualalai Rd, Kailua-Kona, HI 96740
- Maui: Kahului Public Library, 90 School St, Kahului, HI 96732
- Molokai: Molokai Public Library, 15 Ala Malama Ave, Kaunakakai, HI 96748

Following requests to extend the public comment period, the Navy issued a press release announcing the comment period extension and re-published the NOA of the Draft EA in *The Environmental Notice*, on December 8, 2018. The public comment period was extended for 30 days and closed on January 7, 2019, thus the public was provided a 60-day comment and review period of the Draft EA. All public comments received and associated Navy comment response letters are provided in Appendix C (Public Comments on the Draft EA and Response to Public Comments).

NSWC published the NOA of the Final EA/FONSI for three consecutive days (June 9 – 11, 2021) in the Honolulu Star Advertiser, Maui News, and West Hawaii Today, and once in *The Environmental Notice*. The Final EA/FONSI for Naval Special Operations Training, State of Hawaii is available at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/navfac_worldwide/pacific/about_us/national-environmental-policy-act--nepa--information.html under “NEPA documents available for public review” at the bottom of the page. All public notices are presented in Appendix D (Public Involvement Notices).

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
AIR QUALITY		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in the state of Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impact on air quality would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Transportation vehicles, vessels, aircraft and training equipment associated with proposed training activities would generate emissions; however, the emissions would not result in a significant change from the environmental baseline and would have negligible impacts on the ambient air quality of the region. In addition, the dispersive nature of the proposed activities would prevent pollutants concentrating in a single location and would not result in a new major source of emissions that could cause the state of Hawaii to exceed NAAQS. The state of Hawaii is designated as being in attainment for all criteria pollutants and, therefore, does not require a conformity determination. Therefore, no significant impacts on air quality would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Transportation vehicles, vessels, aircraft and training equipment associated with proposed training activities would generate emissions greater than Alternative 1 due to the increase in tempo. Proposed training activities would not result in a significant change from the environmental baseline and would have negligible impacts on the ambient air quality of the region. In addition, the dispersive nature of the proposed activities would prevent pollutants concentrating in a single location and would not result in a new major source of emissions that could cause the state of Hawaii to exceed NAAQS. The state of Hawaii is designated as being in attainment for all criteria pollutants and, therefore, does not require a conformity determination. Therefore, no significant impacts on air quality would occur with implementation of Alternative 2.</p>
LAND USE/RECREATION		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in the state of Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed training activities under Alternative 1 would not restrict the ability of individuals to use or access areas used for recreation, hunting, fishing, or other existing land uses. Proposed training activities would not affect the public’s ability to use recreation areas as training activities would be localized, infrequent, and brief in duration. Right-of-entry permits and/or real estate agreements would be obtained prior to conducting training in areas where consent is needed. Minimization measures employed during training activities would limit encounters with the public during training events. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of Alternative 1. • In accordance with the CZMA, the Navy completed the Federal CCD process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020 and February 17, 2021, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning conditionally concurred with the Navy’s determination that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional impacts on land use/recreation are expected. Impacts on land use/recreation with implementation of Alternative 2 are expected to be similar to Alternative 1 and would be minimal, short term, and temporary due to the following: relatively low intensity of the impacts, localized nature of the impacts, infrequent nature of the impacts, brief duration of the activities, and implementation of SOPs and BMPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on land use/recreation. • The proposed training activities under Alternative 2 would not restrict the ability of individuals to use or access areas used for recreation, hunting, fishing, or other existing land uses. Proposed training activities would not affect the public’s ability to use recreation areas as training activities would be localized, infrequent, and brief in duration. Right-of-entry permits and/or real estate agreements would be obtained prior to conducting training in areas where consent is needed. Minimization measures employed during

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a <i>de minimis</i> usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 <i>Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA</i>. Pursuant to the 2009 <i>de minimis</i> activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed <i>de minimis</i> activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions. • On January 23, 2019 the Navy submitted a Negative Determination for proposed training activities at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area. The Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii. • On March 25, 2021 the Navy submitted an addendum to the January 23, 2019 Negative Determination to address U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS. The Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training on U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii. 	<p>training activities would limit encounters with the public during training events. No public properties would be closed to the public during proposed training activities. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of Alternative 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the CZMA, the Navy completed the Federal CCD process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020 and February 17, 2021, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning conditionally concurred with the Navy’s determinations that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program. • The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a <i>de minimis</i> usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 <i>Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA</i>. Pursuant to the 2009 <i>de minimis</i> activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed <i>de minimis</i> activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions. • On January 23, 2019 the Navy submitted a Negative Determination for proposed training activities at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area. The Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii. • On March 25, 2021 the Navy submitted an addendum to the January 23, 2019 Negative Determination to address U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS. The Navy determined that the

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
		<p>proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training on U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii.</p>
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in the state of Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impacts on biological resources would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Impacts on terrestrial and marine biological resources with implementation of Alternative 1 are expected to be minimal, short term, and temporary due to the following: relatively low intensity of the impacts, localized nature of the impacts, infrequent nature of the impacts, brief duration of the activities, and implementation of SOPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on biological resources.</p> <p>Terrestrial Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the non-invasive nature of the proposed training activities (e.g., no live-fire, no construction, no digging, no fires, no human waste) would have minimal effects on terrestrial vegetation and wildlife because of the short duration, infrequency of occurrence, and low intensity of the proposed training activities. Because the goal of training is for the trainees to be in the field undetected, the environment would be minimally disturbed and materials (e.g., gear and trash) would not be left behind. In addition, identical travel routes would rarely be used; the level of foot traffic associated with each group would not wear paths in the training study area. Species would likely respond to the physical presence of trainees by temporarily stopping normal activities (e.g., feeding, resting) and moving away from the training activity. This type of impact is anticipated to be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (where behavioral changes would be insignificant). • Overall, potential impacts to populations of vegetation and wildlife would be insignificant, as effects on individuals would be temporary and effects to habitat discountable because of the non-invasive nature and intent to leave no trace during or after a training event. Long-term consequences to terrestrial wildlife and vegetation are not 	<p>Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional impacts on terrestrial and marine biological resources are expected. Impacts on biological resources with implementation of Alternative 2 are expected to be similar to Alternative 1 and would be minimal, short term, and temporary due to the following: relatively low intensity of the impacts, localized nature of the impacts, infrequent nature of the impacts, brief duration of the activities, and implementation of SOPs and BMPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on biological resources.</p> <p>Terrestrial Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the non-invasive nature of the proposed training activities (e.g., no live-fire, no construction, no digging, no fires, no human waste) would have minimal effects on terrestrial vegetation and wildlife because of the short duration, infrequency of occurrence, and low intensity of the proposed training activities. Because the goal of training is for the trainees to be in the field undetected, the environment would be minimally disturbed and materials (e.g., gear and trash) would not be left behind. In addition, identical travel routes would rarely be used; the level of foot traffic associated with each group would not wear paths in the training study area. Species would likely respond to the physical presence of trainees by temporarily stopping normal activities (e.g., feeding, resting) and moving away from the activity. The proposed training activities under Alternative 2 would likely induce a slight increase in the number of individual animals that would potentially experience temporary behavioral effects; however, these animals would

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>expected under Alternative 1. Therefore, no significant impacts on terrestrial biological resources would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBTA Conclusion: A variety of bird species would be encountered in the training study area, including those listed under the MBTA. Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), with implementation of aircraft flight restrictions, impacts from proposed training activities under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on migratory bird populations. • ESA Conclusion (Terrestrial Species). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat. As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the USFWS regarding potential impacts on ESA-listed terrestrial species and critical habitat within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, proposed training activities in the terrestrial environment under Alternative 1 may affect, but would not adversely affect, the same ESA-listed terrestrial species and critical habitat as under Alternative 2. <p>Marine Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed training activities in the marine environment would have minimal impacts on marine vegetation and invertebrates because of the minimally invasive training activities and avoidance measures (e.g., timing of activities to avoid low tides and geographic restrictions on sensitive coral reef areas). Any disturbances from activities under Alternative 1 would not be expected to cause long-term or permanent impairment to the surrounding benthic habitats because any damage would likely be very small and localized. • The potential impact on marine fish from the physical presence of trainees, physical disturbance or strike from vessels, and acoustic energy (noise) generated during 	<p>quickly resume normal activities after the disturbance ceases or trainees move through an area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be no detectable increases in overall impacts compared to those discussed under Alternative 1. Potential effects to terrestrial species overall would be insignificant, as effects on individuals would be temporary and effects to habitat discountable because of the non-invasive nature and intent to leave no trace during or after a training event. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts on terrestrial biological resources with implementation of Alternative 2. • MBTA Conclusion. A variety of bird species would be encountered in the training study area, including those listed under the MBTA. Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), with implementation of aircraft flight restrictions, impacts from proposed training activities under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on migratory bird populations. • ESA Conclusion (Terrestrial Species). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat. Based on the analysis in the BE, proposed training activities in the terrestrial environment under Alternative 2 may affect, but would not adversely affect, the following ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat: six plant species and associated critical habitat for two of the species, orangeblack damselfly, two yellow-faced bee species, Hawaiian coot, Hawaiian common gallinule, Hawaiian duck, Hawaiian stilt, Hawaiian goose, Hawaiian hawk, band-rumped storm petrel, Hawaiian petrel, Newell’s Townsend’s shearwater, Hawaiian hoary bat, green turtle, hawksbill turtle, and olive ridley turtle. In March 2019 and March 2021, the USFWS issued letters concurring with the Navy’s findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and critical habitat within the action area

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>training activities under Alternative 1 would be extremely low because (1) most fish can detect and avoid vessel (surface and submersible) and human movements, and (2) activities occur at infrequent intervals and for a brief duration of time. Potential impacts of exposure to vessels and noise generated by vessels are not expected to result in substantial changes to an individual’s behavior, fitness, or species recruitment and are not expected to result in population-level impacts. Since impacts from these stressors would be unlikely, impacts on individual fish or fish populations would be negligible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, no significant impacts on marine biological resources would occur with implementation of Alternative 1. • EFH Conclusion. Pursuant to the EFH requirements of the MSA and implementing regulations, activities proposed under Alternative 1 that involve vessels and personnel in the water could potentially impact EFH and associated species in the training study area. As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and conducted consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the NMFS regarding potential impacts on EFH within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, proposed training activities in the marine environment under Alternative 1 would not adversely affect EFH with the implementation of the following conservation measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct surveillance and site-specific training reconnaissance as described in the proposed BMPs. - Training exercises within areas designated as MLCDs on Oahu and Lanai will be modified to avoid impacts to marine resources. No motorized vessels (e.g., submarine, zodiacs, or jet-skis) will be utilized in either MLC. All vessels/crafts will be left at the outer boundary of the MLCs. Scuba diving, an approved activity within the MLCs, will be conducted within both MLCs. Over-the-beach training is allowed at the 	<p>under their jurisdiction (see Appendix A, <i>Agency Correspondence</i>).</p> <p>Marine Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed training activities would have minimal impacts on marine vegetation and invertebrates because of the minimally invasive training activities and avoidance measures (e.g., timing of activities to avoid low tides and geographic restrictions on sensitive coral reef areas). Any disturbances from activities under Alternative 2 would not be expected to cause long-term or permanent impairment to the surrounding benthic habitats because any damage would likely be very small and localized. • The potential impact on marine fish from the physical presence of trainees, physical disturbance or strike from vessels, and acoustic energy (noise) generated during training activities under Alternative 2 would be extremely low because (1) most fish can detect and avoid vessel (surface and submersible) and human movements, and (2) activities occur at infrequent intervals and for a brief duration of time. Potential impacts of exposure to vessels and noise generated by vessels are not expected to result in substantial changes to an individual’s behavior, fitness, or species recruitment and are not expected to result in population-level impacts. Since impacts from these stressors would be unlikely, impacts on individual fish or fish populations would be negligible. • Therefore, no significant impacts on marine biological resources would occur with implementation of Alternative 2. • EFH Conclusion. Pursuant to the EFH requirements of the MSA and implementing regulations, activities proposed under Alternative 2 that involve vessels and personnel in the water could potentially impact EFH species and habitats present in the training study area. As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and conducted consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. The Navy has determined that under Alternative 2 there would be no adverse effect on EFH within the training study area. In June 2019, as part of the EFH consultation process for the

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>Pupukea MLCD, Oahu; however, over-the-beach training will not be conducted at the Hulopo’e Bay MLCD, Lanai.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure no anchors, equipment, tools, and personnel are in contact with any organism, especially coral; instead place anchors in soft sediment in unconsolidated bottom habitats only. - All vessels should operate at “no wake/idle” speeds at all times while in water depths where the draft of the vessel provides less than a 6-ft clearance. - When conducting activities in shallow water, all vessels should employ a dedicated and qualified “lookout” to assist the pilot with avoiding large coral colonies and other benthic organisms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESA Conclusion (Marine Species). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat. As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from NMFS regarding potential impacts on ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, proposed training activities in the marine environment under Alternative 1 may affect, but would not adversely affect, the same ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat as under Alternative 2. • MMPA Conclusion. Pursuant to the MMPA, the Navy has determined that under Alternative 1, Level A or Level B harassment of marine mammals is not expected to occur. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes) and would not be considered Level A or Level B harassment. Therefore, consultation under MMPA is not required. 	<p>proposed action, NMFS issued a number of conservation recommendations to avoid and minimize impacts to EFH (see Appendix A, <i>Agency Correspondence</i>). The Navy responded in November 2019 and agreed to implement the following conservation recommendations, and consultation for EFH under the MSA was completed in December 2019 with receipt of a letter of concurrence from NMFS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct surveillance and site-specific training reconnaissance as described in the proposed BMPs. - Training exercises within areas designated as MLCDs on Oahu and Lanai will be modified to avoid impacts to marine resources. No motorized vessels (e.g., submarine, zodiacs, or jet-skis) will be utilized in either MLCD. All vessels/crafts will be left at the outer boundary of the MLCDs. Scuba diving, an approved activity within the MLCDs, will be conducted within both MLCDs. Over-the-beach training is allowed at the Pupukea MLCD, Oahu; however, over-the-beach training will not be conducted at the Hulopo’e Bay MLCD, Lanai. - Ensure no anchors, equipment, tools, and personnel are in contact with any organism, especially coral; instead place anchors in soft sediment in unconsolidated bottom habitats only. - All vessels should operate at “no wake/idle” speeds at all times while in water depths where the draft of the vessel provides less than a 6-ft clearance. - When conducting activities in shallow water, all vessels should employ a dedicated and qualified “lookout” to assist the pilot with avoiding large coral colonies and other benthic organisms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESA Conclusion (Marine Species). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat. Based on the analysis in the BE, proposed training activities in the marine environment under Alternative 2 may affect, but would not adversely affect, the following ESA-listed marine

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
		<p>species and associated critical habitat: oceanic whitetip shark, giant manta ray, green turtle, hawksbill turtle, olive ridley turtle, Hawaiian monk seal and associated critical habitat, blue whale (Central North Pacific Stock), Main Hawaiian Islands Insular false killer whale and associated critical habitat, fin whale, sei whale, and sperm whale.</p> <p>On April 30, 2020, NMFS issued a letter concurring with the Navy’s findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat under their jurisdiction within the action area (see Appendix A, <i>Agency Correspondence</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MMPA Conclusion.</u> Marine mammal species with the potential to occur in the training study areas include the Main Hawaiian Islands Insular false killer whale DPS, blue whale, fin whale, sei whale, sperm whale, humpback whale, short-finned pilot whale, bottlenose dolphin, and spinner dolphin, and Hawaiian monk seal. Pursuant to the MMPA, the Navy has determined that under Alternative 2, Level A or Level B harassment of marine mammals is not expected to occur. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes) and would not be considered Level A or Level B harassment. Therefore, consultation under MMPA is not required.
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HST EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impacts on cultural resources would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed training activities would be non-invasive in nature. Training would also follow the protocols established under existing Programmatic Agreements, Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plans, and requirements in land use agreements and/or rights of entry, where applicable, to further avoid and minimize the potential for impacts on archeological resources, historic architecture, and traditional cultural properties. The Navy has determined that no historic properties would be affected with implementation of Alternative 1 based on the following: (1) the goal of small-unit training is to be undetected (silent and unseen) during training and leave no trace of their presence during or after the training activity; (2) the undertaking does 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional impacts on cultural resources are expected and impacts to cultural resources with implementation of Alternative 2 are expected to be similar to Alternative 1. • The proposed training activities would be non-invasive in nature. While tempo would increase under Alternative 2, training would follow the protocols established under existing Programmatic Agreements, Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plans, and requirements in land use

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>not include construction or ground-disturbing activities; (3) the training will avoid historic properties; and (4) proposed training activities at or in the vicinity of historic properties will not alter the characteristics of the historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the NRHP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHPA Section 106 Consultation. As required by NHPA Section 106, the Navy consulted with the Hawaii SHPO, Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic partners, and the public to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on historic properties. As the APE is the same for Alternatives 1 and 2 and the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the Hawaii SHPO regarding potential impacts historic properties within the APE under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, the proposed undertaking under Alternative 1 would result in no historic properties affected in accordance with NHPA Section 106 Implementing Regulations at 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1). 	<p>agreements and/or rights of entry, where applicable, to further avoid and minimize the potential for impacts on archeological resources, historic architecture, and traditional cultural properties. The Navy has determined that no historic properties would be affected with implementation of Alternative 1 based on the following: (1) the goal of small-unit training is to be undetected (silent and unseen) during training and leave no trace of their presence during or after the training activity; (2) the undertaking does not include construction or ground-disturbing activities; (3) the training will avoid historic properties; and (4) proposed training activities at or in the vicinity of historic properties will not alter the characteristics of the historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the NRHP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHPA Section 106 Consultation. The Navy initiated the NHPA Section 106 process August 22, 2018. The Navy consulted with the Hawaii SHPO, Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic partners, and the public. The Navy determined that the proposed undertaking under Alternative 2 would result in no historic properties affected in accordance with NHPA Section 106 Implementing Regulations at 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1). Since the proposed training activities will be ongoing, the Navy has agreed to brief SHPO annually regarding effects to historic properties, if any, as well as locations of training in accordance to Operational Security requirements. In addition, the Navy shall review the Section 106 consultation with the SHPO 7 years following receipt of SHPO’s concurrence letter. Prior to the 7-year review, reinitiation of the Section 106 process would be warranted if there is a change in the undertaking or the APE. On May 29, 2020, the Hawaii SHPO concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect, completing the Navy’s Section 106 requirements.
NOISE		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training activities would generally occur away from residentially zoned areas and the goal of land-based activities is to remain undetected and leave no trace of presence during or after the training. 	<p>Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional noise impacts on noise-sensitive receptors or points of interest are expected and noise impacts with</p>

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
<p>and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impact on the noise environment would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aviation training activities and associated noise would only occur over or within DoD and USCG properties or over open water adjacent to a DoD installation. In addition, the operational conditions of aviation activities to maintain elevations above 2,000 ft except for short periods (below 500 ft for approximately 10 minutes) associated with proposed training under Alternative 1 avoids and minimizes noise and potential noise impacts. Under Alternative 1, proposed training would not include use of live-fire weapons; however, in three locations live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges. Disturbances are expected to be short term and infrequent and any impacts on noise-sensitive receptors or points of interest would be minimal and short term based on the (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts, and (4) brief duration of the activities. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in significant impacts to the regional noise environment. 	<p>implementation of Alternative 2 are expected to be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training activities would generally occur away from residentially zoned areas and the operational conditions of land-based activities is to remain undetected and leave no trace of presence during or after the training. Aviation training activities and associated noise would only occur over or within DoD and USCG properties or over open water adjacent to a DoD installation. In addition, the operational conditions of aviation activities to maintain elevations above 2,000 ft except for short periods (below 500 ft for approximately 10 minutes) associated with proposed training under Alternative 2 avoids and minimizes noise and potential noise impacts. Under Alternative 2, proposed training would not include use of live-fire weapons; however, in three locations live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges. Disturbances are expected to be short term and infrequent and any impacts on noise-sensitive receptors or points of interest would be minimal and short term based on the (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts, and (4) brief duration of the activities. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts to the regional noise environment.
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impacts on public health and safety would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Navy policy requires that training activities ensure the safety and health of personnel and the public. Under Alternative 1, proposed training would not include use of live-fire weapons. However, live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land at three locations to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges with limited and restricted public access; therefore, public health and safety would not be affected. For other training activities, personnel would use existing roads and waterways in compliance with applicable safety regulations. Air-based activities, including the use of aircraft and sUAS, would comply with FAA safety regulation and the DoD's 	<p>Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Navy policy requires that training activities ensure the safety and health of personnel and the public. Under Alternative 2, proposed training would not include use of live-fire weapons. However, live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land at three locations to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges with limited and restricted public access; therefore, public health and safety would not be affected. For other training activities, personnel would travel using existing

Table ES-1: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>memorandum of agreement with the FAA and the NATOPS program. sUAS would only be operated above DoD and USCG installations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All training events on state, county, city, or private lands and harbors would be conducted in accordance with rights-of-entry and real estate agreements and approvals, as applicable. A safety buffer would be established around water- and land-based training areas, and a vehicle would be dedicated for emergency response during training events. Size and type of safety buffer would vary by training site. NSWC would coordinate with the USCG to issue NOTMARs and will also coordinate with local police departments and law enforcement prior to conducting training activities. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts to public health and safety with implementation of Alternative 1. 	<p>roads and waterways in compliance with applicable safety regulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air-based activities, including the use of aircraft and sUAS, would comply with FAA safety regulation and the DoD's memorandum of agreement with the FAA and the NATOPS program. sUAS would only be operated above DoD and USCG installations. All training events on state, county, city, or private lands and harbors would be conducted in accordance with rights-of-entry and real estate agreements and approvals. A safety buffer would be established around water- and land-based training areas, and a vehicle would be dedicated for emergency response during training events. NSWC would coordinate with the USCG to issue NOTMARs and will also coordinate with local police departments and law enforcement prior to conducting training activities. The increase in tempo under Alternative 2 would not have a substantially greater impact on public health and safety when compared to Alternative 1. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts to public health and safety with implementation of Alternative 2.

Notes: APE = area of potential effect; BE = Biological Evaluation; BMP = Best Management Practice; CATEX = Categorical Exclusion; CCD = Coastal Consistency Determination; CFR = Code of Federal Regulations; CZM = Coastal Zone Management; CZMA = Coast Zone Management Act; DoD = Department of Defense; DPS = Distinct Population Segment; EFH = Essential Fish Habitat, ESA = Endangered Species Act; FAA = Federal Aviation Administration; ft = feet; HSTT EIS/OEIS = Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement; KPSTS = Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station; MBTA= Migratory Bird Treaty Act; MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; MMPA = Marine Mammal Protection Act; MSA = Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; NAAQS = National Ambient Air Quality Standards; NATOPS = Naval Air Training and Operating Procedures Standardization; NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act; NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service; NOTMARs = Notice to Mariners; NRHP = National Register of Historic Places; NSO = Naval Special Operations; NSWC = Naval Special Warfare Command; SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer; SOP = Special Operating Procedure; sUAS = small unmanned aircraft system; USCG = U.S. Coast Guard; USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
NAVAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS TRAINING IN THE STATE OF HAWAII
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1

1 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION 1-1

1.1 INTRODUCTION 1-1

1.2 PROPOSED TRAINING LOCATIONS..... 1-15

1.3 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION..... 1-16

1.4 SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS 1-17

1.5 KEY DOCUMENTS..... 1-17

1.6 RELEVANT LAWS AND REGULATIONS..... 1-18

1.7 PUBLIC AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION 1-19

 1.7.1 Agency Consultations and Coordination..... 1-20

 1.7.1.1 USFWS Consultations..... 1-20

 1.7.1.2 NMFS Consultations..... 1-20

 1.7.1.3 SHPO Consultations 1-20

 1.7.1.4 Hawaii CZM Program Consultations..... 1-21

 1.7.1.5 Hawaii Environmental Policy Act (HEPA) Process 1-21

 1.7.1.6 Other Coordination with State of Hawaii Agencies and Elected Officials 1-22

2 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1

2.1 PROPOSED ACTION..... 2-1

 2.1.1 Training Activities..... 2-2

 2.1.2 Water-Based Training 2-3

 2.1.2.1 Diver/Swimmer Training Activities..... 2-4

 2.1.2.2 Insertion/Extraction Training Activities..... 2-4

 2.1.2.3 Launch and Recovery Training Activities..... 2-4

 2.1.2.4 UUV Activities 2-4

 2.1.3 Land-Based Training Activities 2-4

 2.1.3.1 Over-the-Beach Training Activities 2-5

 2.1.3.2 Special Reconnaissance Training Activities 2-5

 2.1.3.3 Simulated Building/Structure Clearance Training Activities 2-5

 2.1.3.4 High Angle Climbing Training Activities..... 2-6

 2.1.4 Air-Based Training Activities 2-6

 2.1.4.1 Drop Zone Training Activities 2-6

 2.1.4.2 Helicopter Landing Zone Training Activities..... 2-7

 2.1.4.3 sUAS Training Activities..... 2-7

2.2 TRAINING SITES..... 2-8

2.3 TRAINING EQUIPMENT 2-8

2.4 TRAINING AREA SCREENING FACTORS 2-10

2.5 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT..... 2-11

 2.5.1 No Action Alternative..... 2-11

2.5.2 Alternative 1 2-12

2.5.3 Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative) 2-15

2.6 BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs) AND STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES (SOPS) 2-16

2.7 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 2-18

3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES..... 3-1

3.1 AIR QUALITY..... 3-2

3.1.1 Introduction 3-2

3.1.1.1 Hazardous Air Pollutants..... 3-4

3.1.1.2 General Conformity..... 3-5

3.1.1.3 Mixing Layer 3-5

3.1.1.4 Climate Change 3-6

3.1.2 Affected Environment..... 3-7

3.1.3 Environmental Consequences 3-8

3.1.3.1 No Action Alternative..... 3-8

3.1.3.2 Alternative 1..... 3-8

3.1.3.3 Alternative 2..... 3-9

3.2 LAND USE/RECREATION..... 3-11

3.2.1 Regulatory Setting..... 3-11

3.2.2 Affected Environment..... 3-12

3.2.2.1 NPS Properties and State and County Parks 3-12

3.2.2.2 Hiking Trails..... 3-13

3.2.2.3 Hunting..... 3-13

3.2.2.4 Fishing 3-13

3.2.2.5 Beach and Ocean Recreation 3-14

3.2.2.6 Land Use Compatibility 3-14

3.2.3 Environmental Consequences 3-15

3.2.3.1 No Action Alternative..... 3-15

3.2.3.2 Alternative 1..... 3-15

3.2.3.3 Alternative 2..... 3-17

3.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-19

3.3.1 Regulatory Setting..... 3-19

3.3.1.1 Endangered Species Act (ESA)..... 3-19

3.3.1.2 Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) 3-19

3.3.1.3 Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) 3-19

3.3.1.4 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) 3-20

3.3.1.5 Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act..... 3-20

3.3.1.6 Marine Managed Areas – Marine Life Conservation Districts (MLCDs) 3-21

3.3.2 Affected Environment..... 3-24

3.3.2.1 Terrestrial Biological Resources 3-24

3.3.2.2 Marine Biological Resources 3-30

3.3.2.3 Special-Status Species 3-33

3.3.3 Environmental Consequences 3-70

3.3.3.1 No Action Alternative..... 3-71

3.3.3.2 Alternative 1..... 3-72

3.3.3.3 Alternative 2..... 3-87

3.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES 3-90

3.4.1 Regulatory Setting..... 3-90

3.4.2 Affected Environment..... 3-90

3.4.2.1 Archaeological Resources 3-93

3.4.2.2 Historic Architecture 3-94

3.4.2.3 Traditional Cultural Properties..... 3-95

3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-96

3.4.3.1 No Action Alternative..... 3-96

3.4.3.2 Alternative 1..... 3-96

3.4.3.3 Alternative 2..... 3-98

3.5 NOISE 3-100

3.5.1 Basics of Sound and A-Weighted Sound Level 3-100

3.5.2 Noise Metrics 3-101

3.5.2.1 Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) 3-102

3.5.2.2 Equivalent Sound Level (L_{eq}) 3-102

3.5.2.3 Sound Exposure Level (SEL)..... 3-102

3.5.2.4 Maximum Sound Level (L_{max}) 3-102

3.5.2.5 Number of Events Above a Threshold Level 3-102

3.5.3 Noise Effects 3-103

3.5.3.1 Annoyance 3-103

3.5.3.2 Potential Hearing Loss..... 3-103

3.5.3.3 Speech Interference..... 3-103

3.5.3.4 Classroom Criteria and Noise Effects on Children..... 3-103

3.5.3.5 Sleep Disturbance 3-104

3.5.3.6 Workplace Noise 3-104

3.5.4 Nonauditory Health Effects..... 3-104

3.5.4.1 Noise Effects on Children 3-104

3.5.4.2 Noise Effects on the Elderly 3-104

3.5.5 Regulatory Setting..... 3-105

3.5.6 Affected Environment..... 3-105

3.5.6.1 Points of Interest..... 3-105

3.5.6.2 Ambient Noise Conditions 3-105

3.5.7 Environmental Consequences 3-106

3.5.7.1 No Action Alternative..... 3-106

3.5.7.2 Alternative 1..... 3-106

3.5.7.3 Alternative 2..... 3-110

3.6 PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY 3-111

3.6.1 Regulatory Setting..... 3-111

3.6.2 Affected Environment..... 3-112

3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-113

3.6.3.1 No Action Alternative..... 3-113

3.6.3.2 Alternative 1..... 3-113

3.6.3.3 Alternative 2..... 3-116

3.7 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON RESOURCES..... 3-116

4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 4-1

4.1 DEFINITION OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS..... 4-1

4.2 SCOPE OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSIS..... 4-1

4.3 PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE ACTIONS..... 4-2

4.3.1 Past DoD Actions..... 4-2

4.3.1.1 MCBH Wave Energy Test Site..... 4-2

4.3.1.2 Installation and Operation of a Fixed Surface Ship Radiated Noise Measurement System at the Fleet Test and Evaluation Center, Barbers Point, Oahu and Surrounding Ocean 4-3

4.3.1.3 MCBH Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion..... 4-3

4.3.1.4 Long Range Strike Weapon Systems Evaluation Program 4-3

4.3.2 Present and Reasonably Foreseeable DoD Actions 4-4

4.3.2.1 T-Pier Demolition at MCBH 4-4

4.3.2.2 PMRF Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems..... 4-4

4.3.2.3 Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing (HSTT) EIS/OEIS..... 4-4

4.3.2.4 Shoreline Stabilization at the Puuloa Range Training Facility (PRTF) 4-5

4.3.2.5 Submarine Dry Dock and Waterfront Production Facility at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility, JBPHH 4-5

4.3.3 Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Non-DoD Actions..... 4-5

4.3.3.1 Commercial Wind Energy Development 4-5

4.3.3.2 Recreational Fishing 4-6

4.3.3.3 Commercial Fishing 4-6

4.3.3.4 Maritime Traffic 4-6

4.3.3.5 Coastal Land Development and Tourism 4-7

4.3.3.6 Undersea Communications Cables 4-7

4.3.3.7 Aquaculture..... 4-7

4.3.3.8 Academic Research 4-8

4.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS 4-8

4.4.1 Air Quality 4-8

4.4.1.1 Description of Geographic Study Area 4-8

4.4.1.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions 4-8

4.4.1.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-8

4.4.2 Land Use/Recreation..... 4-9

4.4.2.1 Description of Geographic Study Area 4-9

4.4.2.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions 4-9

4.4.2.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-9

4.4.3 Biological Resources..... 4-9

4.4.3.1 Description of Geographic Study Area 4-9

4.4.3.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions 4-9

4.4.3.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-10

4.4.4 Cultural Resources 4-10

4.4.4.1 Description of Geographic Study Area 4-10

4.4.4.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions 4-10

4.4.4.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-10

4.4.5 Noise 4-11

4.4.5.1 Description of Geographic Study Area 4-11

4.4.5.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions 4-11

4.4.5.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-11

4.4.6 Public Health and Safety 4-11

4.4.6.1 Description of Geographic Study Area 4-11

4.4.6.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions 4-12

4.4.6.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis 4-12

5 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS REQUIRED BY NEPA 5-1

5.1 CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAWS, PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS... 5-1

5.1.1 Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) 5-4

5.2 IRREVERSIBLE OR IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES 5-5

5.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY .. 5-6

6 LIST OF PREPARERS..... 6-1

6.1 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY..... 6-1

6.2 CONTRACTOR 6-2

7 COORDINATION LIST..... 7-1

7.1 FEDERAL AGENCIES..... 7-1

7.2 STATE OF HAWAII AGENCIES 7-1

7.3 FEDERAL AND STATE ELECTED OFFICIALS..... 7-2

7.4 CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU 7-3

7.5 COUNTY OF HAWAII 7-3

7.6 COUNTY OF MAUI..... 7-4

7.7 LIBRARIES..... 7-4

8 REFERENCES 8-1

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1-1: LOCATION OVERVIEW – PROPOSED TRAINING STUDY AREA IN THE STATE OF HAWAII 1-3

FIGURE 1-2: OAHU ISLAND TRAINING STUDY AREA..... 1-4

FIGURE 1-3: OAHU JOINT BASE PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM TRAINING STUDY AREA 1-5

FIGURE 1-4: OAHU SOUTH REGION TRAINING STUDY AREA..... 1-6

FIGURE 1-5: OAHU WINDWARD REGION TRAINING STUDY AREA 1-7

FIGURE 1-6: OAHU NORTH REGION TRAINING STUDY AREA 1-8

FIGURE 1-7: OAHU WEST REGION TRAINING STUDY AREA 1-9

FIGURE 1-8: ISLAND OF HAWAII TRAINING STUDY AREA 1-10

FIGURE 1-9: KAUAI TRAINING STUDY AREA 1-11

FIGURE 1-10: MAUI TRAINING STUDY AREA..... 1-12

FIGURE 1-11: LANAI TRAINING STUDY AREA 1-13

FIGURE 1-12: MOLOKAI TRAINING STUDY AREA 1-14

FIGURE 3-1: PUPUKEA MLCD, OAHU 3-22

FIGURE 3-2: HULOPO’E BAY MLCD, LANAI..... 3-23

FIGURE 3-3: OCCURRENCE OF WATERBIRD HABITAT, WEDGE-TAILED SHEARWATER NESTING, AND LAYSAN ALBATROSS AREAS AT THE PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY AND THE TRAINING STUDY AREA, KAUAI..... 3-27

FIGURE 3-4: OCCURRENCE OF ESA-LISTED PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES AND WMAS ON MCBH KANEHOHE BAY 3-29

FIGURE 3-5: CRITICAL HABITAT FOR *PANICUM NIIHAUENSE* AND *SESBANIA TOMENTOSA* WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: KAUAI..... 3-39

FIGURE 3-6: OCCURRENCE OF ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT-LISTED PLANT SPECIES AND CRITICAL HABITAT AT THE LUALUALEI ANNEX, OAHU TRAINING STUDY AREA 3-40

FIGURE 3-7: OCCURRENCE OF *BIDENS AMPLECTENS* AT THE KAENA POINT SATELLITE TRACKING STATION, OAHU TRAINING STUDY AREA..... 3-42

FIGURE 3-8: OCCURRENCE OF SPECIAL-STATUS BIRD SPECIES AT THE LUALUALEI ANNEX AND TRAINING STUDY AREA, OAHU 3-46

FIGURE 3-9: OCCURRENCE OF PONDS SUPPORTING ESA-LISTED WATERBIRDS WITHIN THE TRAINING STUDY AREA, HAWAII ISLAND.. 3-47

FIGURE 3-10: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: KAUAI..... 3-61

FIGURE 3-11: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: SOUTH OAHU..... 3-62

FIGURE 3-12: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: WINDWARD OAHU..... 3-63

FIGURE 3-13: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: WEST OAHU 3-64

FIGURE 3-14: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: NORTH OAHU 3-65

FIGURE 3-15: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: MOLOKAI..... 3-66

FIGURE 3-16: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: LANAI..... 3-67

FIGURE 3-17: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: MAUI..... 3-68

FIGURE 3-18: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE TRAINING STUDY AREA: ISLAND OF HAWAII 3-69

FIGURE 3-19: A-WEIGHTED SOUND LEVELS FROM TYPICAL SOURCES..... 3-101

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS BY RESOURCE AREA9

TABLE 2-1: PROPOSED TRAINING ELEMENTS 2-1

TABLE 2-2: CURRENT AND PROPOSED EQUIPMENT FOR NAVAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS TRAINING..... 2-9

TABLE 2-3: PROPOSED TRAINING ACTIVITY BY ALTERNATIVE AND REGION 2-12

TABLE 2-4: PROPOSED FREQUENCY OF TRAINING BY ALTERNATIVE 2-13

TABLE 2-5: PROPOSED AIR-BASED TRAINING BY ALTERNATIVE..... 2-15

TABLE 2-6: BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs) AND STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES (SOPs) FOR NSO TRAINING 2-16

TABLE 3-1: FEDERAL AND STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS 3-4

TABLE 3-2: PSD SIGNIFICANT EMISSION RATES FOR ATTAINMENT AREAS 3-5

TABLE 3-3: EMISSIONS SOURCES AND ANNUAL EMISSION RATES UNDER THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE 3-8

TABLE 3-4: EMISSION SOURCES AND ANNUAL EMISSION RATES UNDER ALTERNATIVE 1 3-9

TABLE 3-5: EMISSION SOURCES AND ANNUAL EMISSION RATES UNDER ALTERNATIVE 2 3-10

TABLE 3-6: THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES KNOWN TO OCCUR OR POTENTIALLY OCCURRING IN THE TRAINING STUDY AREA AND PRESENCE OF CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN THE TRAINING STUDY AREA 3-34

TABLE 3-7: NRHP-LISTED ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE APE 3-93

TABLE 3-8: NRHP-LISTED ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES IN THE APE 3-95

TABLE 3-9: SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES TO CHANGES IN A-WEIGHTED DECIBELS 3-100

TABLE 3-10: ESTIMATED RECEIVED MAXIMUM SOUND LEVELS (L_{MAX}) AT POINTS OF INTEREST 3-107

TABLE 3-11: SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS BY RESOURCE AREA 3-117

TABLE 4-1: CUMULATIVE ACTION EVALUATION..... 4-3

TABLE 5-1: PRINCIPAL FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS APPLICABLE TO THE PROPOSED ACTION 5-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Agency Correspondence

Appendix B: Air Quality Calculations

Appendix C: Public Comments on the Draft EA and Response to Public Comments

Appendix D: Public Involvement Notices

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Abbreviation or Acronym	Definition	Abbreviation or Acronym	Definition
AGL	above ground level	MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
APE	Area of Potential Effect	MSAT	Mobile Source Air Toxic
BE	Biological Evaluation	NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
BMP	Best Management Practice	NATOPS	Naval Air Training and Operating Procedures Standardization
CAA	Clean Air Act	Navy	U.S. Department of the Navy
CATEX	Categorical Exclusion	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
CCD	Coastal Consistency Determination	NHL	National Historic Landmark
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality	NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations	NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
CO ₂	carbon dioxide	NOA	Notice of Availability
CZM	Coastal Zone Management	NOTAM	Notice to Airmen
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act	NOTMAR	Notice to Mariners
dB	decibel(s)	NO _x	nitrogen oxides
dBA	A-weighted decibel(s)	NPS	National Park Service
dB re 1 μPa	decibels reference 1 micropascal	NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
DLNR	Department of Land and Natural Resources	NSO	Naval Special Operations
DNL	day-night average sound level	NSWC	Naval Special Warfare Command
DoD	Department of Defense	OEIS	Overseas EIS
DPS	Distinct Population Segment	OPAREA	Operating Area
EA	Environmental Assessment	OPNAVINST	Chief of Naval Operations Instruction
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone	PCE	Primary Constituent Element
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat	PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter
EO	Executive Order	PMAP	Protective Measures Assessment Protocol
ESA	Endangered Species Act	PMRF	Pacific Missile Range Facility
°F	degrees Fahrenheit	PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration	ROV	remotely operated vehicle
FEP	Fishery Ecosystem Plan	scuba	self-contained underwater breathing apparatus
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact	SEL	sound exposure level
ft	foot/feet	SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
GHG	greenhouse gas	SOP	standard operating procedure
HAR	Hawaii Administrative Rules	sUAS	small unmanned aircraft system
HEPA	Hawaii Environmental Policy Act	U.S.	United States
HRC	Hawaii Range Complex	USC	U.S. Code
HRS	Hawaii Revised Statutes	USCG	U.S. Coast Guard
HSTT	Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing	USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan	USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
JBPHH	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	USSOCOM	U.S. Special Operations Command
kHz	kilohertz	UUV	unmanned underwater vehicle
KPSTS	Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station	VOC	volatile organic compound
L _{eq}	equivalent sound level	WMA	Wildlife Management Area
L _{max}	maximum A-weighted sound level	WPRFMC	Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council
m	meters		
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act		
MCBH	Marine Corps Base Hawaii		
MLCD	Marine Life Conservation District		
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act		

1 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

1.1 Introduction

The United States (U.S.) Naval Special Warfare Command (NSWC) proposes to conduct small-unit beginning, intermediate, and advanced land-, water-, and air-based training activities for naval special operations (NSO) personnel in the coastal nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations throughout the state of Hawaii prior to advancing to more challenging (colder weather) environments. NSWC is the U.S. Department of the Navy's (Navy's) special operations force and the maritime component of the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). The proposed training activities consist of training by NSO personnel with occasional integration of other USSOCOM components, including Army Special Operations Command, Marine Corps Special Operations Command, Air Force Special Operations Command, and Joint Special Operations Command. The occasional integration of other USSOCOM components would occur only with NSWC-led training. The proposed training would take place in selected coastal nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations throughout the state of Hawaii. NSWC has prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as implemented by Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ); Navy regulations; Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) Chapter 343, *Environmental Impact Statements*; and Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) Chapter 11-200, *Environmental Impact Statement Rules*.

The proposed training activities broadly fit into three categories: water-based training, land-based training, and air-based training. Water-based training generally includes NSO personnel diving/swimming, launching/recovering small vehicles designed to operate underwater (submersible) as independent activities, or in combination. Water-based training may also incorporate inserting and extracting NSO personnel or equipment using watercraft as part of a training event and prior to performing a land-based training component. Land-based training would include personnel transiting over the beach on foot, simulating building clearance activities using simulated munitions, in limited areas engaging in high angle climbing, and using observation techniques in a pre-arranged scenario (e.g., special reconnaissance operations with military role players). Air-based training would include the use of small unmanned aircraft systems (sUASs; also known as drones) only over Department of Defense (DoD) or U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) properties or aircraft utilizing drop zones or landing zones for parachute or rope suspension training activities over DoD property, waters, or waters adjacent to a DoD installation.

Training activities in the water, on the land, or in the air could occur as a single or separate event, or in many cases would be combined together to be performed sequentially to meet the training objectives. Section 2.1.1 (Training Activities) of this EA provides greater detail on proposed training activities. The proposed action does not include the use of explosive demolitions, off-road driving, digging, tree climbing, building of camp fires, or construction of facilities or infrastructure. There would be no vegetation removal or cutting, with the exception on one DoD property. The proposed training does not include the use of live-fire; however, live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges where live-fire activities would take place.

Training would occur within the depicted training study area on both DoD and non-DoD properties within the state of Hawaii (Figure 1-1 through Figure 1-12). Within the training study area, DoD sites would be used up to 265 events annually, depending on the alternative selected. Within the training study area, each non-DoD training site would be used on an as-needed basis up to 10 events (2–72 hours each) per calendar year, depending on the alternative selected for up to a maximum of 330

training events per year. As the trainees progress in their training, subsequent training requirements are identified and scheduled. Sites included in this EA would be selected based on the type of training to be conducted, ability of a site to support and facilitate the training, and receipt of real estate agreements/right-of-entry permits. For example, some locations would not be used for training during certain times of the year when scheduled public events, protected natural resources considerations, large surf, or dangerous currents are present. Other sites may be used intermittently throughout a year, while other sites may not be used at all during a given year. The size of the study area allows for this flexibility, which also helps to prevent overuse. Site selection is also based on the availability of a site at the time the training would be scheduled to occur.

Safety support staff would typically visit a site prior to the training event. If members of the public are present, the staff will assess the situation and, based upon safety considerations, will either (1) not start the training, (2) continue the training, (3) temporarily suspend the training, (4) completely stop the training, or (5) relocate the training to another approved training site. Air-based training utilizing sUAS would be restricted to DoD and USCG property on Oahu and Kauai within authorized special use airspace including Restricted Areas and Warning Areas. Any use of sUAS occurring outside of designated special use airspace is dependent on NSWC obtaining a Certificate of Authorization from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Air-based training utilizing fixed-wing, helicopters, sUAS, or MV-22 aircraft would be operated and conducted in compliance with required training/operation manuals, FAA regulations, and the Naval Air Training and Operating Procedures Standardization (NATOPS) program.

This EA also supports Commander, Navy Region Hawaii procurement of appropriate real-estate agreements or right-of-entry permits, on behalf of NSWC, for proposed training areas located on non-DoD property. Although training is anticipated to start in 2021, no training would occur on non-DoD property until the required real estate agreements or right-of-entry permits are obtained. For safety and coordination purposes, land managers of public property and owners of private property, where training has been authorized, would be contacted in accordance with right-of-entry agreements, at a minimum of 24 hours in advance of training. NSWC would also coordinate with local police departments and law enforcement prior to conducting training activities on non-DoD lands. Within the training study area, a number of non-DoD training sites were reviewed and analyzed for impacts and based on the analysis, it was determined the proposed action would not have significant impacts (see Chapter 3). For the purposes of the real estate agreements, the requirements of NEPA are met by this EA.

NSO personnel have been training in certain areas of Hawaii since the early 1990s. NSWC considers Hawaii an important training location due to the temperate weather and ocean conditions that allow trainees to develop required skills before transferring to more challenging environments. Hawaii offers readily accessible, diverse and complex hydrography and bathymetry while enabling the highest degree of safety due to the close proximity of existing Hawaii military facilities. It also offers an ocean environment where civil, commercial, and military training activities may co-exist with minimal interaction. The co-location of other Navy forces in Hawaii affords superior logistics to support and secure the necessary staff and equipment employed during training activities.




Figure 1-1: Location Overview – Proposed Training Study Area in the State of Hawaii



Figure 1-2: Oahu Island Training Study Area




Figure 1-3: Oahu Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam Training Study Area




Figure 1-4: Oahu South Region Training Study Area




Figure 1-5: Oahu Windward Region Training Study Area




Figure 1-6: Oahu North Region Training Study Area




Figure 1-7: Oahu West Region Training Study Area




Figure 1-8: Island of Hawaii Training Study Area




Figure 1-9: Kauai Training Study Area




Figure 1-10: Maui Training Study Area




Figure 1-11: Lanai Training Study Area




Figure 1-12: Molokai Training Study Area

The potential environmental impacts of water-based NSO training activities (e.g., swimmer/diver and insertion/extraction training) conducted within coastal and federal waters have been evaluated in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing (HSTT) Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS), dated October 2018, and summarized in the Record of Decision (signed on December 18, 2018) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018). These water-based training activities, which do not have a land-based component and occur in areas that do not require permission or permit to utilize, were consulted on under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in 2018.

The training proposed under this EA includes land-based training, which requires real estate agreements/right-of-entry permits for access to non-DoD property sites and entry into harbors and bays. Current NSO training on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii (Big Island) have been limited to individual events at a restricted number of sites. These sites were previously reviewed under NEPA and were determined to qualify for approved Records of Categorical Exclusion (CATEX).

The current limited number of sites available to trainees results in repeated use of sites and undue familiarity with the training scenarios, thus limiting the quality of the training. The restricted number of sites are not considered sufficiently varied and diverse to support persistent long-term training requirements. Training must be varied and diverse, and as realistic as possible, to prepare U.S. service members to achieve their mission and ensure their success and survival when deploying on missions. NSWC recognizes the need for relevant training and experience to adequately prepare personnel for worldwide deployments. This includes training in realistic environments. Facilities and topography on military bases/DoD land are often different than those found at off-base locations. Because the nature of NSO requires them to operate worldwide, frequently off military installations, it is imperative that their training provides this diversity and replicates real world environments; therefore, the use of non-DoD land is imperative for training purposes.

1.2 Proposed Training Locations

To facilitate NSO training in a variety of ocean conditions, proposed training sites have been identified on or near six of the main Hawaiian Islands. The training study area includes five regions on Oahu (Figure 1-2): (1) Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam (JBPHH) (Figure 1-3), (2) South (Figure 1-4), (3) Windward (Figure 1-5), (4) North (Figure 1-6), and (5) West (Figure 1-7). The training study area also includes sites on or near the Island of Hawaii (Figure 1-8), Kauai (Figure 1-9), Maui (Figure 1-10), Lanai (Figure 1-11), and Molokai (Figure 1-12). Training activities would occur on DoD property as well as on non-DoD property, pending appropriate approvals. The purple training study area on Figures 1-2 through 1-12 depict a study area which is greater in area than the sites where training activities would occur. There are multiple potential training sites within each of the 10 regional training study areas (i.e., 5 regional training study areas on Oahu, and a regional training study area on the Island of Hawaii, Maui, Lanai, Kauai, and Molokai). Training would only occur on non-DoD property where a right of entry permit or other real estate agreement with a property owner or property manager is received and on DoD and USCG properties identified on Oahu and Kauai.

Training locations will vary due to seasonal weather conditions, public presence at sites, protected natural resources considerations, training qualifications to be satisfied, and training requirements. If a particular non-DoD site is selected for a potential training event, an approved agreement to utilize the property must be in place and the property manager or private property owner would be contacted accordingly prior to conducting training activities.

Air-based training would mainly utilize the airspace above DoD properties. Airspace is an area of defined dimensions where air traffic control service controls flights in accordance with airspace classification. The National Airspace System is under the control of the FAA through the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. The FAA is responsible for the safe and efficient use of U.S. airspace by military and civilian aircraft and for supporting national defense requirements.

Airspace is divided into two major categories: controlled and uncontrolled (Federal Aviation Administration, 2017). In controlled airspace, all aircraft operators are subject to certain pilot qualifications, operating rules, and equipment requirements. Air-based training proposed under this EA utilizing C-130, C-17, sUAS, MV-22, CH-53, or other similar aircraft would be operated in controlled airspace in accordance with FAA regulations and the NATOPS program, which prescribes general flight and operating instructions and procedures applicable to the operation of all U.S. naval aircraft and related activities.

The training study area supports specialized skill set requirements, and a variety of training and training transitions from one site to the next to achieve each level of training. Having a varied selection of sites in an expansive area provides trainers with flexibility in their choice of challenges required for training purposes.

1.3 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the proposed action is to ensure that special operations forces acquire and master individual and team skills in the marine, terrestrial, and aviation aspects of NSO in order to progress to more advanced training and to be combat-ready when called to conduct special operations in support of USSOCOM. NSO personnel must be ready for a variety of military operations—from large-scale conflict to maritime security and humanitarian assistance/disaster relief—to respond to the dynamic, social, political, economic, and environmental issues that may arise. The need for the proposed action is to meet requirements under Title 10 USC Section 167 for the Commander, USSOCOM to provide combat ready forces.

The skills needed to achieve peak military readiness for special operations are challenging to master and difficult to maintain without constant practice. Therefore, training must be diverse, and as realistic as

Title 10, U.S. Code (USC) Section 167 assigns USSOCOM, a unified combatant command, responsibility to prepare combat-ready, forward-deployed special operations forces to carry out assigned missions. Per USSOCOM Directive 10-1cc, USSOCOM has designated Commander, NSWC, the Navy component command of USSOCOM, as the Lead Component for maritime training. Per Chief of Naval Operations Instruction (OPNAVINST) 5450.221E (*Mission, Functions, and Tasks of Naval Special Warfare Command*), the mission of NSWC is to "organize, train, man, equip, educate, sustain, maintain combat readiness, and deploy" special operations forces. The Proposed Action meets the requirements of Title 10 USC Section 167 and NSWC's mission of providing combat-ready special operations forces.

possible in order to prepare U.S. service members to achieve any potential future missions and ensure their success and survival. Current NSO training in Hawaii's warm weather maritime climate does not provide sufficient varied and diverse training locations or physical environmental features, and lacks elements of unpredictability and unfamiliarity, both of which are essential to prepare personnel for more advanced training environments and military operations in support of U.S. interests.

The progressive nature of NSO training requires personnel to successfully complete beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels of training in Hawaii's warm maritime climate prior to advancing to more challenging (colder weather) environments. The progressive training process provides personnel with an in-depth understanding of their individual limitations and capabilities, and their equipment, prior to advancing to more high stress and remote environments. NSWC must conduct warm water training in Hawaii due to limits with personnel availability caused by a high operational tempo, and the following requirements, including submarine force concentration, military logistical support, military security, and bathymetry and warm water.

Having a varied selection of sites in an expansive area provides trainers with diversity in their choice of challenges required for training purposes and supports unique training environment requirements. A wider selection of training sites on DoD, USCG, state, county, city, and private property across Hawaii would ensure that training would be sustained both for diversity and flexibility in the event that a selected site is not available at the time training is scheduled (i.e., due to ocean conditions, large public presence in the area, or protected natural resources considerations). The ability to select from a diverse set of non-DoD sites would introduce the critical elements of unpredictability and unfamiliarity as well as varied and diverse physical environmental features, helping to further prepare NSO trainees for real-world combat scenarios.

1.4 Scope of Environmental Analysis

This EA includes an analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with two action alternatives and the No Action Alternative. The environmental resource areas analyzed in this EA include air quality, land use/recreation, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and public health and safety. The study area for each resource analyzed may differ due to how the proposed action interacts with or potentially impacts the resource.

1.5 Key Documents

Key documents are sources of information incorporated into this EA. Documents are considered to be key because of similar actions, analyses, or impacts that may apply to this proposed action. CEQ guidance encourages incorporating documents by reference. Documents incorporated by reference in part or in whole include:

- *Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Activities Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (HSTT EIS/OEIS) (October 2018)*. Under the HSTT EIS/OEIS, the Navy's proposed action was to conduct training and testing activities (including the use of active sonar and explosives) primarily within existing range complexes and operating areas (OPAREAs) located along the coast of Southern California and around the Hawaiian Islands. Navy OPAREAs include designated ocean areas near fleet homeports. The HSTT EIS/OEIS incorporated a full range of training and testing activities, focusing on the water-based activities. The Navy evaluated impacts from these continuing activities in existing ranges and OPAREAs, including activities that occur during transit between these range complexes and OPAREAs, to

analyze new or changing training and testing activities based on evolving operational requirements, including those associated with new platforms and systems not previously analyzed. The Navy's analysis included a thorough review of the best available science to ensure the most applicable science is incorporated. The analysis supported MMPA, ESA, NHPA, CZMA, and MSA consultations for Navy training activities into the reasonably foreseeable future (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018).

1.6 Relevant Laws and Regulations

NSWC has prepared this EA based upon federal and state laws, statutes, regulations, and policies pertinent to the implementation of the proposed action, including the following:

- NEPA (42 USC 4321–4370h), which requires an environmental analysis for major federal actions that have the potential to significantly impact the quality of the human environment.
- CEQ Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500–1508).
- Navy regulations for implementing NEPA (32 CFR 775), which provides Navy policy for implementing CEQ regulations and NEPA.
- Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 USC 7401 et seq.)
- Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251 et seq.)
- ESA (16 USC 1531 et seq.)
- MSA (16 USC 1801 et seq.)
- MMPA (16 USC 1361 et seq.)
- Marine, Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (16 USC 1431 et seq. and 33 USC §1401 et seq.)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 USC 703–712)
- Rivers and Harbors Act (33 USC 407)
- CZMA (16 USC 1451 et seq.)
- Archeological and Historic Data Preservation Act (54 USC 3125)
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC 470aa-470mm)
- NHPA (54 USC 306108 et seq.)
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC 3001 et seq.)
- National Maritime Heritage Act, as amended (54 USC 308701–1356b)
- Submerged Lands Act (43 USC 1301 et seq.)
- Abandoned Shipwreck Act, as amended (43 USC 2101–2106)
- Sunken Military Craft Act (10 USC 113 et seq.)
- HRS Chapter 190, *Marine Life Conservation Program*
- HRS Chapter 343, *Environmental Impact Statements*
- HAR Chapter 11-200, *Environmental Impact Statement Rules*
- HRS Chapter 195D, *Conservation of Aquatic Life, Wildlife, and Land Plants*
- HAR Chapter 13-107, *Threatened and Endangered Plants*
- HAR Chapter 13-124, *Indigenous Wildlife, Endangered and Threatened Wildlife, Injurious Wildlife, Introduced Wild Birds, and Introduced Wildlife*
- Comprehensive Environmental Response and Liability Act (42 USC 9601 et seq.)
- Executive Order (EO) 11988, *Floodplain Management*
- EO 11990, *Protection of Wetlands*

- EO 12088, *Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards*
- EO 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-income Populations*
- EO 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*
- EO 13089, *Coral Reef Protection*
- EO 13186, *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*
- Chief of Naval Operations (OPNAV) M-5090.1, *Environmental Readiness Program Manual*

A description of the proposed action's consistency with these laws, policies and regulations, as well as the names of regulatory agencies responsible for their implementation, is cited in Chapter 3 as necessary and presented in Chapter 5 (Other Considerations Required by NEPA).

1.7 Public and Agency Participation and Intergovernmental Coordination

The CEQ regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1506.6) direct agencies to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures. State of Hawaii regulations require a notice in the Hawaii Office of Environmental Quality Control bulletin *The Environmental Notice* (HAR 11-200-3). NSWC published a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EA for three consecutive days (November 8 through November 10, 2018) in the Honolulu Star Advertiser, Maui News, and West Hawaii Today, and once in *The Environmental Notice* on November 8, 2018. The notice described the proposed action, solicited public comments on the Draft EA, provided dates of the public comment period, and announced that a copy of the Draft EA would be available for a 30-day review (November 8, 2018 through December 10, 2018). The Draft EA was made available on the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific website (<https://go.usa.gov/xUnDC>) and copies of the Draft EA were placed in the following public libraries:

- Oahu: Hawaii State Library, 478 S. King Street, Honolulu, HI 96813
- Kauai: Waimea Public Library, 9750 Kaunualii Hwy, Waimea, HI 96796
- Hawaii Island: Kailua-Kona Public Library, 75-138 Hualalai Rd, Kailua-Kona, HI 96740
- Maui: Kahului Public Library, 90 School St, Kahului, HI 96732
- Molokai: Molokai Public Library, 15 Ala Malama Ave, Kaunakakai, HI 96748

Following requests to extend the public comment period, the Navy issued a press release announcing the comment period extension and re-published the availability of the EA in *The Environmental Notice* on December 8, 2018. The public comment period was extended for 30 days and closed on January 7, 2019, thus the public was provided a 60-day comment and review period of the Draft EA. All public comments received and associated Navy comment response letters are provided in Appendix C (Public Comments on the Draft EA and Response to Public Comments).

NSWC published the NOA of the Final EA for three consecutive days (June 9 – 11, 2021) in the Honolulu Star Advertiser, Maui News, and West Hawaii Today, and once in *The Environmental Notice*. The Final EA for Naval Special Operations Training, State of Hawaii is available at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/navfac_worldwide/pacific/about_us/national-environmental-policy-act--nepa--information.html under "NEPA documents available for public review" at the bottom of the page. All public notices are presented in Appendix D (Public Involvement Notices).

1.7.1 Agency Consultations and Coordination

The Navy, on behalf of NSWC, consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); State of Hawaii Department of Planning, Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program; and the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO); and coordinated with the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) on the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2). Correspondence between the Navy and USFWS, NMFS, SHPO, State of Hawaii Department of Planning, and Hawaii DLNR is available in Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*.

1.7.1.1 USFWS Consultations

As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a Biological Evaluation (BE) and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat. On March 14, 2019 and March 16, 2021, the USFWS issued letters concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and critical habitat under their jurisdiction within the action area (see Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

1.7.1.2 NMFS Consultations

As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat. On April 30, 2020, NMFS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction (see Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

Pursuant to the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) requirements of the MSA and implementing regulations, activities proposed under Alternative 2 that involve vessels and personnel in the water could potentially impact EFH species and habitats present in the training study area. As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and conducted consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. The Navy has determined that under Alternative 2 there would be no adverse effect on EFH within the training study area. On June 28, 2019, NMFS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 would not adversely affect EFH within the training study area with implementation of conservation recommendations (see Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

1.7.1.3 SHPO Consultations

The Navy consulted under the NHPA Section 106 with the Hawaii SHPO to assess the effects of the proposed action on historic properties. The Section 106 consultation included coordination with Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic preservation non-governmental organizations, and the public. The Navy determined that the proposed undertaking for NSWC to conduct land-, water-, and air-based training activities in the state of Hawaii would not affect historic properties in accordance with NHPA Section 106 Implementing Regulations at 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1). Since the proposed training activities will be ongoing, the Navy has agreed to brief SHPO annually regarding effects to historic properties, if any, as well as locations of training in accordance to Operational Security requirements. In addition, the Navy shall review the Section 106 consultation with the SHPO 7 years following receipt of SHPO's concurrence letter. Prior to the 7-year review, reinitiation of the Section 106 process would be warranted if there is a change in the undertaking or the area of potential effect (APE). On May 29, 2020,

the Hawaii SHPO concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect, completing the Navy's Section 106 requirements (see Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

1.7.1.4 Hawaii CZM Program Consultations

In accordance with the CZMA, the Navy completed the Federal Coastal Consistency Determination (CCD) process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD land. On September 24, 2019 and October 11, 2020, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning concurred with the Navy's determination that the proposed activity is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program with implementation of four conditions, which the Navy will implement (refer to Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a *de minimis* usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 *Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA*. Pursuant to the 2009 *de minimis* activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed *de minimis* activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions (see Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

The Navy also submitted Negative Determinations for proposed training activities on Oahu at USCG Station Barbers Point, the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area, and U.S. Air Force-leased lands at the Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station (KPSTS). The Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

1.7.1.5 Hawaii Environmental Policy Act (HEPA) Process

The Navy has issued a Final EA and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under NEPA. Because portions of the proposed action would involve the use of state, county, or city lands, pursuant to HRS Chapter 343 and its implementing regulations, a separate determination will be made by the Hawaii DLNR under HEPA (HAR 11-200-6(b)(1)(A)) whether to adopt the final EA and issue a notice of determination of FONSI. The Hawaii DLNR is the agency that oversees the HEPA process for the applicant (Navy).

1.7.1.6 Other Coordination with State of Hawaii Agencies and Elected Officials

The Navy also coordinated with the following State of Hawaii agencies and elected officials during preparation of the Draft and Final EAs:

- State of Hawaii Department of Defense
- Office of Hawaii State Governor
- State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Airports Division
- State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Harbors Division
- Department of Land and Natural Resources, Land Division
- Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of State Parks
- State of Hawaii Planning Office
- Office of City and County of Honolulu Mayor
- City and County of Honolulu Parks and Recreation Department
- City and County of Honolulu Environmental Services
- County of Hawaii, Mayor Harry Kim
- County of Hawaii Planning Department
- County of Hawaii Planning Department, Cultural Resources Commission
- County of Hawaii Civil Defense Agency
- County of Hawaii Department of Public Works
- County of Hawaii, Fire Department
- County of Hawaii Police Department
- County of Hawaii Parks and Recreation
- County of Maui, Mayor Michael Victorino
- County of Maui Office of Economic Development
- Office of Congressman Ed Case
- Office of Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard
- Office of State Senator Maize Hirono
- Office of State Senator Brian Schatz
- State Representative Lynn Decoite
- State Representative Nicole Lowen
- State Representative David Tarnas

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

2.1 Proposed Action

NSWC proposes to conduct small unit beginning, intermediate, and advanced land-, water-, and air-based training activities for NSO personnel in the coastal nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations throughout the state of Hawaii. Table 2-1 lists the proposed training elements.

Table 2-1: Proposed Training Elements

Water-Based Training
Diving/swimming
Inserting and extracting trainees or equipment using watercraft (including submersible craft)
Launching and recovering watercraft (including submersible craft)
Using unmanned underwater vehicles (UUVs)
Land-Based Training
Moving on foot over the beach
Clearing areas/structures using water-soluble paint pellets as simulated munitions (used only on DoD property) as part of simulated building clearance training
Hiking to an observation point and using observation techniques while remaining hidden (special reconnaissance operations)
Conducting high angle climbing (negotiating cliffs, rock faces, and other vertical challenges)
Air-Based Training
Utilizing drop zones
Using helicopter landing zones
Utilizing sUAS

Systems used during training may include sUAS, submersible craft such as manned or unmanned underwater vehicles (UUVs) and remotely operated vehicles (ROVs) (herein both termed UUVs), and other personal underwater propulsion devices. Vessels such as small ships, jet skis, or small boats may be used in conjunction with training systems during certain training scenarios, and for safety and training support. Aircraft assets such as C-130, C-17, CH-53, and MV-22 or similar aircraft would be used to facilitate drop zone and landing zone training activities. Not all training elements would occur at all training sites. A number of sites are required to ensure the full range of training is provided.

The purpose of the proposed training is to build trainees' skills, experience, and confidence by challenging them in a variety of locations with dynamic ocean conditions and land types in a warm-weather environment. As part of the training, the trainees learn skills needed to avoid detection along with the goal of leaving no trace of their presence during or after training activities. To support the intent of the training, live-fire ammunition or explosives would not be used and off-road driving, digging, tree climbing, construction of facilities or infrastructure, or the building of camp fires would not occur. There is no requirement to assemble training devices or structures at any site. Vegetation clearing is limited to one proposed location on DoD property (Waipio Peninsula in the JBPHH Region; Figure 1-3) to support a drop zone training area.

However, as part of this proposed action, activities may be combined with other actions occurring on DoD lands under previous authorizations. For example, although the proposed action does not include the use of live fire, in three locations (Puuloa Range Training Facility, Pearl City Peninsula; and Marine Corps Base Hawaii [MCBH] - Kaneohe Bay Range Training Facility), live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD property to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges where authorized live-fire training activities would take place. The training in and around existing military facilities or other facilities designated for

simulated building clearance training activities would include the use of simulated weapons that use water-soluble paint pellets (approximately the circumference of a dime).

A training event may consist of one or multiple training activities (e.g., launch and recovery, diver/swimmer, over the beach). During a typical training event, there would be up to 20 trainees and up to 26 support personnel (up to 46 people in total) at a training site within the training study area, except for drop zone activities where up to 40 trainees would participate (see Section 2.1.4.1). In a few instances, there could be up to 24 trainees; however, total personnel would not exceed 46. Support personnel would be divided to assist both the in-water training activity and the on-land training activity. It is assumed for purposes of analysis that not all support personnel would be in the water or on land at any given time because they would be dispersed between the two areas.

Training events are progressive in nature and would range between 2 and 72 hours in duration depending on the activity. As training activities are scheduled, compatible sites within the training study area would be selected to support each training objective. To sustain the highest level of training value and avoid trainee familiarity with specific sites, site selections are made to create the most challenges for the trainees and be responsive to training requirements and training qualifications. Not all sites within the training study area would be utilized over a 1-year period. Site selection would also consider seasonal conditions (e.g., high surf, strong currents, high winds) and site conditions (e.g., scheduled public events, protected natural resources considerations).

The travel of personnel and equipment from the staging area located at JBPHH to the individual training sites is incorporated into the overall training scenario and would utilize government and public waterways and roads. This minimal travel may include military support vehicles towing small boats and safety and maintenance equipment and transportation of trainees and support personnel. Waterborne transportation would similarly include the movement of training vessels (such as small surface support vessels, jet skis, or small boats), safety equipment, and trainees and support personnel from the staging base to the event location. Typically, submersibles are launched from boat ramps near the site where training activities are scheduled.

2.1.1 Training Activities

The training activities associated with the proposed action are described in detail below and broadly fit into three categories: water-based training, land-based training, and air-based training. To meet training objectives, training activities may be single distinct events or they may be combined together sequentially. A generic example would be launching a submersible or small boat from a boat ramp (launch and recovery), the vessels would travel to the training locations (the insertion part of insertion/extraction), trainees would exit the vessel and swim to the objective area (diver/swimmer); trainees observe the surrounding area, and, when conditions are met, proceed ashore (over-the-beach). Once onshore, trainees would focus on observing a specific site or a specific individual who is a part of the exercise (special reconnaissance) and, upon completion of the on-land training objectives, trainees would reenter the water, swim to the extraction point (diver/swimmer), and be extracted from the water (the extraction part of insertion/extraction). The vessel would then return to the boat ramp and be placed on a trailer to go back to JBPHH (recovery portion of launch and recovery).

A broad example incorporating the air-based component of training would be inserting trainees to a designated landing zone via helicopter using a rope suspension method or parachute. Following completion of the training objectives, trainees would be extracted via helicopter or other land- or water-based method depending on the training scenario and location. Air-based training activities would be

conducted in conjunction with other DoD aircraft assets (e.g., sUAS, C-130, C-17, CH-53, and MV-22 aircraft). The complete event would be conducted in a secure and safely controlled manner, the result of extensive advanced planning, with specific training standards and success criteria. Trainees may also utilize sUAS over DoD and USCG property within an authorized training area as prescribed by the DoD and the FAA to provide local surveillance over the training objective prior to and during a training action. The sUAS would be retrieved as part of the activity.

2.1.2 Water-Based Training

Water-based training activities are identified as diver/swimmer, insertion/extraction, UUV training, and launch and recovery (the process of placing a vessel into the water and recovering it). In general, water-based training activities would include trainees, a training supervisor, and safety support personnel for the submersible craft or watercraft operation phases of the event. Support personnel are assigned to supervise water-based training (typically from a boat) and provide medical support if required. Supervisor and safety support personnel would focus on maintaining a safety buffer consistent with USCG regulations, namely the USCG Navigation Rules and Regulations Handbook, as the site conditions and surrounding environment dictate. For example, navigation lights on a dive boat (i.e., red over white over red) or a diver down flag indicate that a dive is in progress and oncoming vessel traffic needs to keep well clear at slow speed. Dive site locations would avoid locations that experience heavy traffic patterns, such as main shipping routes or areas with heavy fishing activities. In the event maritime vessels approach an active dive site, safety personnel would utilize radio Channel 16 (intended for international distress, safety, and calling) to contact vessels as needed. If an oncoming vessel does not respond, a safety boat would approach the vessel and, depending on the situation, ask it to (1) hold its position, (2) go around the dive site, (3) if necessary be escorted by the safety boat around the dive site, or (4) divers would be recalled out of the water.

Safety buffers ensure the safety for the trainees, training vessels, and any commercial or civilian craft transiting near the event location. Other responsibilities for safety support personnel include looking out for hazards to navigation that could affect the safety of the trainees, and recalling swimmers and divers, or the small submersible, to the surface if required. If the public enters the training area, the safety support personnel would assess the situation and, based upon safety considerations, will either continue the training, temporarily suspend the training, completely stop the training, or relocate the training to another approved training site.

During water-based training activities, vessels would avoid contact with hard surfaces, vessels and personnel would avoid marine mammals and ESA-listed species, and vessels would remain on the water surface or within the water column (e.g., UUV) (with the exception of small inflatable boats, which could be carried ashore). A crewman would act as a lookout during training evolutions on boats and support vessels to avoid marine mammals and ESA-listed species that may enter the area during training activities. If a marine mammal or ESA-listed species was observed in the vicinity of the training area, the support vessel would signal the submersible for recall.

Water-based training activities would use existing government and public boat ramps near the selected training location to launch the training platform (small submersible vehicle, surface support craft, or small inflatable boat) into the waterway. However, some training scenarios require an ocean launch using a small ship. A ship launch may also occur during training activities in locations that are not served by an existing boat ramp (specific offshore locations of Oahu, Maui, the Island of Hawaii, Kauai, Lanai, and Molokai) or if weather or tidal conditions result in a safety concern regarding a boat ramp launch.

2.1.2.1 Diver/Swimmer Training Activities

During diver/swimmer training events, trainees would swim or dive to an objective area (e.g., harbor, beach, moored vessel) for up to 6 hours. During night training, the trainees would use buoys marked with a glow stick (Chemlight) to identify their location to the support staff. Rubber replica weapons could be carried by trainees to reproduce the bulk and weight of the gear the trainee would carry during an actual mission.

2.1.2.2 Insertion/Extraction Training Activities

During insertion/extraction training events, trainees would be trained to approach or depart an objective area using submersible craft or surface watercraft (e.g., jet skis, WaveRunners, or small boats). This activity trains personnel to effectively insert and extract people and equipment during the day or night. Submersible and surface craft would have standard USCG lighting for night training. Insertion/extraction training events utilizing submersible craft would operate along the shoreline to conduct water-based training.

2.1.2.3 Launch and Recovery Training Activities

During launch and recovery training events, training would be conducted in water areas and consist of launching and recovering submersibles or surface craft, or a combination of both, from a boat ramp, water platform, or via a crane located on a ship or a barge. Trainees would also practice operating and maneuvering small personal watercraft (e.g., jet skis or WaveRunners) to obtain safety qualifications and certifications.

2.1.2.4 UUV Activities

A subset of water-based training would involve the use of a UUV. UUVs are small, battery-powered, unmanned submersible that is hand-launched from a land or a host vessel and used to conduct bathymetric, oceanographic, and other geographic underwater surveys. UUVs operate within the water column and would not be set on the floor of the ocean. UUVs operate under the same navigational rules as any marine vessel and would be operated to avoid other marine vessels. Training activities requiring a UUV would occur concurrently approximately 30 percent of the time when diver/swimmer training activities are taking place. The launch and recovery of the UUV would be conducted in water areas only and consist of launching and recovering up to two UUVs per training event. UUVs can be autonomous or tethered and are controlled from the water surface or by a diver for real-time feedback to the operator. Diving personnel may be in the water in the vicinity of the land or the host vessel for the launch or retrieval portions of the activity. Underwater areas to be surveyed by the UUV are pre-programmed into the vehicles' navigation system prior to launch. UUVs are tracked by personnel on the host vessel to ensure they remain on course and, if needed, can be recovered at any point along the pre-programmed track.

2.1.3 Land-Based Training Activities

Land-based training activities are identified as over-the-beach, special reconnaissance, simulated building clearance, and high angle climbing. All land-based training activities would include support personnel. Support personnel are responsible for the safety and oversight of trainees participating in the activity. The support personnel continually evaluate the training scenario and employ standard operating procedures (SOPs) to ensure that training activities are isolated and remain safe. Trainees receive safety briefings, have constant oversight by instructors, and NSWC Public Affairs Officers or their representatives would be available to interact with the public should anyone approach an active training

scenario. Additionally, as part of the training objective that the activities be undetected, the support personnel teach trainees that no expended equipment, human waste, or transported liquids remain on site after the training activity is completed. One unmarked NSWC vehicle designated as an emergency response vehicle would be utilized by the support personnel; vehicles used by support personnel would be parked in designated areas that afford optimal availability, if required during a training event.

2.1.3.1 Over-the-Beach Training Activities

During an over-the-beach training activity, trainees would exit the water, cross the beach, and quietly transition to land-based activities. Upon arrival at a pre-designated area, trainees would remain out of sight for several hours before exiting the site or continuing to move towards a pre-determined objective. Rubber replica weapons could be carried by trainees to imitate real-world events. Actual weapons could be carried by trainees within three DoD properties to existing live-fire training ranges: Puuloa Range Training Facility, Pearl City Peninsula (Figure 1-3), and MCBH – Kaneohe Bay Range Training Facility (Figure 1-5).

2.1.3.2 Special Reconnaissance Training Activities

Upon arrival at a designated area, trainees would hike to a designated observation point. Trainees are taught the techniques for conducting reconnaissance without alerting anyone to their presence or location. Trainees would remain undetected for a period of time with the goal of leaving no trace of their presence behind. This includes no vegetation trampled, no branches broken, no footprints visible, or any other indicators that they were there. Trainees would use observation techniques, following procedures, and report back on a scenario involving role-play with support personnel. No reconnaissance would be intentionally performed on activities other than those staged and pre-arranged for training purposes.

2.1.3.3 Simulated Building/Structure Clearance Training Activities

Simulated building clearance is only proposed on DoD property within the training study area: Oahu JBPHH Region (Figure 1-3) and Oahu West Region (Lualualei Annex; Figure 1-7). The activity would consist of trainees conducting simulated actions against a site, or against support personnel designated as part of the exercise who are simulating a threat or enemy, within the boundaries of a confined area or building. Simulated building clearance training develops the trainees' ability to operate within a small unit, move into a structure, conduct clearance from room to room, and engage in role-play (support personnel) simulated combat scenarios. The combat scenarios involve the use of simulated weapons and simulated munitions from both trainees and support staff acting as enemy opponents. The intent is for trainees to remain concealed and silent, and then depart the area avoiding detection with minimal disturbance. The training includes the use of weapons configured to only fire plastic or paint pellets. No live-fire weapons or ammunition would be used. The simulated munitions would be marking rounds, which are specialized plastic/paint capsules that are environmentally friendly and water soluble. The temporary marks these simulated munitions make are about the circumference of a dime. Sounds associated with the firing of the simulated munitions are less than actual live rounds and sound similar to an air rifle. No property damage would occur, and cleanup (picking up simulated marking rounds/washing away paint marks if present) would be handled by support personnel immediately at the conclusion of the training scenario. Support staff would be on site at all times in order to ensure overall safety in the training environment.

2.1.3.4 High Angle Climbing Training Activities

High angle climbing events are training evolutions where trainees negotiate cliffs, rock faces, and other vertical challenges to develop infiltration and retrieval of climbing equipment techniques. Trainees would be instructed in the use of ropes and other climbing gear to traverse obstacles while carrying gear. Proposed high-angle climbing training would only occur within the Oahu North Region (Figure 1-6).

2.1.4 Air-Based Training Activities

Air-based training activities are conducted in areas identified as drop zones, helicopter landing zones, or authorized airspace, including restricted areas and warning areas, or in accordance with valid FAA sUAS Certificate of Authorization. Aircraft participating in air-based training events could include C-130, C-17, CH-53, MV-22, or sUAS (DoD Group 1 or Group 2 [i.e., less than 55 pounds]). Air-based training would only occur within the airspace above DoD and USCG properties or over open water adjacent to a DoD installation. All air-based training events would include a supervisor, at least one medical corpsman, and up to 10 support personnel who are responsible for the safety and oversight of trainees participating in the event. When necessary, there would be support personnel on site to maintain a safety buffer to prevent bystanders or traffic from entering into designated drop or landing zones. Two or three vehicles would be utilized by these personnel, with one emergency response vehicle. Safety personnel would also maintain a safety buffer around proposed water-based drop zones to prevent other watercraft from entering into a designated water drop zone.

2.1.4.1 Drop Zone Training Activities

NSO personnel would utilize existing and new land-based and water-based drop zones within JBPHH, MCBH, and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area to conduct air-based training activities. Training within the proposed water drop zones immediately adjacent to and offshore of MCBH (Figure 1-5) would be within state of Hawaii waters. Water-based drop zone training activities are conducted at sites where up to 40 trainees land after parachuting from fixed-wing aircraft at an altitude between 5,000 and 1,500 feet (ft) above ground level (AGL).

Land-based drop zone training activities are conducted at sites where up to 40 trainees land after parachuting from fixed-wing aircraft at an altitude between 12,500 and 500 ft AGL. Land-based and water-based drop zones may also be utilized for training activities where helicopters or MV-22 aircraft approach the ground or water surface (approximately 5–15 ft AGL) and up to 15 trainees practice inserting into an area or extracted (approximately 5 ft AGL) out of an area via helicopter rope suspension techniques. These techniques include rappelling, fast roping, casting, special patrol insertion and extraction, or hoist operation. Rappelling, fast roping, and special patrol insertion and extraction are techniques used to lower oneself down a rope quickly into an area that does not permit aircraft landing. A hoist operation is a technique used to extract trainees out of an area. Trainees practice extraction techniques in drop zones, such as being retrieved by a helicopter or MV-22 aircraft via a rope that is lowered into a pickup area (on land or over water), trainees hooking up to the specialized rope, and the helicopter vertically lifting from the extraction zone until the rope and trainees are clear of obstructions.

NSO drop zone training activities would:

- include up to 6 hours of aircraft operation per training event;
- utilize C-130, C-17, MV-22, CH-53 or similar aircraft to support training with parachutes;

- utilize MV-22 aircraft or helicopters to support rappelling, fast roping, special patrol insertion and extraction or hoist operation over land or water;
- include hovering for approximately 15 minutes when facilitating drop zone training activities via helicopter or MV-22; and
- coordinate use of airspace with FAA Honolulu Control Facility as far in advance as practicable.

Proposed land-based drop zones and landing zones training activities would occur within the Oahu JBPHH Region (Waipio Peninsula, Pearl City Peninsula, and Ford Island; Figure 1-3); Oahu North Region (Kahuku Training Area – Kanes [drop zone only]; Figure 1-6); Oahu Windward Region (MCBH; Figure 1-5), and Oahu West Region (Lualualei Annex; Figure 1-7). Training would take place from 1:30 pm to 10:00 pm. Landing zones on Pearl City Peninsula would be utilized 5–12 times/year. Vegetation clearing would be required at only one proposed land-based drop zone location: Oahu JBPHH Region (Waipio Peninsula; Figure 1-3).

2.1.4.2 Helicopter Landing Zone Training Activities

Helicopter landing zones would consist of dedicated helicopter landing pads within JBPHH property. In locations where no pad exists, the helicopter landing zones would be surveyed prior to use to identify any safety concerns or hazards. The NATOPS program determines requirements for each aircraft utilizing a landing zone. NSO training utilizing helicopter landing zone training areas during a training event would:

- include up to 4 hours of aircraft operation per training event;
- utilize helicopter or MV-22 aircraft lowering to the ground surface to insert or extract NSO trainees in accordance with training and safety requirements;
- occur as a standalone activity or used in conjunction with all training activities (with the exception of drop zones);
- utilize landing zones approved in accordance with FAA authorizations; and
- coordinate use of airspace with FAA Honolulu Control Facility as far in advance as practicable.

2.1.4.3 sUAS Training Activities

The sUAS, also commonly called a drone, consists of a hand-launched or catapult system, a control system, and a remotely piloted or self-piloted (i.e., pre-programmed flight pattern) air vehicle that may be fixed-wing or rotary-wing. They would carry only non-hazardous payloads such as cameras, sensors, and communications equipment. Propulsion is through electrical motor-driven propellers powered by rechargeable batteries. The sUAS would be deployed and fly within an authorized training area over DoD property (such as Restricted Airspace) and within Warning Areas, as prescribed by the DoD and FAA. For training outside restricted airspace or warning areas, the sUAS would be flown over DoD and USCG property in accordance with a valid FAA Certificate of Authorization. Proposed sUAS training activities would occur only above DoD property within the JBPHH, Windward, North, South, and West Regions on Oahu, USCG property on Oahu, and DoD property on Kauai. The use of sUAS may be a standalone activity or used in conjunction with all training activities, with the exception of in drop zones. Proposed sUAS utilized for proposed training would:

- be categorized as DoD Group 1 or Group 2 systems, weighing less than 55 pounds;
- vary in size up to approximately 2 meters (m) in length, with a wingspan of 3 m;
- normally operate below 3,500 ft AGL;
- utilize ground observers (no manned aircraft observers); and
- fly in accordance with FAA authorizations.

2.2 Training Sites

Under the proposed action, proposed training activities would occur periodically throughout the state of Hawaii within five Oahu regions (JBPHH, South, Windward, North, and West); and the islands of Hawaii, Kauai, Maui, Lanai, and Molokai (see Figure 1-2 through Figure 1-12). The geographic regions within the training study area are all capable of supporting the training activities (Section 2.1.1, Training Activities), objectives, and requirements. The training study area offers varied topography, hydrography, and bathymetry (including strong and shifting currents) to units conducting extended, recurring, and sustainment water-, air- and land-based training.

NSO personnel consider several factors in addition to training qualifications and training requirements when selecting a site for training. The selection of a site is dependent on receiving real estate approvals/permits, seasonal conditions (high surf, dangerous currents, or high winds), and site conditions (period of high public presence or protected natural resources considerations). Virtually all of the skills that the proposed training is designed to hone may be accomplished throughout all the geographic regions; however, consideration of the factors discussed above narrow the potential sites available for training at different times of the year. Some sites and facilities support specific individual training objectives and requirements.

The variety of sites allows for a training progression to occur based on the trainees' skill set demonstrated as they accomplish each training skill objective. Multiple sites on Oahu and on or near other Hawaiian Islands are needed to accommodate seasonal changes, evolving skill sets, and site-specific restrictions that may occur at certain times of the year. The diversity of sites within the training study area also facilitates minimal interaction with the public and minimization of impacts on the natural environment at each potential training site through planned infrequent and random use. Additionally, infrequent use of sites helps to mitigate negative training aspects associated with trainees becoming too familiar with what to expect when they repeatedly conduct the same training at the same sites. Training must be varied and diverse, and as realistic as possible, to prepare U.S. service members to achieve their mission and ensure their success and survival when deploying on missions.

2.3 Training Equipment

Table 2-2 lists the current and proposed equipment that may be used during proposed training activities across the training study area in Hawaii. Each activity would require a specific mix of personnel, equipment, and supporting systems. Further, the particular goal of a single training evolution may require a specific set of equipment.

Table 2-2: Current and Proposed Equipment for Naval Special Operations Training

Equipment Type	Description and Purpose	Area of Utilization
Simulated Weapons		
Simulated Weapon	Trainees carry rubber simulated weapons throughout a training event to represent the combat weight and balance of the weapon and to experience the considerations needed to maintain and keep functioning in undersea conditions.	Training Study Area
Live-fire Weapons	Trainees carry real weapons throughout some training events to represent the combat weight and balance of the weapon and to experience the considerations needed to maintain and keep functioning in undersea conditions. Real weapons/bullets would be carried only at DoD sites where NSO personnel would conduct live-fire activities on established and authorized DoD live-fire ranges.	Three DoD sites: Puuloa Range Training Facility, Pearl City Peninsula, and MCBH – Kaneohe Bay Range Training Facility
Simunitions Cartridge	A small cartridge that emits a plastic projectile (i.e., paint ball) that is utilized only during simulated building clearance exercises. All marks would be removed and all expended shell casings would be retrieved.	DoD sites where simulated building clearance would occur.
Marine Vessels		
Surface Support Craft	Surface support craft includes commercial or military boats (~20–36 ft long) for open water utility operations.	Training Study Area Waters
Submersible	Manned underwater propulsion device that is the primary transit and delivery vehicle for all NSO undersea training events.	Training Study Area Waters
Small Inflatable Boats	Small rubber inflatable boats (≤ 30 ft long); may be used in conjunction with training systems during certain training scenarios, and for safety and training support.	Training Study Area Waters
Personal Watercraft	Personal watercraft such as jet skis or WaveRunners are used for swimmer safety in certain events during training.	Training Study Area Waters
UUV/ROV	UUVs and ROVs controlled by a trainee with real-time feedback; can be tethered, untethered, or autonomous and can operate on or below the surface.	Training Study Area Waters
Ground Support Vehicles		
Passenger Van	Personnel transport.	Training Study Area
Emergency Response Vehicle	Medical command and NSWC control vehicle.	Training Study Area
Pick-up Truck	Transport of essential equipment, including surface support craft and personnel.	Training Study Area
Aircraft		
C-130 (or similar)	Fixed-wing aircraft with a large profile that operates at low altitude.	Only at DoD properties and adjacent state waters.
C-17 (or similar)	Large military transport aircraft.	Only at DoD properties.
MV-22 (or similar)	Tiltrotor aircraft with both vertical and short takeoff and landing capabilities.	Only at DoD properties and adjacent state waters.
CH-53 (or similar)	Heavy-lift transport helicopter.	Only at DoD properties and adjacent state waters.
sUAS	Consists of a hand-launched or catapult system, control system, and is remotely piloted or self-piloted (i.e., pre-programmed flight pattern) air vehicle that may be fixed-wing or rotary-wing; would carry cameras, sensors, and communications equipment.	Only at DoD properties.

2.4 Training Area Screening Factors

NSWC considered three factors (training, safety, and logistics) when identifying broad geographic areas that could support warm-weather NSO training and satisfy the training requirements.

Training: Land and maritime special operations training activities prepare NSO personnel for global operations in a spectrum of environments. NSWC evaluated the whole state of Hawaii to identify specific locales that were suited to support specific training requirements. Included in the evaluation were specific logistic and safety concerns, existing training, and the desire to have little to no impact on the public and environmental resources. NSWC must conduct warm-water training in Hawaii due to limits with personnel availability caused by a high operational tempo and requirements that include submarine force concentration, military logistical support, military security, bathymetry, and warm water.

The proposed action would support the foundation and mastery of skills necessary to meet diverse global training challenges required for NSO personnel prior to moving on to more challenging environments. Specific characteristics of the unique water and coastline environments of Hawaii are detailed below.

- Favorable weather conditions – Hawaii offers a warm-water training environment that allows NSO personnel to master skills before transitioning to inclement weather conditions at other training locations.
- Access to both open-ocean and nearshore waters.
- A complex bathymetry – Hawaii offers challenges in operating and replicates real-world operational environments.
- Complex hydrographic features that offer unique and challenging training conditions.
- Varied operating environments, coupled with the extensive proximity of naval facilities and associated units, which allow for training from several diverse host platforms for the special operations submersibles. This diverse collection of associated units and platforms allows the maximization of training by supporting other training evolutions during the same scheduled training period. The breadth of training sites across Hawaii ensures that new locations and the varied amount of training locations within the training cycle would prevent familiarity with a common training environment and continually challenge the special operations units conducting the training.

Bathymetry – The National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) defines bathymetry as “the study of the ‘beds’ or ‘floors’ of water bodies, including the ocean, rivers, streams, and lakes.” The term ‘bathymetry’ originally referred to the ocean’s depth relative to sea level, although it has come to mean ‘submarine topography,’ or the depths and shapes of underwater terrain.

Hydrography – NOAA defines hydrography as “the science that measures and describes the physical features of the navigable portion of the earth’s surface and adjoining coastal areas.”

Safety: Due to the nature of the training operations, and the associated maritime environment in which they must be conducted, specific safety considerations must be in place to support NSO water-based training activities. Specific safety considerations that must be met include:

- Ready access to an active recompression dive chamber within 1-hour transit from the training site in accordance with the U.S. Navy Diving Manual.

- The proximity of multiple military facilities with on-call response medical capabilities offering the flexibility to rapidly respond to any emerging safety issue.
- Timely access to medical support.

Logistics: Due to the unique training and operational requirements for NSO personnel, the proximity of secured Navy facilities/installations is critical. Specifically:

- The required level of security for the equipment used in some water-based training activities can only be met on a military facility.
- Staging for all aspects of the training is optimally served on a local naval base. This includes:
 - lodging,
 - proximity to transportation,
 - maintenance support, and
 - classified material storage.

2.5 Alternatives Development

NSWC must consider reasonable alternatives to the proposed action in accordance with NEPA and CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508). The potential environmental impacts of NSWC's proposed action to enhance current and advanced training for NSO and other U.S. special operations commands are associated with activities of personnel in-water and movement over land, and associated air-based training activities. Accordingly, NSWC focused its alternatives analysis on variances to the frequency and variable use of training sites within the training study area to satisfy the purpose of and need for the proposed action (Section 1.3, Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action). Reasonable alternatives must meet the stated objectives of the proposed action. Two action alternatives (Alternatives 1 and 2) have been identified in addition to the No Action Alternative. These three alternatives are analyzed in this EA and discussed in detail below. Alternative 2 is the Preferred Alternative.

2.5.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the water-, land-, and air-based NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past approximate 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX, as applicable, and the October 2018 Final HSTT EIS/OEIS (Tables 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5). To date, four event-based CATEX have been approved to support NSO training on non-DoD property and four Records of CATEX have been approved to support NSO training on DoD property on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii. All eight Records of CATEX signed to date cover personnel swimming, over the beach training, high-angle climbing, and the use of small ships, boats, and submersibles on a limited number of sites in Hawaii. Except for training at small arms ranges on DoD land, other NSO training is considered at-sea training, which is covered in the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS. Under the No Action Alternative, NSO training activities for a typical year include approximately 10 events/year on all non-DoD properties combined and approximately 50 events/year on all DoD and USCG properties combined.

Under the No Action Alternative, approved training locations would continue to be restricted to a limited number of sites within the state of Hawaii. When NSO personnel have limited sites for training, the essential element of unpredictability is removed from the training environment. Familiarity with a training site induces prior awareness of a training scenario, thus significantly reducing the quality of

training. Training scenarios at the limited number of existing approved sites on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii are not sufficiently diverse to support the requirements for warm-weather NSO training and training progression, and, therefore, do not adequately support the requirements to achieve combat readiness. The No Action Alternative does not meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action as NSO units would not conduct, or meet, the full mission profile training requirements. However, it is being carried forward for analysis in this EA as a baseline from which to compare the impacts of the action alternatives.

Table 2-3: Proposed Training Activity by Alternative and Region

Alternative	Region	Water-Based Training			Land-Based Training				Air-Based Training		
		D/S	I&E	L&R	OTB	SR	SBC	HA	DZ	LZ	sUAS
No Action	JBPHH (Oahu)	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	✓
	Windward Region (Oahu)	✓	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	North Region (Oahu)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	South Region (Oahu)	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-
	West Region (Oahu)	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Island of Hawaii	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Kauai	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Maui	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Lanai	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Molokai	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternative 1 and Alternative 2*	JBPHH (Oahu)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓
	Windward Region (Oahu)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	✓	✓
	North Region (Oahu)	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	South Region (Oahu)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	✓
	West Region (Oahu)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓
	Island of Hawaii	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-
	Kauai	-	✓	-	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	✓
	Maui	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Lanai	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Molokai	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: D/S = Diver/Swimmer Training, HA = High-Angle Climbing Training, I&E = Insertion and Extraction Training (to include unmanned underwater vehicle [UUV] activities), JBPHH = Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, L&R = Launch and Recovery Training, OTB = Over-the-Beach Training, SBC = Simulated Building Clearance Training, SR = Special Reconnaissance Training, sUAS = small unmanned aircraft system,

✓ = training activity proposed; “-” indicates the training activity is NOT proposed.

*Training frequency would increase with Alternative 2, see Table 2-4.

2.5.2 Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, proposed training activities would occur within the training study area, which includes the nearshore waters and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu, the Island of Hawaii, and Kauai, and nearshore waters and two harbors at Maui; nearshore waters and two harbors at Molokai, and one nearshore area and harbor at Lanai. Land- or air-based training is not proposed on Maui, Lanai, and Molokai (Table 2-3). Within the training study area, each non-DoD property training site would be used for a maximum of 6 events/year for 2 to 72 hours/event (pending receipt of real estate agreements/right-of-entry permits) (Table 2-4). The maximum number of events across all non-

DoD land properties would not exceed 198 events/year and would be distributed throughout each property within the training study area. NSO personnel would also utilize DoD and USCG property within the training study area for up to 52 events/year to develop skills associated with the training activities. The proposed training events on DoD and USCG property would be distributed throughout the property within the training study area (Figure 1-2 and Figure 1-9). Under this alternative, NSWC would deploy a support vessel to facilitate water-based training occurring outside the 1-hour transit distance from JBPHH. The support vessel would have a dive chamber available, and the capability to repair and recover training devices.

Table 2-4: Proposed Frequency of Training by Alternative

Activities	Region	Frequency***		
		Alternative 1	Alternative 2	No-Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diver/swimmer • Insertion/extraction • Launch/recovery • Simulated building clearance* • Over-the-beach**** • Special reconnaissance • sUAS‡ • Landing zone*/drop zone 	Oahu JBPHH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 6 training events/year at an individual non-DoD training site (maximum total on all non-DoD sites would be 198 events/year). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 10 training events/year at an individual non-DoD training site (maximum total on all non-DoD sites would be 330 events/year). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline training activities would continue at the currently approved level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 10 training events/year across all non-DoD land. ○ 50 training events/year on DoD land. • Air-based training (sUAS) would only occur at JBPHH. • Land- and water based training would be restricted to JBPHH, Oahu Windward, Oahu South, Oahu West, and Kauai.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diver/swimmer • Insertion/extraction • Launch/recovery • Over-the-beach**** • sUAS‡ • Landing zone*/drop zone 	Oahu Windward Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 52 training events/year on DoD and USCG property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 265 training events/year on DoD and USCG property. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diver/swimmer • Insertion/extraction • Launch/recovery • Over-the-beach • sUAS‡ • Landing zone*/drop zone • High angle climbing 	Oahu North Region			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diver/swimmer • Insertion/extraction • Launch/recovery • Simulated building clearance* • Over-the-beach • Special reconnaissance • sUAS‡ 	Oahu South Region			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diver/swimmer** • Insertion/Extraction • Launch/recovery • Simulated building clearance* • Over-the-beach • Special reconnaissance • sUAS‡ • Landing zone*/drop zone 	Oahu West Region			

Table 2-4: Proposed Frequency of Training by Alternative

Activities	Region	Frequency***		
		Alternative 1	Alternative 2	No-Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diver/swimmer • Insertion/extraction • Launch/recovery • Over-the-beach 	Island of Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 6 training events/year at an individual non-DoD training site (maximum total on all non-DoD sites would be 198 events/year). • Up to 52 training events/year on DoD property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 10 training events/year at an individual non-DoD training site/year (maximum total on all non-DoD sites would be 330 events/year). • Up to 265 training events/year on DoD property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline training activities would continue at the currently approved level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on the Island of Hawaii: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 10 training events/ year on non-DoD land. ○ 50 training events/year on DoD land. • As under current baseline conditions, NSO training would not occur on Maui, Lanai, and Molokai.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insertion/extraction • Over-the-beach • Special reconnaissance • sUAS‡ 	Kauai			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diver/swimmer** • Insertion/extraction** • Launch/recovery** 	Maui			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diver/swimmer** • Insertion/extraction** 	Lanai, Molokai			

*Activity occurs only on DoD property and adjacent state waters. Proposed landing zone and drop zone frequency presented in Table 2-5.

‡Activity occurs only on DoD and USCG property.

**Activity occurs only in nearshore waters (harbors and bays).

***For analysis purposes, the frequency represents a conservative estimation.

****At Puuloa Range Training Facility, Pearl City Peninsula, and MCBH-Kaneohe Bay Range Training Facility, NSO personnel would conduct live-fire activities on already established and authorized DoD live-fire ranges.

Notes: Activities under the No Action Alternative are limited in scope and scale to a few non-DoD sites on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii (Table 2-3). The few sites available to trainees results in repeated use of sites and undue familiarity with the training scenarios, thus negating the quality of the training. The limited number of sites currently available in Hawaii are not considered sufficiently diverse to support long-term training requirements and adequately prepare NSO personnel for missions. For all the alternatives, not every site will be used every year; however, for any particular site within a region and alternative, the maximums as described above would not be exceeded.

Under Alternative 1, proposed training would include drop zone training activities up to 30 events/year and landing zone training activities up to 20 events/year. Land-based drop zones and landing zones include JBPHH (Waipio Peninsula, Pearl City Peninsula, and Ford Island), Oahu North (Kahuku Training Area [drop zone only]), and Oahu West (Lualualei Annex). Water-based drop zones would be utilized within the offshore waters off Oahu JBPHH Region (Pearl City Peninsula) and Oahu Windward Region (MCBH-Kaneohe Bay). Table 2-5 summarizes the air-based training proposed under Alternative 1. Air-

based training would be conducted in accordance with FAA rules and regulations, and the NATOPS program.

Table 2-5: Proposed Air-Based Training by Alternative

Training Activity	Aircraft Type	Annual Training Events			Annual Aircraft Operations (hours)		
		Alternative 1	Alternative 2	No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	No Action Alternative
Drop Zone	C-130, C-17, MV-22, or CH-53	30	40	0	180	240	0
Landing Zone	MV-22 or CH-53	20	30	0	80	120	0
Total		50	70	0	260	360	0

All training events would be conducted in accordance with military training procedures, approved SOPs, protective measures, and mitigation measures under existing regional environmental compliance documents (i.e., Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans [INRMPs] or Protective Measures Assessment Protocol [PMAP]) in place to protect marine mammals and ESA-listed threatened and endangered species. Under Alternative 1, NSO would be positioned to accommodate training for USSOCOM components alongside NSO personnel. The occasional integration of other USSOCOM components would occur only with NSWC-led training. This will not expand the number of participants above 46.

2.5.3 Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Alternative 2 includes the proposed training study area, and all activities and support platform (for training areas outside the 1-hour distance from JBPHH), as described under Alternative 1; however, there would be an increase in the annual training conducted (Table 2-4). Under Alternative 2, each non-DoD training site would be used for a maximum of 10 events/year for 2 to 72 hours/event (pending receipt of real estate agreements/right-of-entry permits) within the training study area. The maximum number of events across all non-DoD properties would not exceed 330 events/year and would be distributed throughout each property within the training study area. Up to 265 events/year would occur on DoD and USCG property. The proposed training events on DoD and USCG properties would be distributed throughout the properties within the training study area (Figures 1-2 and 1-9).

Table 2-5 summarizes the air-based training under Alternative 2. Under Alternative 2, proposed training would include drop zone and landing zone training activities up to 40 events/year and landing zone training activities up to 30 events/year (proposed locations are the same as those described above under Alternative 1). Air-based training would be conducted in accordance with FAA rules and regulations, and the NATOPS program.

All training events would be conducted in accordance with military training procedures, approved SOPs, protective measures, and mitigation measures under existing environmental compliance documents. Under Alternative 2, NSO would be positioned to accommodate training for additional USSOCOM components alongside NSO personnel. The occasional integration of other USSOCOM components would occur only with NSWC-led training.

The increased frequency of training under Alternative 2 best meets the purpose of and need for the proposed action. Increasing the frequency of training under Alternative 2 allows greater flexibility to support emerging training and demand requirements that are driven by emergent national defense needs. Alternative 2 best supports special operations forces as they acquire and master individual and

team skills in the marine, terrestrial, and aviation aspects of NSO in order to progress to more advanced training and to be combat-ready when called to conduct special operations in support of USSOCOM. Therefore, Alternative 2 is the preferred alternative as it best achieves the requirement that training be varied and diverse, and as realistic as possible, to prepare U.S. service members to achieve their mission and ensure their success and survival when deploying on missions.

2.6 Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

This section presents an overview of BMPs and SOPs that NSWOC would incorporate into the proposed training activities for NSO personnel within the state of Hawaii. BMPs and SOPs are existing policies, practices, and measures to reduce the environmental impacts of designated activities, functions, or processes. Although BMPs and SOPs mitigate potential impacts by avoiding or minimizing impacts, BMPs and SOPs are distinguished from potential mitigation measures because BMPs and SOPs are: (1) existing requirements for the proposed action; (2) ongoing, regularly occurring practices; or (3) not unique to this proposed action. In other words, the BMPs and SOPs identified in this document are inherently part of the proposed action and are not potential mitigation measures proposed as a function of the NEPA environmental review process for the proposed action. For all alternatives considered, BMPs and SOPs would be implemented as described in Table 2-6. Minimization and avoidance measures are discussed separately in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) when applicable. Navy special operations training would also follow the PMAP general training category.

The use of shipboard lookouts is a critical component of all Navy protective measures. Navy shipboard lookouts are highly qualified and experienced observers of the marine environment. Their duties require that they report all objects sighted in the water to the Officer of the Deck (e.g., trash, a periscope, marine mammals, sea turtles) and all disturbances (e.g., surface disturbance, discoloration) that may be indicative of a threat to the vessel and its crew.

Table 2-6: Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for NSO Training

Training Activity	BMP/SOP Description	Purpose
Water-Based Training Activities		
Swimmer/Diver	Diving and swimming events will have on site safety support. For dives there will be a minimum of two boats with support personnel. Boat 1 would maintain proximity to the divers or swimmers and have the Safety Supervisor with coxswain, crewman, and qualified medic. Boat 2 would serve as a lookout boat and interdict oncoming vessel traffic. Additionally, depending on the length of the dive or swim, jet skis would be onsite to provide additional safety coverage.	Maintain safety of trainees and the public.
All Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vessels will avoid contact with hard surfaces. During in-water training activities, vessels and personnel would avoid marine mammals and ESA-listed species and vessels would remain on the water surface or within the water column (with the exception of small inflatable boats, which would be carried ashore). • No anchors, equipment, tools, and personnel will be allowed to be in contact with any organism, especially coral; anchors will be placed in soft sediment in unconsolidated bottom habitats only. • All vessels will operate at “no wake/idle” speeds at all times while in water depths where the draft of the vessel provides less than a 6-foot clearance. 	Maintain safety of trainees and avoidance of marine mammals and ESA-listed species (e.g., sea turtles).

Table 2-6: Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for NSO Training

Training Activity	BMP/SOP Description	Purpose
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During water-based training activities, a crewman would act as a lookout during training evolutions on boats and support vessels to avoid marine mammals and ESA-listed species that may enter the area during training activities. During nighttime training, the lookout would be equipped with night vision goggles. If a marine mammal or ESA-listed species is observed in the vicinity of the training area and the training activity may affect the animal, the support vessel would signal personnel and vessels for recall, or training may be shifted to avoid the animal. Vessels and personnel will actively move away from the direction that the marine species is traveling by putting the engine in neutral until the animal is at least 50 ft away, and then slowly moving away to the prescribed distance. • If marine mammals or ESA-listed marine species are noticed within 50 yards of any training activity, training may continue only if, in the best judgment of the marine species observer, the activity would not affect the animal(s). Otherwise, the training will cease until the animal(s) departs. • All vessels will avoid direct “head-on” approaches to marine mammals and maneuver to maintain a mitigation zone of 500 yards around whales and 200 yards around all other marine mammals (with the exception of bow-riding dolphins). 	
Land-Based Training Activities		
All Activities	Land-based training will have a minimum of three onsite safety personnel: Lead and Assistant Safety Supervisors, and qualified medic. The medic will stage an emergency response vehicle onsite.	Maintain safety of trainees and the public.
All Activities	If ESA-listed marine species (i.e., Hawaiian monk seal or sea turtle) are noticed within 50 yards of the training activities, training may continue at a distance of 50 yards away from the marine species. Otherwise, the training will cease until the animal departs. If a nesting sea turtle is observed, then that area will be avoided to prevent disturbing the nest area, the nesting female on land, or its return to the water.	Maintain safety of trainees and avoidance of marine mammals and ESA-listed species (e.g., sea turtles).
All Activities	Vehicles will remain on existing established roadways, and sound will be minimized during training to avoid detection.	Maintain safety of trainees and the public and avoid impacts to terrestrial natural resources.
Air-Based Training Activities		
Drop Zone and Landing Zone	Air-based training will have a Lead Air Safety Supervisor, Assistant Air Safety supervisor, qualified medic with emergency response vehicle, and road guards. This ground crew element will set the conditions for air platforms to operate during landings and takeoffs. All air-based training will be conducted in accordance with FAA rules and regulations and the NATOPS program.	Maintain safety of trainees.
sUAS	Support personnel will maintain line of sight at all times with the sUAS. Personnel will enact immediate recovery in the event of a platform error in accordance with FAA rules and regulations and the NATOPS program.	Maintain positive control of the sUAS before, during, and after training event.

Table 2-6: Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for NSO Training

Training Activity	BMP/SOP Description	Purpose
All Training Activities		
All Activities	Activities will be coordinated with managers and property owners of non-DoD, DoD, or USCG properties. NSWC will also coordinate with local police departments and law enforcement prior to conducting training activities. All training events will be conducted in accordance with military training procedures, approved SOPs, and protective measures, including OPNAVINST 5100.23G, <i>Navy Safety and Occupational Health Program Manual</i> .	Maintain safety of trainees and the public.
All Activities	NSO personnel will adhere to military installation-specific SOPs or other measures such as those detailed in an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP). INRMPs integrate conservation measures as SOPs to minimize and avoid potential impacts to natural resources on military installations while maintaining military readiness.	Comply with established natural resource management procedures and measures.
All Activities	Biosecurity planning is a standard operating procedure during exercise planning and execution. All training events would be conducted in accordance with existing military training procedures, approved SOPs, and protective mitigation measures that are in place to avoid or minimize the potential for biosecurity concerns. NSO personnel would follow site-specific recommendations in Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, Army, and USCG installations in Hawaii, where activity planners and resource managers have a suite of recommendations to reduce, to the maximum extent practical, the transport, introduction, and establishment of potentially invasive species. Host installations and property owners/managers are responsible for relaying any installation-specific biosecurity instructions. Biosecurity concerns would be identified in land use and real estate agreements for activities that may occur on non-DoD properties.	Biosecurity

2.7 Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis

Only one alternative was considered, but not carried forward for detailed analysis in this EA as it did not meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action and did not satisfy the training location screening factors presented in Section 2.4 (Training Area Screening Factors).

The only other area considered for warm water NSO training lacked key components that are offered in the state of Hawaii. Hawaii was selected due to limits with personnel availability caused by a high operational tempo combined with the following requirements:

- submarine force concentration,
- military logistical support,
- military security, and
- appropriate hydrography, bathymetry, and warm water.

As discussed in Section 2.2 (Training Sites), Hawaii, with a diversity of different island environmental conditions, contains the combination of water-, land-, and air-based areas that would support the required specialized training in a warm-weather environment. The proposed training locations in the state of Hawaii fulfill all of the beginning, intermediate, and advanced NSO training requirements, and

therefore Hawaii is considered the only feasible location for supporting NSO personnel prior to moving on to more challenging environments.

One site outside of the state of Hawaii, the San Diego (California) Fleet Concentration Area, passed the initial screening but was subsequently not carried forward for detailed analysis. Located primarily in and around San Diego Bay, the San Diego Fleet Concentration Area offers a somewhat similar diverse training environment to Hawaii, but on a much smaller scale and in a less temperate environment. Water temperatures in San Diego, particularly in the Bay, are colder than the Pacific Ocean around the Hawaiian Islands. Further, because San Diego Bay is relatively small and shallow, with a single channel to the sea, the area lacks the desired complex hydrography that facilitates skill mastery. Additionally, NSO units stationed in San Diego currently use this locale to conduct a broad spectrum of training for other missions that are independent of the proposed training addressed in this EA. Adding the training for the proposed action would impact other NSO training and required training for other Navy and Marine Corps units in the San Diego Fleet Concentration Area.

Consequently, the proposed training in the Hawaiian Islands is needed to provide the diverse environment that replicates mission areas that feature similar challenges. Although the San Diego Fleet Concentration Area was considered, it is not being carried forward for detailed analysis in this EA because it does not offer the diverse bathymetric and hydrographic features of the Hawaiian Islands or the favorable weather conditions to support year-round training requirements. Accordingly, the San Diego Fleet Concentration Area does not fulfill the training screening factor described above in Section 2.4 (Training Area Screening Factors) that would allow NSO personnel to master skills before transitioning to inclement weather conditions at other training locations.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

3 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

This chapter presents a description of the environmental resources and baseline conditions that could be affected from implementing any of the alternatives and an analysis of the potential direct and indirect effects of each alternative.

All potentially relevant environmental resource areas were initially considered for analysis in this EA. In compliance with NEPA, CEQ, and 32 CFR Part 775 guidelines, the discussion of the affected environment (i.e., existing conditions) focuses only on those resource areas potentially subject to impacts. Additionally, the level of detail used in describing a resource is commensurate with the anticipated level of potential environmental impact.

The term “significant,” as used in NEPA, requires considerations of both context and intensity. Context means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (e.g., human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of a proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend on the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant (40 CFR Part 1508.27). Intensity refers to the severity or extent of the potential environmental impact, which can be thought of in terms of the potential amount of the likely change. In general, the more sensitive the context, the less intense a potential impact needs to be in order to be considered significant. Likewise, the less sensitive the context, the more intense a potential impact would be expected to be significant.

This section describes the affected environment of air quality, land use/recreation, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and public health and safety, and the potential impacts to these resources with implementation of the proposed action and No Action Alternative.

The potential impacts on the following resource areas are considered to be negligible or non-existent, and therefore were not analyzed in detail in this EA:

Water Resources: The proposed action would not impound, divert, drain, control, or otherwise modify the waters of any stream or other body of water. The proposed training activities do not involve changes to drainage patterns or introduce pollutants to training study area surface waters or groundwater. Water quality is not expected to undergo a measurable impact due to the proposed action.

Geological Resources: The proposed action does not include construction on undeveloped lands or ground-disturbing activities in any undisturbed areas.

Visual Resources: The proposed action does not include construction or permanent new structures over an undisturbed area and would not alter the visual landscape within the training study area. In addition, any vegetation clearing (only proposed at one location) would not change the overall composition of the landscape.

Airspace: The proposed action would not result in a permanent change of airspace designation or restriction in the existing airspace within the training study area or surrounding area. To support sUAS training activities, a Certificate of Authorization would be obtained from the FAA, or sUAS would be operated within airspace designated as restricted airspace or warning areas. The Certificate of Authorization would specify provisions or limitations, if necessary, as part of the approval, to ensure the

sUAS can operate safely with other airspace users. Air-based training involving aircraft would be conducted in accordance with FAA regulations and the NATOPS program.

Infrastructure: The proposed action does not include changes to infrastructure within the training study area. There would be no disruption or change to existing wastewater, water, telecommunication, or other utility services with implementation of the proposed action.

Transportation: The proposed action would not change or alter transportation facilities or circulation of traffic patterns within the training study area or surrounding area.

Hazardous Materials and Wastes: The proposed action involves minimal use of machinery, equipment, or vehicles; as such, no increases in the amount of hazardous waste produced would be expected. With implementation of BMPs, including compliance with Navy Spill Prevention and Control and Countermeasure plans, hazardous materials and waste would not be released into the environment under the proposed action. Military expended material such as flares and pyrotechnics, propellants, and explosives would not be utilized as part of NSO training under the proposed action. Hazardous materials and wastes would not be generated or released into the environment under the proposed action and expended batteries would be recycled or disposed of properly after returning from training activities through existing characterization, recycling, and disposal programs.

Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice: The proposed action would not change the population demographics, employment, or community characteristics within the training study area.

3.1 Air Quality

3.1.1 Introduction

Air pollution is a threat to human health and the environment (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2007). In addition to damaging the natural environment, including trees, crops, plants, lakes, and animals, air pollution damages the exteriors of buildings, monuments, and statues. It creates haze or smog that reduces visibility and interferes with aviation. To improve air quality and reduce air pollution, Congress established the CAA in 1970 and followed with major amendments in 1977 and 1990, which set regulatory limits on air pollutants and helped to ensure basic health and environmental protection from air pollution.

Most air pollutants originate from stationary sources (e.g., factories, refineries, power plants), mobile sources (e.g., cars, trucks, buses), and indoor sources (e.g., some building materials and cleaning solvents). Air pollutants are also released from natural sources such as volcanic eruptions and forest fires.

Air quality is defined by ambient concentrations of specific air pollutants—pollutants the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) determined may affect the health or welfare of the public. Ambient air quality is reported as the atmospheric concentrations of specific air pollutants at a particular time and location. The units of measurement are expressed as a mass per unit volume (e.g., micrograms per cubic meter of air) or as a volume fraction (e.g., parts per million by volume). The ambient air pollutant concentrations measured at a particular location are determined by the pollutant emissions rate, local meteorology, and atmospheric chemistry. Wind speed and direction, the vertical temperature gradient of the atmosphere, and precipitation patterns affect the dispersal, dilution, and removal of air pollutant emissions from the atmosphere.

The CAA required that the USEPA establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for the following six criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter (dust particles less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter [PM₁₀] and fine particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter [PM_{2.5}]), and lead. These pollutants are called “criteria” pollutants. The NAAQS set specific concentration limits for the pollutants in the outdoor (ambient) air. The concentration limits were developed because these pollutants are common in ambient outdoor air, considered harmful to public health and the environment, and come from numerous and diverse sources. The concentration limits are designed to aid in protecting public health (primary standards) and the environment (secondary standards).

In addition to the six criteria pollutants, the USEPA currently designates 187 substances as hazardous air pollutants under the federal CAA. Hazardous air pollutants are pollutants known or suspected to cause cancer or other serious health effects, or adverse environmental and ecological effects (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016b).

Criteria air pollutants are classified as either primary or secondary pollutants based on how they are formed in the atmosphere. Primary air pollutants are emitted directly into the atmosphere from the source of the pollutant and retain their chemical form. Examples of primary pollutants are the smoke produced by burning wood and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) emitted by industrial solvents. Secondary air pollutants are those formed through atmospheric chemical reactions that usually involve primary air pollutants (or pollutant precursors) and normal constituents of the atmosphere. Ozone, a major component of photochemical smog, is a secondary air pollutant. Ozone precursors fall into two broad groups of chemicals: nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and VOCs. NO_x consists of nitric oxide and nitrogen dioxide. Finally, some criteria air pollutants are a combination of primary and secondary pollutants. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} are generated as primary pollutants by various mechanical processes (e.g., abrasion, erosion, mixing, or atomization) or combustion processes. They are also generated as secondary pollutants through chemical reactions or through the condensation of gases into fine aerosols.

Areas with air pollution problems typically have one or more criteria pollutants consistently present at levels that exceed the NAAQS. These areas are designated as nonattainment for the standards. Certain NSO training activities under this action take place within nonattainment or maintenance areas. These areas are identified by their air quality designated areas (an area designated by the federal government where communities share a common air pollution problem).

The USEPA delegates authority to states, through their air quality management agencies, to prepare and implement State Implementation Plans for nonattainment areas, which demonstrate how the area will meet the NAAQS. Areas classified as attainment, after being designated as nonattainment, may be reclassified as maintenance areas subject to maintenance plans showing how the area will continue to meet federal air quality standards. If the state fails to develop an adequate plan to achieve and maintain the NAAQS or a State Implementation Plan revision is not approved by the USEPA, federal agencies must comply with the Federal Implementation Plan that the USEPA is required to develop. States may also choose to adopt the Federal Implementation Plan as an alternative to developing their own State Implementation Plan.

To facilitate their management, nonattainment areas for some criteria pollutants are further classified by the severity of their air quality problem:

- Ozone – marginal, moderate, serious, severe, and extreme
- CO – moderate and serious

- PM – moderate and serious

The CAA allows states to establish air quality standards more stringent than the NAAQS; however, they are prohibited from imposing more stringent conformity requirements unless the requirements apply equally to non-DoD activities. The State of Hawaii established standards more stringent than the NAAQS for certain pollutants (e.g., sulfur dioxide) and established standards for hydrogen sulfide, which is not covered by the NAAQS. Table 3-1 lists all NAAQS and Hawaii Standards.

Table 3-1: Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards

Air Pollutant	Time Average	Hawaii Standard	Federal Primary Standard	Federal Secondary Standard
Carbon monoxide (CO)	1-hour average	9 ppm	35 ppm	None
	8-hour average	4.4 ppm	9 ppm	None
Lead (Pb)	3-month average	1.5 µg/m ³	0.15 µg/m ³	Same as primary
Nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂)	1-hour average	None	100 ppb	None
	Annual average	0.04 ppm	53 ppb	Same as primary
Particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter (PM ₁₀)	24-hour block average	150 µg/m ³	150 µg/m ³	Same as primary
	Annual average	50 µg/m ³	None	None
Particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter (PM _{2.5})	24-hour block average	None	35 µg/m ³	Same as primary
	Annual average	None	12 µg/m ³	15 µg/m ³
Ozone (O ₃)	8-hour rolling average	0.08 ppm	0.070 ppm	Same as primary
Sulfur dioxide (SO ₂)	1-hour average	None	75 ppb	None
	3-hour block average	0.5 ppm	–	0.5 ppm
	24-hour block average	0.14 ppm	None	–
	Annual average	0.03 ppm	None	–
Hydrogen sulfide (H ₂ S)	1-hour average	25 ppb	None	None

Source: Hawaii Department of Health (2015).

Notes: ppb = parts per billion, ppm = parts per million, µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter.

3.1.1.1 Hazardous Air Pollutants

Unlike the criteria pollutants, there are no NAAQS for hazardous air pollutants emissions. The CAA regulates stationary hazardous air pollutant emissions via two sets of national emissions standards: (1) the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (40 CFR Part 61) regulate emissions of specific hazardous air pollutant compounds from specific sources, and (2) National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories (40 CFR Part 63) regulate all hazardous air pollutant emissions from listed categories of stationary sources.

Mobile source hazardous air pollutants are emitted from highway vehicles and non-road equipment, with six compounds being specifically identified as having the greatest influence on health: benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, acrolein, acetaldehyde, and diesel particulate matter. Specifically, Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) are regulated by the 2007 Mobile Source Air Toxic Rules, which identified 21 compounds which are known or suspected to cause cancer or other serious health and environmental effects and the 2014 USEPA’s Tier 3 vehicle and fuel standards which control the benzene content of gasoline (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2015). Mobile source hazardous air pollutants are generally regulated at the production level, in the same manner as criteria pollutants.

3.1.1.2 General Conformity

The USEPA General Conformity Rule applies to federal actions occurring in nonattainment or maintenance areas when the total direct and indirect emissions of nonattainment pollutants (or their precursors) exceed specified thresholds (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017). The emissions thresholds that trigger requirements for a conformity analysis are called *de minimis* levels. *De minimis* levels (in tons per year) vary by pollutant and also depend on the severity of the nonattainment status for the air quality management area in question.

A conformity applicability analysis is the first step of a conformity evaluation and assesses if a federal action must be supported by a conformity determination. This is typically done by quantifying applicable direct and indirect emissions that are projected to result due to implementation of the federal action. Indirect emissions are those emissions caused by the federal action and originating in the region of interest, but which can occur at a later time or in a different location from the action itself and are reasonably foreseeable. The federal agency can control and will maintain control over the indirect action due to a continuing program responsibility of the federal agency. Reasonably foreseeable emissions are projected future direct and indirect emissions that are identified at the time the conformity evaluation is performed. The location of such emissions is known and the emissions are quantifiable, as described and documented by the federal agency based on its own information and after reviewing any information presented to the federal agency. If the results of the applicability analysis indicate that the total emissions would not exceed the *de minimis* emissions thresholds, then the conformity evaluation process is completed.

The state of Hawaii is designated as being in attainment for all criteria pollutants and, therefore, does not require a conformity determination. The *de minimis* thresholds are only applicable to areas that have been classified as being in nonattainment, which means they are not applicable to this analysis. However, the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program is used to ensure that federal actions would not cause a region in attainment for all criteria pollutants to exceed NAAQS or local ambient air quality standards. The PSD permit must be obtained for any action that would result in a new major source or modify an existing major source resulting in a change of emissions that exceed a set of Significant Emission Rates, which are shown in Table 3-2. However, the proposed action would not qualify as a major source since there are no stationary sources of emissions. Although this means that the PSD program does not apply to this action, the significance thresholds that it establishes are still useful as a reference point to demonstrate whether an action will have an impact on the ambient air quality.

Table 3-2: PSD Significant Emission Rates for Attainment Areas

Pollutant	Significant Emission Rate (tpy)
NO _x	40
VOC	40
CO	100
SO ₂	40
PM ₁₀	15
PM _{2.5}	10

Note: SO₂ = sulfur dioxide, tpy = tons per year.

3.1.1.3 Mixing Layer

The mixing layer (or mixing height) is defined as the altitude below which the most vigorous initial mixing of air takes place. The mixing height can fluctuate, and is generally a function of weather,

seasonal variation, and topography present within a parcel of air. Mixing heights within the Hawaiian Islands can fluctuate throughout the day and throughout the seasons. However, the commonly accepted mixing height is 3,000 ft AGL. Emissions released above this altitude can be inhibited and effectively blocked from mixing beneath a surface-based temperature inversion. Therefore, aircraft emissions above 3,000 ft AGL are unlikely to contribute to ground-level pollutant concentrations (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1992).

3.1.1.4 Climate Change

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are compounds that contribute to the greenhouse effect—a natural phenomenon in which gases trap heat within the lowest portion of the earth’s atmosphere (surface-troposphere system), causing heating (radiative forcing) at the surface of the earth. The primary long-lived GHGs directly emitted by human activities are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, nitrogen trifluoride, and sulfur hexafluoride. CO₂, methane, and nitrous oxide occur naturally in the atmosphere. These gases influence the global climate by trapping heat in the atmosphere that would otherwise escape to space. The heating effect from these gases is considered the probable cause of the global warming observed over the last 50 years (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2009b). Global warming and climate change affect many aspects of the environment. Not all effects of GHGs are related to climate. For example, elevated concentrations of CO₂ can lead to ocean acidification and stimulate terrestrial plant growth, and methane emissions can contribute to higher ozone levels.

The USEPA determined that six GHGs in combination endanger both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations: CO₂, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2009a).

To estimate global warming potential, which is the heat trapping capacity of a gas, the U.S. quantifies GHG emissions using the 100-year timeframe values established in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007), in accordance with United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 2013) reporting procedures. All global warming potentials are expressed relative to a reference gas, CO₂, which is assigned a global warming potential equal to 1. Six other primary GHGs have global warming potentials: 25 for methane, 298 for nitrous oxide, 124 to 14,800 for hydrofluorocarbons, 7,390 to greater than 17,340 for perfluorocarbons, 17,200 for nitrogen trifluoride, and up to 22,800 for sulfur hexafluoride. To estimate the CO₂ equivalency of a non-CO₂ GHGs, the appropriate global warming potential of that gas is multiplied by the amount of the gas emitted. All six GHGs are multiplied by their global warming potential, and the results are added to calculate the total equivalent emissions of CO₂. The dominant GHG emitted is CO₂, mostly from fossil fuel combustion (85.4 percent) (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). Weighted by global warming potential, methane is the second largest component of emissions, followed by nitrous oxide. Global warming potential-weighted emissions are presented in terms of equivalent emissions of CO₂, using units of metric tons.

The proposed action is anticipated to release GHGs to the atmosphere. These emissions are quantified (primarily using methods elaborated upon in the *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014*) for the proposed Navy training and testing in the training study area (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a).

The potential effects of proposed GHG emissions are by nature global and may result in cumulative impacts because most individual sources of GHG emissions are not large enough to have any noticeable effect on climate change. Therefore, the impact of proposed GHG emissions to climate change is discussed in the context of cumulative impacts.

3.1.1.4.1 Current Requirements and Practices

In June 2014, the DoD released the 2014 *Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap* to document DoD's efforts to plan for the changes that are occurring or expected to occur as a result of climate change. The Roadmap provides an overview and specific details on how DoD's adaptation will occur, and describes ongoing efforts (U.S. Department of Defense, 2014).

The Navy is committed to improving energy security and environmental stewardship by reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The Navy is actively developing and participating in energy, environmental, and climate change initiatives that will increase use of alternative energy and reduce GHG emissions. The Navy has adopted energy, environmental, and climate change goals. These goals include reducing non-tactical petroleum use; ensuring environmentally sound acquisition practices; ensuring environmentally compliant operations for ships, submarines, aircraft, and facilities operated by the Navy; and implementing applicable elements of the Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap.

Equipment used by military units in the training study area, including ships and other marine vessels, aircraft, and other equipment, are properly maintained and fueled in accordance with applicable Navy requirements. Operating equipment meets federal and state emission standards, where applicable.

3.1.2 Affected Environment

The proposed action would take place in various locations around the state of Hawaii, which is regulated by the Clean Air Branch of the Hawaii Department of Health. The Clean Air Branch is responsible for implementing and enforcing State and federal air quality regulations in the state of Hawaii, which is classified by the USEPA as unclassified/attainment for all criteria pollutants; therefore, a Conformity Determination is not required for the proposed action (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017).

The state of Hawaii has some of the best air quality in the country. The climate of Hawaii contributes to the excellent air quality in the following ways:

- Consistent trade winds blowing out of the northeast quadrant efficiently carry away air pollutants that are produced on the islands and promote effective dispersal.
- Hawaii is located at such a great distance from other sources of pollution that the air that is carried to the islands is generally free of pollutants.
- Atmospheric inversions are uncommon, meaning that there is generally good vertical dispersion of pollutants.

Other factors that affect air quality are the temperature and rainfall. Air temperatures in Hawaii generally range from 70 to 80 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) throughout the year with slight variability depending on the season. Rainfall is most abundant and frequent on the windward slopes of the mountains of each island. The driest location on average is near the summit of Mauna Kea (average of 8 inches/year), while the wettest location is near Big Bog on the windward slope of Haleakala (average of 404 inches/year) (Giambelluca et al., 2013). Rain is effective at washing dust and other air pollutants out of the atmosphere, which improves air quality (Chu, 2015).

3.1.3 Environmental Consequences

Effects on air quality are based on estimated direct and indirect emissions associated with the action alternatives. The area that would be impacted by air pollutants released by the proposed action is the air basin in which the project is located, the State of Hawaii Air Basin. Estimated emissions from a proposed federal action are typically compared with the relevant national and state standards to assess the potential for increases in pollutant concentrations. Since the state of Hawaii is in attainment for NAAQS, project emissions are compared to PSD Significant Emission Thresholds to determine whether a significant increase in emissions would occur.

3.1.3.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX for DoD and non-DoD property and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. NSWC activities that occurred in the Hawaii region under the Records of CATEX and HSTT/OEIS produce emissions that are considered negligible (Table 3-3). Air pollutants associated with the No Action Alternative originate from watercraft and ground transportation. Equipment used for training in the training study area, including boats and vehicles, is properly maintained in accordance with applicable Navy regulations and federal CAA requirements (e.g., 40 CFR 63 Subpart ZZZZ). Operating equipment meets federal and state emission standards, where applicable. There are no fixed sources of emissions, such as generators, contributing to emissions. All sources of pollution are considered to be mobile sources. Due to this aspect of NSO training and the fact that training activities occur over a large expanse of land, emissions are readily dispersed throughout the training study area, inhibiting accumulation of pollutants in a single location. Therefore, no significant impact on existing air quality would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.

Table 3-3: Emissions Sources and Annual Emission Rates Under the No Action Alternative

Equipment Type	Annual Emissions (tpy)					
	NO _x	VOC	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Watercraft	16	205	500	1	0	0
Ground Transportation	5	0	3	0	0	0
Total	21	205	503	1	1	1
PSD Significant Emission Rate	40	40	100	40	15	10
Exceeds PSD Significance?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

Notes: SO_x = sulfur oxides, tpy = tons per year.

3.1.3.2 Alternative 1

Alternative 1 does not involve any construction activities, nor are there any fixed sources of emissions, such as stationary industrial generators, associated with training activities. A summary of air pollution sources is shown in Table 3-4 along with their expected annual emissions, which are based on the duration and emission release rates of the equipment used. Sources of emissions associated with the proposed action include the combustion of fossil fuels from engines in ground vehicles, watercraft, aircraft, and mobile generators aboard the Marine Vessel. The analysis incorporates aircraft emissions that would be released below the mixing height of 3,000 ft AGL. C-17 or C-130 aircraft would only be below this altitude during their takeoff and landing cycles. MV-22 and CH-53 aircraft are assumed to be below 3,000 ft AGL for the duration of their use. Proposed sUAS and UUVs would utilize rechargeable battery power and would not emit pollutants and are therefore excluded from the air quality analysis.

Since NSWC baseline air emissions are negligible, as discussed in Section 3.1.3.1 (No Action Alternative), all of the emissions produced under Alternative 1 would be considered a change from the environmental baseline.

Table 3-4: Emission Sources and Annual Emission Rates Under Alternative 1

Equipment Type	Annual Emissions (tpy)					
	NO _x	VOC	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Watercraft and Aircraft	43	455	1,110	2	2	2
Ground Transportation	12	1	6	0	0	0
Total	55	455	1,116	2	2	2
Baseline Emissions	21	205	503	1	1	1
Change in Emissions	34	250	613	1	1	1
<i>PSD Significant Emission Rate</i>	40	40	100	40	15	10
Exceeds PSD Significance?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

Notes: SO_x = sulfur oxides, tpy = tons per year.

Alternative 1 would produce criteria pollutant emissions that exceed PSD Significant Emission Rates for VOCs and CO pursuant to PSD permitting requirements. Since these thresholds are merely used as a reference point for the significance of pollutant emissions, a PSD permit would not need to be obtained. In addition, training activities under Alternative 1 would be distributed across the state of Hawaii and would not cause pollutants to accumulate in localized areas. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in a significant change from the environmental baseline and would have negligible impacts on the ambient air quality of the region.

In addition to the criteria pollutants, trace amounts of mobile source air toxics (MSAT) would be emitted from aircraft, watercraft, and ground transportation utilized under Alternative 1. Although a quantitative estimation of MSAT production was not performed, they are generally produced in quantities one or more orders of magnitude smaller than criteria pollutants. Since criteria pollutants are not produced in sufficient quantities to violate NAAQS under Alternative 1, it can be assumed that MSATs would not be produced in large enough quantities to significantly affect the air quality (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2007, 2008, 2009c).

Alternative 1 would contribute directly to emissions of GHGs from the combustion of fossil fuels. Training activities would generate approximately 2,841 tons (2,577 metric tons) of CO₂ equivalent each year, as detailed in Appendix B (Air Quality Calculations). These estimated annual GHG emissions would account for only 0.00004 percent of the United States' annual GHG emissions. This limited amount of emissions would not likely contribute to global warming to any discernible extent.

Therefore, no significant impacts on regional air quality would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

3.1.3.3 Alternative 2

Activities under Alternative 2 would not differ from those of Alternative 1. Construction activities would not occur, and no generators or other stationary sources of emissions would be used under Alternative 2. However, the frequency of training events would increase. All emissions arise from mobile sources such as watercraft, aircraft, and ground transport. Similar to Alternative 1, only the aircraft emissions that would be released below the 3,000 ft AGL mixing height were incorporated into this analysis. C-17 or C-130 aircraft would only be below this altitude during their takeoff and landing cycles. MV-22 and CH-53 aircraft are assumed to be below 3,000 ft AGL for the duration of their use. A summary of air

pollution sources under Alternative 2 are shown in Table 3-5 along with their expected annual emissions, which are based on the duration and emission release rates of the equipment used.

Similar to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would produce criteria pollutant emissions that exceed PSD Significant Emission Rates for VOCs and CO pursuant to PSD permitting requirements. However, training activities under Alternative 2 would be distributed across the islands and would not cause pollutants to accumulate in localized areas. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in a significant change from the environmental baseline and would have negligible impacts on the ambient air quality of the region.

Table 3-5: Emission Sources and Annual Emission Rates Under Alternative 2

Equipment Type	Annual Emissions (tpy)					
	NO _x	VOC	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Watercraft and Aircraft	48	503	1,228	3	2	2
Ground Transportation	12	1	6	0	0	0
Total	60	504	1,234	3	3	3
Baseline Emissions	21	205	503	1	1	1
Change in Emissions	39	299	731	2	2	2
PSD Significant Emission Rate	40	40	100	40	15	10
Exceeds PSD Significance?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

Notes: SO_x = sulfur oxides, tpy = tons per year.

In addition to the criteria pollutants, trace amounts of MSATs would be emitted from watercraft and ground transportation utilized under Alternative 2. Although a quantitative estimation of MSAT production was not performed, they are generally produced in quantities that are one or more orders of magnitude smaller than criteria pollutants. Since criteria pollutants are not produced in sufficient quantities to violate NAAQS under Alternative 2, it can be assumed that MSATs would not be produced in large enough quantities to significantly affect the air quality (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2007, 2008, 2009c).

Implementation of Alternative 2 would contribute directly to emissions of GHGs from the combustion of fossil fuels. Training activities would generate approximately 3,428 tons (3,110 metric tons) of CO₂ equivalent each year, as detailed in Appendix B (Air Quality Calculations). These estimated annual GHG emissions would account for approximately 0.00004 percent of the United States' annual GHG emissions. This limited amount of emissions would not likely contribute to global warming to any discernible extent.

Although Alternative 2 produces slightly more emissions annually than Alternative 1, no significant impacts would occur on regional air quality with implementation of Alternative 2.

3.2 Land Use/Recreation

This discussion of land use includes current and planned uses and the regulations, policies, or zoning that may control the proposed land use. The term land use refers to real property classifications that indicate either natural conditions or the types of human activity occurring on a parcel of land. Two main objectives of land use planning are to ensure orderly growth and compatible uses among adjacent property parcels or areas. However, there is no nationally recognized convention or uniform terminology for describing land use categories. As a result, the meanings of various land use descriptions, labels, and definitions vary among jurisdictions. Natural conditions of property can be described or categorized as unimproved, undeveloped, conservation or preservation area, and natural or scenic area. There is a wide variety of land use categories resulting from human activity. Descriptive terms often used include residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, institutional, and recreational.

3.2.1 Regulatory Setting

In many cases, land use descriptions are codified in installation master planning and local zoning laws. OPNAVINST 11010.40A (*Encroachment Management Program*) establishes an encroachment management program to ensure operational sustainment that has direct bearing on land use planning on installations.

The Hawaii State Planning Act was established to provide for wise use of Hawaii's resources and to guide development of the state. This act establishes the Hawaii State Plan, which identifies goals, objectives, and policies for the state. The State Plan is implemented through the development of county and functional plans. Functional plans establish policies and guidelines within a specific field of activity that is funded by any agency of the state. County plans are comprehensive long-range plans that address the unique problems and needs for each county or regions within the county. In addition to county plans, community plans are developed following the approval of the countywide plans, and establish goals, objectives, and policies for individual communities (Hawaii Office of Planning, 2019).

The Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan developed by the Hawaii DLNR outlines a strategic plan with goals and objectives for recreation in Hawaii. Relevant goals include providing a world-class outdoor recreational experience and expanding opportunities for outdoor recreation.

Through the CZMA, Congress established national policy to preserve, protect, develop, restore, or enhance resources in the coastal zone. This Act encourages coastal states to properly manage use of their coasts and coastal resources, prepare and implement coastal management programs, and provide for public and governmental participation in decisions affecting the coastal zone. To this end, CZMA imparts an obligation upon federal agencies whose actions or activities affect any land or water use or natural resource of the coastal zone to be carried out in a manner consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of federally approved state coastal management programs. However, federal lands are statutorily excluded from the State's coastal uses or resources. If, however, the proposed federal activity affects coastal uses or resources beyond the boundaries of the federal property (i.e., has spillover effects), CZMA Section 307 federal consistency requirement applies. As a federal agency, the Navy is required to determine whether the proposed NSO activities would affect the coastal zone. This takes the form of a CCD, a negative determination, or a determination that no further action is necessary.

3.2.2 Affected Environment

The training study area and contiguous nearshore waters encompass a broad spectrum of land use and landownership types, including private lands, public parks, harbors, golf courses, and recreation areas. Commercial, institutional, recreational, and military activities take place simultaneously within these areas.

Federally owned lands within the state of Hawaii include lands managed by the USFWS, National Park Service (NPS), and DoD (U.S. Geological Survey, 2003). Recreational opportunities across DoD and non-DoD lands include hunting, hiking, wildlife viewing, camping, fishing, beach combing, swimming, surfing, snorkeling, sailing, watercraft rentals, sunbathing, and picnicking. Generally, access to military installation recreational areas is restricted to military personnel and their families and is not open to the general public.

Hawaii's unique environment and mild climate provide an ideal backdrop for a myriad of year-round mountain and coastal outdoor recreation activities. Mountain-based recreation is often in a forest setting and tends to include activities such as hiking, wilderness camping, picnicking, and hunting. The Division of State Parks and Division of Forestry and Wildlife of the Hawaii DLNR are most directly connected with mountain-based recreation. Coastal recreation along the shoreline and in the ocean includes surfing, swimming, snorkeling, diving, fishing, boating, beach activities, camping, and picnicking. State recreation agencies most directly connected with coastal recreation include the Division of State Parks, Division of Aquatic Resources, and the Division of Boating and Ocean Recreation (Hawaii Division of State Parks, 2015).

The 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation found that in 2011, 465,000 Hawaii residents and non-residents participated in outdoor recreational activities (U.S. Department of the Interior et al., 2011). In the public survey conducted for the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, residents of Hawaii identified visiting the beach, swimming in the ocean, and snorkeling as the top three water-based activities. Hawaii residents also identified hiking, picnicking/BBQ, and wildlife watching as the top three land-based activities (Hawaii Division of State Parks, 2015).

3.2.2.1 NPS Properties and State and County Parks

NPS Properties

Nine NPS properties are found in the Main Hawaiian Islands: one National Historic Trail (Island of Hawaii); two National Historic Sites (Island of Hawaii and Oahu); three National Historic Parks (two on the Island of Hawaii and one on Molokai); one National Memorial (Oahu); and two National Parks (Island of Hawaii and Maui). Proposed training activities would not occur on any NPS property. The NSWC coordinated with the NPS on the Island of Hawaii regarding the proposed action and the exclusion of the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historic Park from proposed training activities (see Appendix A, Section A.5).

Hawaii State Parks

Hawaii's State Park System is composed of 50 state parks encompassing approximately 30,000 acres on five major islands. State parks offer varied ocean and land-based outdoor recreation and heritage opportunities (HAR Section 13-256-16). A right-of-entry permit is required for any activity other than camping, lodging, and activities compatible with the functions and purposes of each individual area,

facility, or unit of the premises (HAR Section 13-256-16). Several state parks are located within the training study area.

County Parks and Recreation Areas

In addition to state parks, Hawaii has a number of county parks and recreational areas. The City and County of Honolulu's Department of Parks and Recreation is responsible for city parks on Oahu. The County of Maui's Department of Parks and Recreation manages county parks and recreational facilities throughout the Islands of Maui, Molokai, and Lanai. The County of Kauai's Department of Parks and Recreation manages parks throughout Kauai and the County of Hawaii's Department of Parks and Recreation manages county parks throughout the Island of Hawaii. These county parks include campgrounds, beach parks, botanical gardens, and recreation facilities such as playgrounds, pools, boat ramps and courts for basketball or tennis. County parks are located within the training study areas.

3.2.2.2 Hiking Trails

Numerous hiking trails throughout the state of Hawaii are managed and maintained by the State of Hawaii and the Division of Forestry and Wildlife's Na Ala Hele Trail and Access Program. However, there are unsanctioned trails in the state of Hawaii. These hiking trails are not maintained by a program or agency. Several sanctioned and unsanctioned hiking trails are within the training study areas along the coastlines of Oahu and the Island of Hawaii.

3.2.2.3 Hunting

Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai, Lanai, and the Island of Hawaii all have one or more state-designated public hunting areas called hunting units, which typically overlap with other recreational areas and are open for hunting at certain times of the year (Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife, 2017a). In some areas, access across military lands is permitted for hunting activities with permission and in coordination with other ongoing military activities. Hunting for large or small game in Hawaii requires a license. Hunted game bird species include quail, dove, turkey, and pheasant (Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife, 2017b). In addition to hunting game birds, hunted game mammal include pig, sheep, deer, and goat. Protected game mammals, which include the Brush-tailed wallabies and wild cattle, may not be hunted unless authorized by the Division of Forestry and Wildlife (Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife, 2017c). In addition, the Division of Forestry and Wildlife sets hunting seasons and hours, determines authorized weapons, and may modify or cancel a hunting season depending on weather conditions or size of animal populations (Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife, 2017a).

3.2.2.4 Fishing

DLNR's Division of Aquatic Resources is the lead state agency for monitoring recreational fishing within the state of Hawaii. Recreational fishing in Hawaii does not require a fishing license, and shoreline areas are open for fishing unless otherwise posted. Fishing may be restricted in areas such as military bases, National Wildlife Refuges, natural area reserves, harbors, or private properties. Recreational fishing regulations depend on the species of fish. Size limits, bag limits, and seasonal restrictions are enforced for certain fish species. There are also restrictions specific to location, referred to as a regulated fishing area (Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources, 2016). Recreational fishing occurs within the public areas of the training study areas.

In addition to recreational fishing, residents of Hawaii participate in traditional fishing practices to uphold cultural values (Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources, 2019a). The DLNR has the authority to create Community-Based Subsistence Fishing Areas (CBSFAs) to recognize and protect customary and

traditional fishing practices in Hawaii (Zanre, 2014). The Haena, Kauai CBSFA is the first CBSFA in the state of Hawaii and includes the waters and submerged lands from the shoreline to a distance of 1 mile off the northwestern coast of Kauai (Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources, 2019). Although there are no officially designated CBSFA within the training study area, subsistence fishing and traditional fishing practices are activities that occur throughout the waters of the state of Hawaii, including areas within the training study area.

The Hawaii DLNR's Division of Aquatic Resources is also the lead state agency for monitoring commercial fishing within the state of Hawaii. Individuals or vessels engaged in taking, selling, or offering for sale any marine life for commercial purposes (including charter fishing services) must obtain a Commercial Marine License from the Division of Aquatic Resources. The Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources defines "commercial purpose" as the taking of marine life for profit or gain; or as a means of livelihood, when the marine life is taken in or outside of the state, and when the marine life is sold, offered for sale, landed, or transported for sale anywhere in the state (Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources, 2017). The Division of Aquatic Resources collects various data in the form of fishing reports from fishermen, marine life and habitat surveys (e.g., fish counts/transects), creel surveys, port surveys, fish market sampling, and other scientific surveys for use in monitoring and assessing the aquatic resources of the State.

3.2.2.5 Beach and Ocean Recreation

The state of Hawaii offers a wide variety of beaches for recreation. Typical beach and water-based activities include swimming, snorkeling, surfing, paddling, boating, fishing, beach combing, and picnicking.

The Division of Boating and Ocean Recreation manages boating and ocean recreation facilities on the Island of Hawaii, Lanai, Maui, Kauai, Molokai and Oahu. These facilities include small boat harbors, launch ramps, and anchorage points. The State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Harbors Division maintains jurisdiction over 10 harbors throughout the State. In addition to boating, personal watercraft recreation (e.g., jet skiing) is extremely popular in Hawaii. The increasing number of watercraft operating in designated riding areas prompted the DLNR to implement a 2005 rule (HAR Section 13-256-16) requiring all personal watercraft operators to be certified in the safe use of their watercraft (Hawaii Division of Boating and Ocean Recreation, 2015).

3.2.2.6 Land Use Compatibility

The training study area is located within counties and regions under the guidance of the Hawaii State Plan and supporting community plans; however, the proposed action will not interfere with implementation of the goals, objectives, and policies outlined in the Hawaii State Plan or county plans.

The training study area is located within the coastal zone of the state of Hawaii. The State of Hawaii Office of Planning is the lead agency for coastal management and is responsible for enforcing the State's federally approved CZM program (State of Hawaii, 2017). The proposed action is expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects. Activities on most federal properties should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program per the *Navy/Marine Corps De Minimis Activities under the CZMA* List (State of Hawaii, 2017). The Navy will comply with project mitigation and general conditions in accordance with General Condition 12 (Military Training and Testing) of the *Navy/Marine Corps De Minimis Activities* List. The Navy evaluated DoD (including USCG) project areas that are not covered by the *Navy/Marine Corps De Minimis* List under the Hawaii CZM Program via a Negative Determination.

3.2.3 Environmental Consequences

The location and extent of a proposed action needs to be evaluated for its potential effects on a project site and adjacent land uses. Factors affecting a proposed action in terms of land use include its compatibility with on-site and adjacent land uses, restrictions on public access to land, or change in an existing land use that is valued by the community. Other considerations are given to proximity to a proposed action, the duration of a proposed activity, and its permanence.

3.2.3.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX for DoD and non-DoD land and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. NSWC activities that occurred in the Hawaii region under the Records of CATEX and HSTT/OEIS would not change land use, recreational activities, or recreational facilities. Therefore, no significant impact on existing land use or recreation would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.

3.2.3.2 Alternative 1

With implementation of Alternative 1, individuals would be allowed continued use of recreational areas on non-DoD and DoD lands consistent with existing access. Training would be localized, infrequent, brief in duration and consistent with the existing land use. Trainees swimming in the water, moving across the beach, and walking on or off trails would be consistent with the manner in which the public conducts these same activities.

Under Alternative 1, the state of Hawaii recreational goals of ensuring quality recreational facilities and expanding recreation facilities throughout the state of Hawaii would be maintained. The goals and objectives of the Hawaii State Plan and supporting community plans would also be maintained. The proposed action does not include changing access to or use of land owned or managed by the State of Hawaii or any of the associated counties. Training activities would be temporary and would not interfere with public use of water areas for traditional fishing practices for recreation or food. Individuals would be allowed continued use of marine areas on non-DoD and DoD lands consistent with existing access. Training would not restrict recreational activities or fishing access and activities within the training study area. Minimization measures employed during training activities would limit encounters with the public during training events. For example, if the public enters the training area, the safety support personnel assess the situation and, based upon safety considerations, will either continue the training, temporarily suspend the training, completely stop the training, or relocate the training to another approved training site. The Navy, on behalf of NSWC, would obtain a right-of-entry permit prior to conducting any training activity where consent is needed from owners of non-DoD properties. Training would only occur on non-DoD property if proper consent was obtained. Within the training study area, an individual non-DoD site would be used for no more than six events a year.

The airborne noise produced from surface vessels supporting training activities would be consistent with noise from non-Navy vessels (such as recreational fishing boats) common in the area and would not disrupt other recreational activities in the training study area. Due to their battery-operated propulsion system; the short duration of the flights; and their use only over DoD and USCG property or within authorized airspace (restricted airspace and warning areas), typically away from the general public, proposed sUAS training activities would not disrupt or interfere with other recreational activities. Airborne noise from training activities involving air-based training activities utilizing aircraft would have

no effect on recreational activities as they are proposed to be conducted in designated areas consistent with other military activities and where public access is already restricted or limited. Drop zone and landing zone areas are not co-located with public recreational activities.

NSO personnel would utilize existing and new land- and water-based drop zones within JBPHH and adjacent to MCBH property to conduct air-based training activities. Helicopter landing zones would consist of dedicated helicopter landing pads within JBPHH property. Land proposed for landing and drop zones would not require site construction or land modifications with the exception of one proposed drop zone location at Waipio Peninsula (JBPHH Region) where minor vegetation removal is required (e.g., selective cutting of larger brush and trees). A drop zone survey is required for airborne operations. Completing the drop zone survey process involves both physically inspecting the drop zone and documenting the information on Air Force Form 3823, *Drop Zone Survey*. In addition, the user must conduct a physical inspection of the drop zone prior to use to identify and evaluate potential hazards to airdropped personnel/equipment, man-made or natural structures, and ground personnel.

For all open water training events involving broadcast navigational hazards (including water-based drop zones and parachute drops, cast and recovery, or operating and maneuvering small personal watercraft), NSO support personnel would be present to ensure that training areas are clear and safe to conduct water-based training activities separate from the public. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

In accordance with the CZMA, the Navy completed the Federal CCD process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020 and February 17, 2021, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning concurred with the Navy's determinations that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program based on the following conditions that the Navy will implement:

1. The proposed activity shall be carried out as represented in the CZM federal consistency determination and all supporting materials and information provided to the Hawaii CZM Program. Any changes to the proposed activity shall be submitted to the Hawaii CZM Program for review and approval. Changes to the proposed activity may require a full CZM federal consistency review, including publication of a public notice and provision for public review and comment. This condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed activity is implemented as reviewed for consistency with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program. HRS Chapter 205A (*Coastal Zone Management*), is the federally approved enforceable policy of the Hawaii CZM Program that applies to this condition.
2. The proposed activity shall be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the SHPO concurrence of "no adverse effect to historic properties," issued May 29, 2020, for the NHPA Section 106 consultation. In addition, SHPO requirements resulting from the HRS Chapter 6E Historic Preservation review under the state HEPA process shall be complied with. HRS Chapter 6E is the federally approved enforceable policy of the Hawaii CZM Program that applies to this condition.
3. The proposed activity shall not obstruct or preclude public engagement in or access to ocean recreation in/on non-DoD areas. This condition is necessary to ensure consistency with the recreational resource policies contained in HRS Chapter 205A (*Coastal Zone Management*), which is the federally approved enforceable policy that applies to this condition.
4. The proposed activity shall be conducted in compliance with the Hawaii DLNR, Division of Aquatic Resources recommendations of October 11, 2020, that were agreed to by the Navy as

transmitted and indicated in the June 18, 2020 letter and October 19, 2020 email to the Office of Planning.

Refer to Appendix A (*Agency Correspondence*) for further details and a table that lists the CZM conditions and applicable enforceable policies by site/location.

The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a *de minimis* usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 *Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA*. Pursuant to the 2009 *de minimis* activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed *de minimis* activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions (refer to Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

On January 23, 2019, the Navy submitted a Negative Determination for proposed training activities on Oahu at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area. After an assessment was conducted, the Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. The Navy has determined that the implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii (refer to Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

In addition, on March 25, 2021, the Navy submitted an addendum to the January 23, 2019 Negative Determination to address U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS on Oahu. After an assessment was conducted, the Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. The Navy has determined that the implementation of the proposed NSO training on U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii (refer to Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

3.2.3.3 Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, air-based training events would be conducted within or above DoD and USCG property or within designated airspace (restricted airspace or warning areas) (Section 2.2, Training Sites). Land proposed for landing and drop zones would not require site construction or land modifications with the exception of one proposed drop zone at Waipio Peninsula (JBPHH Region) where minor vegetation removal is required (e.g., selective cutting of larger brush and trees). A drop zone survey is required for airborne operations. Completing the drop zone survey process involves both physically inspecting the drop zone and documenting the information on Air Force Form 3823, *Drop Zone Survey*. In addition, the user must conduct a physical inspection of the drop zone prior to use to identify and evaluate potential hazards to airdropped personnel/equipment, man-made or natural structures, and ground personnel.

With implementation of Alternative 2, individuals would be allowed continued use of recreational areas on non-DoD and DoD lands consistent with existing access. The increase in training tempo associated with Alternative 2 would not impact land use or recreational activities due to the nature of the training activities being localized, infrequent, brief in duration, and consistent with the existing land use. Trainees swimming in the water, moving across the beach, and walking on or off trails would be consistent with the manner in which the public conducts these same activities. Training activities would not interfere with public use of water areas for traditional fishing practices for recreation or food.

Individuals would be allowed continued use of marine areas on non-DoD and DoD lands consistent with existing access. Training would not restrict recreational activities or fishing access and activities within the training study area.

Under Alternative 2, the state of Hawaii goals of ensuring quality recreational facilities and expanding recreation facilities throughout the state of Hawaii would be maintained. The goals and objectives of the Hawaii State Plan and supporting community plans would also be maintained. The proposed action does not include changing access to or use of land owned or managed by the State of Hawaii or any of the associated counties. Under Alternative 2, minimization measures employed during training activities limit encounters with the public during training events. For example, if the public enters the training area, the safety support personnel assess the situation and, based upon safety considerations, will either continue the training, temporarily suspend the training, completely stop the training, or relocate the training to another approved training site. The Navy, on behalf of NSWC, would obtain a right-of-entry permit prior to conducting any training activity. Training would only occur on non-DoD property if proper consent was obtained. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of Alternative 2.

In accordance with the CZMA, the Navy completed the Federal CCD process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020 and February 17, 2021, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning concurred with the Navy's determinations that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program (refer to Section 3.2.3.2, Alternative 1 and Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a *de minimis* usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 *Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA*. Pursuant to the 2009 *de minimis* activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed *de minimis* activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions.

In addition, the Navy submitted Negative Determinations for proposed training activities at USCG Station Barbers Point, the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area, and U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS. The Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point, the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area, and U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii (refer to Section 3.2.3.2, Alternative 1 and Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

3.3 Biological Resources

Biological resources include living, native, or naturalized plant and animal species and the habitats within which they occur. Plant associations are referred to generally as vegetation, and animal species are referred to generally as wildlife. Habitat can be defined as the resources and conditions present in an area that support a plant or animal. Within this EA, biological resources are divided into three major categories:

- *Terrestrial biological resources* (Section 3.3.2.1): terrestrial vegetation and terrestrial wildlife, including.
- *Marine biological resources* (Section 3.3.2.2): marine vegetation and marine wildlife, including marine invertebrates and fish.
- *Special-status species* (Section 3.3.2.3): those terrestrial and marine species listed under the ESA or by the State of Hawaii (HAR 13-124, Exhibit 2 and HRS, Section 195D) as threatened or endangered, birds listed under the MBTA, and marine mammals listed under the MMPA.

3.3.1 Regulatory Setting

Special-status species, which, for purposes of this EA, are those species listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA, and species afforded federal protection under the MMPA or the MBTA. Special-status species also include those species addressed by State of Hawaii rules protecting threatened and endangered species (Section 1.6, Relevant Laws and Regulations). The federal regulatory frameworks relevant to biological resources analyzed in this EA are summarized below.

3.3.1.1 Endangered Species Act (ESA)

The purpose of the ESA is to conserve the ecosystems upon which threatened and endangered species depend and to conserve and recover listed species. Section 7 of the ESA requires action proponents to consult with the USFWS or NMFS to ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of ESA-listed threatened and endangered species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. Critical habitat cannot be designated on any areas owned, controlled, or designated for use by the DoD where an INRMP has been developed that, as determined by the Secretaries of the Interior or Commerce, provides a benefit to the species subject to critical habitat designation.

3.3.1.2 Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA)

All marine mammals are protected under the provisions of the MMPA. The MMPA prohibits any person or vessel from “taking” marine mammals in the U.S. or the high seas without authorization. The MMPA defines “take” to mean “to harass, hunt, capture, or kill or attempt to harass, hunt, capture, or kill any marine mammal.” In the case of military readiness activities, the MMPA defines “harassment” as any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which (i) has the significant potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild (Level A Harassment); or (ii) has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering to a point where such behavioral patterns are abandoned or significantly altered (Level B Harassment).

3.3.1.3 Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)

Migratory and most native-resident bird species are protected under the MBTA, and their conservation by federal agencies is mandated by EO 13186 (*Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory*

Birds). Under the MBTA it is illegal for anyone by any means or in any manner, to take, possess, import, export, transport, sell, purchase, barter, or offer for sale, purchase, or barter, any migratory bird, or the parts, nests or eggs of such a bird at any time, except under the terms of a valid permit issued pursuant to federal regulations.

The 2003 National Defense Authorization Act gave the Secretary of the Interior authority to prescribe regulations to exempt the Armed Forces from the incidental taking of migratory birds during authorized military readiness activities. Congress defined military readiness activities as all training and operations of the armed forces that relate to combat and the adequate and realistic testing of military equipment, vehicles, weapons, and sensors for proper operation and suitability for combat use. Military readiness activities do not include: (A) routine operation of installation support functions such as administrative offices, military exchanges, water treatment facilities, schools, housing, storage facilities, and morale, welfare, and recreation activities; (B) the operation of industrial activities; or (C) the construction or demolition of facilities listed in A or B (50 CFR part 21.3). For purposes of this EA, the proposed training operations are considered military readiness activities. In 2007, the final rule, known as the DoD Migratory Bird Rule (50 CFR part 21), authorized the DoD to take migratory birds in such cases and includes a requirement that if the DoD determines that a proposed or an ongoing military readiness activity might result in a significant adverse effect on a population of a migratory bird species, they must confer and cooperate with the USFWS to develop appropriate and reasonable conservation measures to minimize or mitigate identified significant adverse effects. This is done in accordance with, and through, the NEPA process (this EA).

3.3.1.4 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA)

The MSA provides for the conservation and management of the fisheries resources of the U.S. Under the Act, EFH consists of the waters and substrate needed for federally managed fisheries species to spawn, breed, feed, or grow to maturity. For Hawaii, EFH is established by the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council (WPRFMC). EFH has been established for five management units in the Main Hawaiian Islands: bottomfish and seamount groundfish, pelagics, crustaceans, precious corals, and coral reef ecosystem. Information on EFH for the management units is presented in the Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) for the Pacific Pelagic Fisheries of the Western Pacific Region (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2009) and the Draft FEP for the Hawaii Archipelago (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2016a).

3.3.1.5 Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act

Under the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (16 USC section 1431 et seq.) (also known as the National Marine Sanctuaries Act), the Secretary of Commerce may establish a national marine sanctuary for marine areas with special conservation, recreational, ecological, historical, cultural, archaeological, scientific, educational, or aesthetic qualities. Day-to-day management of national marine sanctuaries has been delegated by the Secretary of Commerce to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. Once a sanctuary is designated, the Secretary of Commerce may authorize activities in the sanctuary only if they can be certified to be consistent with the National Marine Sanctuaries Act and can be carried out within the regulations for the sanctuary. Regulations exist for each sanctuary, and military activities may be authorized within those regulations.

Section 304(d) of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act requires federal agencies to consult with the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries whenever their proposed actions are likely to destroy, cause the

loss of, or injure a sanctuary resource. The Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary is a single-species managed sanctuary, composed of waters around Maui, Lanai, and Molokai; and smaller areas off the north shore of Kauai, off the Island of Hawaii's west coast, and off the north and southeast coasts of Oahu. All of the proposed NSO training activities that would occur within the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary fall into classes of activities covered in the 1997 Final EIS/Management Plan for the Sanctuary, which under the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary regulations do not require permits or further consultation under section 304(d) unless the military activity is modified in a manner significantly greater than was considered in a previous consultation. These military activities are also the same classes of activities previously analyzed in the Navy's 2013 and 2018 Final HSTT EISs/OEISs and for which the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries found no consultation was required (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013, 2018). The activities proposed in this EA have not been modified in a manner significantly greater than those considered in the 2013 and 2018 Final HSTT EISs/OEISs and, therefore, consultation is not required.

3.3.1.6 Marine Managed Areas – Marine Life Conservation Districts (MLCDs)

MLCDs are established by the Hawaii DLNR, as authorized by HRS Chapter 190. MLCDs are designed to conserve and replenish marine resources. They provide fish and other aquatic life with a protected area in which to grow and reproduce. MLCDs allow only limited fishing and other consumptive uses or prohibit such uses entirely. Signs located at each MLCD indicate the District's boundaries and describe regulations for the area. MLCDs are most popular as sites for snorkeling, diving, and underwater photography (Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources, 2019b).

There are two MLCDs that are within proposed Training Study Areas on Oahu and Lanai: Pupukea and Hulopo'e Bay, respectively.

- Pupukea MLCD, Oahu - The MLCD is located offshore of Pupukea and Waimea Bay beach parks, from the highwater mark seaward 100 yards along a line extending due west of Kulalua Point at the northern end of Pūpūkea Beach Park, then southerly to the most seaward exposed rock of the Wananapaoa Islets on the south side of Waimea Bay (including the islets), then due southeast to shore (Figure 3-1). The district includes two major swimming areas, Shark's Cove and Three Tables, and the offshore waters. Prohibited activities within the Pupukea MLCD include:
 - Taking or altering any sand, coral or other geological feature or specimen, or possessing in the water any device that may be used for the taking or altering of a geological feature or specimen (Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources, 2019b).
- Hulopo'e Bay MLCD, Lanai - The MLCD extends from the highwater mark seaward to a line from Kaluako'i Point to Flat Rock (Figure 3-2). Hulopo'e Bay has large tidepools at its left point. A shallow reef is just offshore, providing excellent snorkeling opportunities. Prohibited activities within the Hulopo'e Bay MLCD include:
 - Taking or altering any sand, coral, or other geological feature or specimen.
 - Operating, anchoring, or mooring any vessel within the MLCD.
 - Operating, anchoring, or mooring a vessel in such a way as to damage marine life or geological features anywhere in the MLCD (Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources, 2019b).




Figure 3-1: Pupukea MLCD, Oahu




Figure 3-2: Hulo'opo'e Bay MLCD, Lanai

3.3.2 Affected Environment

The following discussions provide a description of existing conditions for each of the categories under biological resources within potential training locations identified in Section 2.2 (Training Sites). Because of the disparate conditions at different land-based and in-water training locations within the training study area, terrestrial and marine species and habitats are analyzed by island. Special-status species managed under the regulatory frameworks summarized in Section 3.3.1 (Regulatory Setting), including plants, terrestrial mammals, birds, invertebrates, marine fishes, sea turtles, and marine mammals, are described in Section 3.3.2.3 (Special-Status Species).

3.3.2.1 Terrestrial Biological Resources

This section describes the terrestrial plant communities, constituent plant species, and terrestrial wildlife resources within land-based training locations identified in Section 2.2 (Training Sites). Land-based training would only occur on Kauai, Oahu, and the Island of Hawaii; therefore, only the training study areas on these islands are addressed.

3.3.2.1.1 Terrestrial Vegetation

Plants along the coasts of the Hawaiian Islands are adapted to salt-spray and wave wash and are typically found growing in low mats. Behind the immediate coastal area is a zone of vegetation that is quite varied in composition and structure, but somewhat less specialized in life form. Coastal plant communities in Hawaii are distributed across a very wide range of conditions and are not homogeneous. The primary factors that influence their composition and structure include moisture, substrate, and exposure to wind and salt water. Examples of native plants that comprise this coastal community include naupaka (*Scaevola taccada*), naio (*Myoporum sandwicense*), and mao (*Gossypium tomentosum*). Native plant species within the strand community represent one of the best surviving groups of the known Hawaiian flora (Warshauer et al., 2009).

Examples of non-native invasive plants within the strand community include large trees and shrubs such as ironwood (*Casuarina equisetifolia*) and kiawe (*Prosopis pallida*), and various herbaceous plants (New Zealand spinach [*Tetragonia tetragonioides*], Indian fleabane [*Pluchea indica*], and silky jackbean [*Canavalia sericea*]). In protected waters, such as bays and estuaries within the training study area, examples of non-native invasive plants include two species of mangroves (*Rhizophora mangle* and *Bruguiera sexangula*), pickleweed (*Batis maritima*), and water hyacinth (*Eichornia crassipes*) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a, 2012; Warshauer et al., 2009).

Inland, the plant communities vary in both composition and structure, and individual plants are adapted to more diverse conditions (e.g., soil types, canopy cover, wind exposure, elevation, precipitation) (Warshauer et al., 2009). Representative native or indigenous trees include coconut, ohia, koa, and hala. Some representative invasive plants that may occur within the inland portions of the training study area include cape ivy (*Delairea odorata*), fountain grass (*Pennisetum setaceum*), devil weed (*Chromolaena odorata*), fireweed (*Senecio madagascariensis*), cane tubouchina (*Tibouchina herbacea*), glory bush (*Tibouchina urvilleana*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), lantana (*Lantana camara*), two species of pampas grass (*Cortaderia jubata* and *Cortaderia selloana*), and miconia (*Miconia calvescens*) (Big Island Invasive Species Committee, 2018; Kauai Invasive Species Committee, 2018; Oahu Invasive Species Committee, 2018). Each island within the training study area has unique vegetation communities, summarized below.

Kauai

As shown in Figure 1-9, the Kauai training study area is limited to the western coastline, primarily on the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) and Polihale State Park. The Kauai region of the training study area is located on Kauai's Mana Plain, historically associated with an extensive wetland separated from the coastal beach by high sand dunes. PMRF abuts a 7,000-acre agricultural zone to the east of the facility, supporting coastal wetland habitats with hydrolytic vegetation. In addition, some of the last remaining dryland coastal habitats occur along this area of coastal Kauai, including the aalii nama scrub and Nohili dune habitats, which contain several rare plant species, including *Nama sandwicensis* and *Chamaesyce celastroides*. Two ESA-listed plant species potentially occur at PMRF and are discussed below in Section 3.3.2.3.1 (Special-Status Plants).

Oahu

Warshauer et al. (2009) noted that there are several sections of Oahu's coastline that are relatively undisturbed, and the strand communities in these areas support moderately diverse assemblages of dry region flora. The training study area within the JBPHH Region, including Pearl City Peninsula, Ford Island and Waipio Peninsula (Figure 1-3) includes maintained vegetation areas such as mowed grass, developed areas with concrete or asphalt or non-native scrub vegetation (e.g., haole koa [*Leucaena leucocephala*] and kiawe). Wetland areas within Pearl Harbor include mudflats, shallow ponds, small streams, pickleweed beds, cattails beds, and watercress beds. The non-developed portion of this shoreline supports estuaries with emergent vegetation and is targeted by both Navy and State of Hawaii natural resource staff for restoration activities (e.g., removal of invasive mangrove forests).

Much of the lowland vegetation (consisting of native, invasive, and planted species) within the training study area has been previously disturbed by human activities and includes areas frequented by the public, such as beach parks. Certain coastline and dune areas are less disturbed and provide habitat for largely native communities of strand vegetation.

Inland portions of the training study area within the Kahuku Training Area is mostly devoid of vegetation surrounded by grassy fields and characterized by steep basalt cliffs. The proposed Oahu North training study area east of Kaena Point and west of Dillingham is primarily a mixture of lowland wet and wet cliff ecosystems that receive greater than 75 inches annual precipitation. The lowland wet ecosystem is generally found below 3,300 ft elevation and includes a variety of wet grasslands, shrublands, and forests. The wet cliff ecosystem is generally composed of shrublands on near-vertical slopes in areas, or in otherwise wet substrate conditions (77 Federal Register 57648). The training study area in the Lualualei Annex consists primarily of mowed areas of the non-native introduced buffel grass (*Cenchrus ciliaris*), with smaller areas of kiawe-buffel grass in the northwest and southern corners. The eastern portion is dominated by haole koa /kiawe scrub (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a).

Island of Hawaii

The training study area for the Island of Hawaii includes two stretches of coast along the western coast of the island. These locations along the Kona and Kohala coasts are usually lava flow flats, bluffs, or cliff faces, with primarily basaltic sediments. There are few beaches along this stretch of coast and many of these have been altered for resort and residential development, with severe losses of native plant species attributed to invasive plant invasions and ungulate pressure (Warshauer et al., 2009).

3.3.2.1.2 Terrestrial Wildlife

The Hawaiian Islands lie within the West Pacific Flyway, where the shoreline, estuarine, and open ocean environments support a variety of seabird species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2005). Recent research estimates that 15 million seabirds inhabit the Hawaiian Archipelago; 22 species of seabirds regularly nest in the Hawaiian Islands, and many more pass through during migration to and from their breeding grounds elsewhere in the Pacific (Newton, 2010; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015d). Because of the long isolation of the Hawaiian Islands before human contact, Hawaiian land birds exhibited a wide range of diverse species, numbering over 100 native land bird species. Subsequent to introductions of non-native birds and other animals, along with introduced pathogens, 64 native land bird species are now extinct (Flaspohler et al., 2010; Sax et al., 2002). Introduced diseases, ungulates, and predators, along with habitat loss are factors primarily responsible for the decline of avian and other wildlife diversity (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2005). The following subsections summarize the wildlife resources within different regions of the training study area where land-based training activities would occur.

Kauai

The Kauai training study area includes PMRF. Introduced bird species are the most abundant bird species at PMRF. This is typical of lowlands in the Hawaiian Islands, where most of the natural habitats have been altered by development and agriculture. Non-native birds commonly observed throughout PMRF include spotted dove (*Streptopelia chinensis*), zebra dove (*Geopelia striata*), northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), northern cardinal (*Cardinalis cardinalis*), red-crested cardinal (*Paroaria coronata*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), and Japanese white-eye (*Zosterops japonicus*).

A total of 14 MBTA-listed waterbirds, seabirds, shorebirds, and waterfowl have been recorded at PMRF, including northern shoveler (*Anas clypeata*), green-winged teal (*Anas crecca*), Pacific golden plover (*Pluvialis fulva*), black-bellied plover (*Pluvialis squatarola*), ruddy turnstone (*Arenaria interpres*), sanderling (*Calidris alba*), wandering tattler (*Tringa incana*), brown booby (*Sula leucogaster*), and black-footed albatross (*Phoebastria nigripes*). Western cattle egret (*Bubulcus ibis*), an introduced invasive species, are also residents. The drainage ditches at PMRF provide foraging and loafing habitat for native waterbird species, including the black-crowned night heron (*Nycticorax nycticorax*) and four endangered waterbirds (see Section 3.3.2.3.3, Special-Status Birds). In addition, Laysan albatross (*Phoebastria immutabilis*) and wedge-tailed shearwater (*Puffinus pacificus*) are known to nest at PMRF (Figure 3-3) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010a).

Common non-native mammal species at PMRF are feral cats (*Felis catus*), rats (*Rattus* spp.) and the common house mouse (*Mus muscalus*). Amphibian and reptile species at PMRF include the following non-native introduced species: marine toad (*Rhinella marina*), house gecko (*Hemidactylus frenatus*), mourning gecko (*Lepidodactylus lugubrus*), and snake-eyed skink (*Cryptoblepharus poecilopleurus*) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010a).




Figure 3-3: Occurrence of Waterbird Habitat, Wedge-tailed Shearwater Nesting, and Laysan Albatross Areas at the Pacific Missile Range Facility and the Training Study Area, Kauai

Oahu

The South Oahu Region of the training study area on Oahu extends on either side of Pearl Harbor on the southern coastline, from Barbers Point to east of Sand Island, as well as Koolina Harbor, and has developed coastlines (Figure 1-4). Within the JBPHH Region of the training study area, wildlife habitats are varied and support a relatively wider diversity of bird species relative to other locations within the training study area. Some of the most valuable waterbird habitat can be found at the Waiawa Unit of Pearl Harbor National Wildlife Refuge. A total of 26 resident and migrant bird species are known to occur within Pearl Harbor, including four ESA-listed endangered endemic waterbirds (see Section 3.3.2.3.3, Special-Status Birds). In addition, Pearl Harbor supports a diverse number of migrant species, such as the Pacific golden-plover, ruddy turnstone, wandering tattler, sanderling, northern shoveler, mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), lesser scaup (*Aythya affinis*), northern pintail (*Anas acuta*), green-winged teal, and American wigeon (*Anas americana*). The introduced western cattle egret is also a year-round resident within Pearl Harbor. The majority of the birds recorded during surveys within Pearl Harbor were introduced species, including spotted dove, gray francolin (*Francolinus pondicerianus*), and zebra dove (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a).

The West Oahu Region of the training study area on Oahu includes most of the coastline from the Ko Olina area north to the end of Highway 93. The West Oahu Region also includes the Lualualei Annex, which is discussed in detail under Special-status Species. The Windward Oahu Region of the training study area on Oahu includes Kahana Bay, a stretch of coast running north from He'eia Pier in Kaneohe Bay, the coastline along MCBH Kaneohe Bay, the coastline along Kailua Bay, and the coastline along Waimanalo Bay from Bellows Air Force Station to Makapuu Point (see Figure 1-5). Native waterbirds and seabirds along Oahu coastlines include great frigatebird (*Fregata minor*), wandering tattler, sanderling, ruddy turnstone, Pacific golden plover, black-crowned night heron, brown noddy (*Anous stolidus*), black noddy (*Anous minutus*), sooty tern (*Onychoprion fuscatus*), brown booby, masked booby (*Sula dactylatra*), Bulwer's petrel (*Bulweria bulwerii*), Laysan albatross, grey-backed tern (*Onychoprion lunatus*), and red-tailed tropicbird (*Phaethon rubricauda*) (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b).

MCBH, Kaneohe Bay supports a large colony of wedge-tailed shearwaters (*Puffinus pacificus chlororhynchus*) along the Fort Hase shoreline of Kailua Bay and east of the Nuupia Ponds Wildlife Management Area (WMA) as well as a large red-footed booby (*Sula sula*) colony at Ulupau Crater in the Ulupau WMA (Figure 3-4). The red-footed booby colony is one of only two colonies in the Main Hawaiian Islands. Both species are known to move between colonies on MCBH, Kaneohe Bay and the Moku Manu State Wildlife Sanctuary, a 17-acre islet approximately 0.5 mile northeast of Ulupau Head/MCBH, Kaneohe Bay (Figure 3-4). This State Wildlife Sanctuary supports nesting wedge-tailed shearwater, black noddy, brown noddy, Bulwer's petrel, red-tailed tropicbird, sooty tern, great frigatebird, Christmas shearwater, grey-backed tern, masked booby, brown booby, and red-footed booby (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b; U.S. Marine Corps, 2017).

Introduced spotted dove, zebra dove, northern mockingbird, northern cardinal, red-crested cardinal, house finch, Japanese white-eye, common myna (*Acridotheres tristis*), and European house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) are common throughout Oahu. Non-native mammals include small Indian mongoose (*Herpestes auropunctatus*), feral cats, rats, and house mice (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b).




Figure 3-4: Occurrence of ESA-listed Plant and Wildlife Species and WMAs on MCBH Kaneohe Bay

Island of Hawaii

The training study area for the Island of Hawaii includes three stretches of coast along the western shore of the island (Figure 1-8). These coastal areas are characterized by lava cliffs with intermittent stretches of beach. Non-native introduced bird species expected along the Kona coast within the training study area include spotted dove, zebra dove, northern mockingbird, northern cardinal, red-crested cardinal, house finch, Japanese white-eye, common myna, and European house sparrow. Non-native mammals include small Indian mongoose (*Herpestes auropunctatus*), feral cats, rats, and house mice. There are a few small coastal wetlands that support a number of ESA-listed waterbird species (see Section 3.3.2.3, Special-Status Birds). Seabirds and shorebirds along the coast are expected to be similar to those found on other Hawaiian islands.

3.3.2.2 Marine Biological Resources

Marine biological resources within the training study area are found in a variety of benthic habitats, within the water column, and in intertidal zones of beaches and rocky shores within approximately 12 nautical miles from the shoreline. Marine biological resources within these shallow water habitats and deeper water areas are summarized below.

3.3.2.2.1 Marine Vegetation

Marine vegetation includes plants such as mangroves, algae, and various seagrasses that occur in marine or estuarine waters. Mangroves in Hawaii are considered invasive with some areas targeted for removal and restoration (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a). Invasive mangrove concentrations have been identified around Molokai, Oahu, and Kauai, with the most extensive mangroves occurring along the south shore of Molokai and along the northern shore of Pearl Harbor with spotty locations in Kaneohe Bay (Costa & Kendall, 2016).

In shallow water reef communities, crustose coralline algae and macroalgae are the primary components of marine vegetation communities. Dense native seagrass beds are found growing on soft sediment offshore from beach areas and freshwater inlets. Invasive algae species (e.g., gorilla seaweed [*Gracilaria salicornia*]) are established in some shoreline areas (Costa & Kendall, 2016). In general, coastal waters that have suitable substrates and relatively lower wave intensity, such as bays, support higher concentrations of marine vegetation.

3.3.2.2.2 Marine Invertebrates

Marine invertebrates in the training study area occur in a variety of ocean habitats. For purposes of this EA, marine invertebrates are described in two broad categories—corals and benthic invertebrates. Information on marine invertebrates within coastal waters of islands within the training study area are compiled from the University of Hawaii at Manoa's Coral Reef Assessment and Monitoring Program (University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2015b) and Fisheries Ecology Research Lab (University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2015a), and The Nature Conservancy's Hawaii Marine Program (The Nature Conservancy, 2015), and summarized by Bauer et al. (2016). Major taxonomic groups for marine invertebrates in nearshore waters of Hawaii include sponges (Phylum Porifera); foraminifera, radiolarians, and ciliates (Phylum Foraminifera); corals, hydroids, and jellyfish (Phylum Cnidaria); segmented worms (Phylum Annelida); bryozoans (Phylum Bryozoa); cephalopods, bivalves, sea snails, chitons (Phylum Mollusca); shrimp, crab, lobster, barnacles, copepods (Phylum Arthropoda-Crustacea); and sea stars, sea urchins, and sea cucumbers (Phylum Echinodermata) (Bauer et al., 2016).

Corals are invertebrates that are related to anemones, jellyfish, and hydras. They are made of invertebrate polyps and can generally be categorized as either hard or soft. Hard corals have calcium carbonate skeletons, grow in colonies, and are reef-building animals that live in symbiosis with phytoplankton called zooxanthellae. Soft corals are flexible, have calcareous particles in their body walls for structural support, can be found in both tropical and cold ocean waters, do not grow in colonies or build reefs, and do not always contain zooxanthellae. Animals that live on the sea floor are called benthos. Most of these animals lack a backbone and are called invertebrates. Typical benthic invertebrates include sea anemones, sponges, corals, sea stars, sea urchins, worms, bivalves, crabs, and many more. Spalding et al. (2007) places the Hawaiian Archipelago within the Hawaii ecoregion, Hawaiian province, and the Eastern Indo-pacific biogeographic realm. Coral diversity in the Hawaiian Islands is comparable to that found in the Western Atlantic and Caribbean, both of which have less than 1/10th the number of coral species found in Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. However, diversity is only one measure of the biological importance of a coral reef, and the Hawaiian reefs are significant from an ecological, commercial, recreational, and cultural perspective.

The western coast of Kauai exhibits low hard coral cover, with the highest amounts reported along the northern coast near Hanalei Bay (Pacific Islands Ocean Observing System, 2018). While no explicit recent quantitative surveys have been carried out for in-coastal waters of PMRF, repetitive quantitative surveys were conducted in this area on an annual basis from 1994 through 1997 as part of the required compliance for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit for the Zone of Mixing of the Kekaha Sugar Mill Discharges (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010b). In addition, Dollar and Brock (2007) conducted qualitative surveys off Barking Sands to evaluate marine communities. The most-abundant species (*Porites lobata*, *Pocillopora meandrina*, and *Montipora patula*, and coral) cover less than 2 percent of the bottom within the southernmost sector of the PMRF. Other less-abundant species in the area include *Porites compressa*, *Montipora capitata*, and *Pavona varians* (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010b).

Around Oahu, high amounts of coral cover are reported by Bauer et al. (2016) at Kaneohe Bay and other areas with low turbidity (e.g., Hanauma Bay). Relatively high amounts of coralline algae are found in Kaneohe Bay and along the windward coast, as well as south-facing shores near Makapuu. Waters off of the Kaneohe Bay Range Training Facility (Ulupau Crater), off shore of Fossil Beach, are also known to support important coral reef areas, in terms of diversity and structure, for a wide variety of marine wildlife. The total number of stony corals and diversity of species within Pearl Harbor appears to have increased since 1974 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a). Unfortunately, the dramatic increase in gorilla seaweed (*Gracilaria salicornia*) is of great concern in and around Oahu. This algae has devastated corals in many areas of Hawaii (including areas within Pearl Harbor and Kaneohe Bay), and its presence in Hanauma Bay adversely impacts stony coral growth and recruitment, and the general macrobenthic invertebrate diversity and fish stocks (Smith et al., 2004). In addition, this invasive red alga can lead to changes in physical parameters on the reef, including reduced irradiance, increased sedimentation, and marked variation in diurnal dissolved oxygen and pH cycles (Martinez et al., 2012).

Along Hawaii's Kona and Kohala coasts, Bauer et al. (2016) reported relatively high amounts of coral cover. On the Island of Hawaii, the majority of sites surveyed were located on the western leeward side of the island. Bauer et al. (2016) reported coral species richness (numbers of differing species) was relatively low along much of the western portion of the island, with moderately higher values occurring in bays. Representative species include non-gorgonian Alcyonacea (suborders Alcyoniina and Stolonifera) and gorgonian Alcyonacea (suborders Calcaxonia, Halaxonia, Scleraxonia).

3.3.2.2.3 Marine Fishes

Fishes are vital components of the marine ecosystem and have great ecological and economic aspects. To protect this resource, NMFS works with the regional fishery management councils to identify the essential habitat for every life stage of each federally managed species, using the best available scientific information. Information on ESA-listed fish species that occur in the training study area is presented below in Section 3.3.2.3 (Special-Status Species).

Coral reef fish communities in the Hawaiian Islands show a consistent pattern of dominant species groups throughout the year, including wrasses (Labridae), triggerfishes (Balistidae), and butterflyfishes (Chaetodontidae) (Hoover, 2008). Several of the reef-associated fish species (bigeye scad [*Selar crumenophthalmus*], mackerel scad [*Decapterus macarellus*], goatfishes [Mullidae], and squirrelfishes [Holocentridae]) in the training study area also show seasonal fluctuations, which are usually related to movements of juveniles into new areas or spawning activity (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, 2014; Rodgers et al., 2015). Although species composition may change, the dominant fish groups are similar among the reefs throughout the training study areas.

The WPRFMC has authority over the managed fisheries based in, and surrounding, the state of Hawaii. The 2009 FEP for the Hawaii Archipelago was developed by the WPRFMC as a Fisheries Management Plan and is consistent with the MSA and the national standards for fishery conservation and management (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2016a). The FEP does not establish any new fishery management regulations but consolidates existing fishery regulations for demersal species. Specifically, this FEP identifies as management unit species those species known to be present in waters around the Hawaiian Islands, including bottomfishes and seamount groundfishes, crustaceans, precious corals, and coral reef ecosystem. Although pelagic fishery resources play an important role in the biological as well as the socioeconomic environment of these islands, they are managed separately through the Pacific Pelagic FEP (Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, 2016b). EFH includes all types of aquatic habitat, including wetlands, coral reefs, seagrasses, and rivers where fish spawn, breed, feed, or grow to maturity.

3.3.2.2.4 Marine Reptiles

The USFWS and NMFS share federal jurisdiction for sea turtles, with the USFWS having lead responsibility on the nesting beaches and NMFS, the marine environment. As all sea turtle species are listed under the ESA, they are discussed in Section 3.3.2.3 (Special-Status Species).

3.3.2.2.5 Marine Mammals

Pursuant to the ESA and MMPA, NMFS has jurisdiction and management authority for marine mammals (whales, dolphins, and seals) in Hawaiian waters. NMFS also has jurisdiction over the Hawaiian monk seal in all environments, including on land. All marine mammals in the United States are protected under the MMPA, and some species receive additional protection under the ESA. The MMPA defines a marine mammal “stock” as “a group of marine mammals of the same species or smaller taxon in a common spatial arrangement that interbreed when mature.” For management purposes under the MMPA, a stock is considered an isolated population or group of individuals within a whole species that is found in the same area. However, generally due to a lack of sufficient information, management stocks defined by NMFS may include groups of multiple species, such as with *Mesoplodon* beaked whales (Carretta et al., 2014). Although all marine mammals are protected under the MMPA, only a few species that occur in the training study area are listed under the ESA. Information on ESA-listed marine mammals is presented below in Section 3.3.2.3 (Special-Status Species). Only those ESA-listed species

that have the potential to be impacted by training and testing activities are discussed further. Information on marine mammals not protected under the ESA that are commonly observed throughout the training study areas is presented below.

Marine mammals are a diverse group of approximately 130 species. Most live predominantly in the marine habitat, although some species (e.g., monk seals) spend time in terrestrial habitats (Jefferson, 2009; Rice, 1998). Marine mammal species with the potential to occur in the training study area include humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), short-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*), bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus gilli*), and spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*). The humpback whale is the most common baleen whale species found in Hawaiian waters, although rare sightings of fin (*Balaenoptera physalus*), minke (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*), Bryde's (*Balaenoptera edeni*), blue (*Balaenoptera musculus*), and North Pacific right whales (*Eubalaena japonica*) are possible (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2017). As many as 10,000 humpbacks migrate to Hawaiian waters every year to mate, give birth, and nurse their calves. The mating and calving season runs from November through May, with peak occurrences from January through March (Richie et al., 2016). The Hawaii Distinct Population Segment (DPS) for humpback whales was recently delisted by NMFS (81 Federal Register 62260); however, this species is still protected under the MMPA (as are all marine mammals).

3.3.2.3 Special-Status Species

A total of 34 ESA-listed species are potentially present within the training study area: 6 terrestrial plants, 1 terrestrial mammal, 8 birds, 8 insects, 2 marine fish, 3 sea turtles, and 6 marine mammals (Table 3-6). A total of 36 species are listed by the State of Hawaii: the 34 that are federally listed in addition to 2 species of birds that are not federally listed under the ESA. The training study area also includes portions of federally designated critical habitat for three terrestrial plants and two marine mammals. In older critical habitat listings, the USFWS considered primary constituent elements (PCEs) to determine which areas to designate as critical habitat. PCEs are those physical and biological features that are essential to the conservation of the species and that may require special management considerations or protection. Although the term PCE is no longer used by the USFWS (81 Federal Register 7414), as it is used in the older critical habitat designations in Federal Register notices, the term has been retained in this document for consistency, when appropriate, to aid in review.

Table 3-6: Threatened and Endangered Species Known to Occur or Potentially Occurring in the Training Study Area and Presence of Critical Habitat within the Training Study Area

Common Name (Scientific Name)	Federal Status	State Status	Occurrence within Training Study Area	CH Present within Training Study Area?
Terrestrial Plants				
Lau ehu (<i>Panicum niihauense</i>) ⁽¹⁾	E, CH	E	Kauai: PMRF, Polihale State Park	Yes
Ohai (<i>Sesbania tomentosa</i>) ⁽²⁾	E, CH	E	Kauai: Polihale State Park	Yes
Ko oloa ula (<i>Abutilon menziesii</i>) ⁽³⁾	E	E	Oahu: Lualualei Annex	NA
Puukaa (<i>Cyperus trachysanthos</i>) ⁽⁴⁾	E	E	Oahu: Lualualei Annex	NA
Ihi (<i>Marsilea villosa</i>) ⁽⁸⁾	E, CH	E	Oahu: Lualualei Annex	No
Ko oko olau (<i>Bidens amplexans</i>) ⁽³⁷⁾	E	E	Oahu: Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station	No
Terrestrial Mammals				
Hawaiian hoary bat (<i>Lasiurus cinereus semotus</i>) ⁽⁹⁾	E	E	Oahu, Kauai, Island of Hawaii: all locations	NA
Birds				
Band-rumped storm petrel (<i>Oceanodroma castro</i>) Hawaii DPS ⁽¹⁰⁾	E	E	Coastal waters of Kauai and Island of Hawaii	NA
Hawaiian common gallinule (<i>Gallinula galeata sandwicensis</i>) ⁽¹⁴⁾	E	E	Kauai: PMRF Oahu: Pearl Harbor, MCBH Kaneohe Bay	NA
Hawaiian coot (<i>Fulica alai</i>) ⁽¹¹⁾	E	E	Kauai: PMRF Oahu: Pearl Harbor, MCBH Kaneohe Bay Island of Hawaii: Aimakapa and Opaepala ponds	NA
Hawaiian duck (<i>Anas wyvilliana</i>) ⁽¹²⁾	E	E	Kauai: PMRF Oahu: Pearl Harbor, MCBH Kaneohe Bay Island of Hawaii: Aimakapa and Opaepala ponds	NA
Hawaiian goose (<i>Branta sandwicensis</i>) ⁽¹³⁾	T	T	Kauai: PMRF, Polihale State Park Island of Hawaii: all locations	NA
Hawaiian hawk (<i>Buteo solitarius</i>) ⁽⁶⁾	DL	DL	Island of Hawaii: southern TSA	NA
Hawaiian petrel (<i>Pterodroma phaeopygia sandwichensis</i>) ⁽¹⁵⁾	E	E	Kauai: PMRF, Polihale State Park	NA
Hawaiian stilt (<i>Himantopus mexicanus knudseni</i>) ⁽¹⁶⁾	PT	E	Kauai: PMRF Oahu: Pearl Harbor, MCBH Kaneohe Bay, Maunaloa Bay	NA
Newell's Townsend's shearwater (<i>Puffinus auricularis newelli</i>) ⁽¹⁷⁾	T	T	Kauai: PMRF, Polihale State Park Island of Hawaii: Kona Coast	NA
Short-eared owl (<i>Asio flammeus sandwichensis</i>) ⁽¹⁸⁾	NL	E (Oahu)	Oahu: all locations	NA
White tern (<i>Gygis alba</i>) ⁽¹⁸⁾	NL	T	Oahu: Pearl Harbor, MBH Kaneohe Bay, shoreline between Pearl Harbor and Diamond Head	NA

Table 3-6: Threatened and Endangered Species Known to Occur or Potentially Occurring in the Training Study Area and Presence of Critical Habitat within the Training Study Area

Common Name (Scientific Name)	Federal Status	State Status	Occurrence within Training Study Area	CH Present within Training Study Area?
Insects				
Yellow-faced bees				
<i>Hylaeus anthracinus</i> ⁽¹⁹⁾	E	E	Oahu: coastal locations	NA
<i>Hylaeus assimulans</i> ⁽²⁰⁾			Island of Hawaii: coastal locations	
<i>Hylaeus facilis</i> ⁽²¹⁾			None	
<i>Hylaeus hiliaris</i> ⁽²²⁾			None	
<i>Hylaeus kuakea</i> ⁽²³⁾			None	
<i>Hylaeus longiceps</i> ⁽¹⁹⁾			Oahu: coastal locations	
<i>Hylaeus mana</i> ⁽²³⁾			None	
Orangeblack Hawaiian damselfly (<i>Megalagrion xanthomelas</i>) ⁽²⁴⁾	E	E	Oahu: Pearl Harbor Island of Hawaii: Honokohau wetland	NA
Marine Fishes				
Oceanic whitetip shark (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) ⁽²⁵⁾	T	T	Waters around all islands	NA
Giant manta ray (<i>Manta birostris</i>) ⁽²⁶⁾	T	T	Waters around all islands	NA
Sea Turtles				
Green turtle (<i>Chelonia mydas</i>) Central North Pacific DPS ⁽²⁷⁾	T	T	Nesting and basking: all islands	NA
Hawksbill turtle (<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>) ⁽²⁸⁾	E	E	In-water: all islands	
Olive ridley turtle (<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>) ⁽²⁹⁾	E	E	Nesting: Oahu (MCBH Kaneohe Bay) In-water: all islands	
Marine Mammals				
False killer whale (<i>Pseudorca crassidens</i>) Main Hawaiian Islands Insular DPS ⁽³⁰⁾	ESA: E, CH MMPA: depleted stock	E	Waters around all islands	Yes
Blue whale (<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>) ⁽³¹⁾	ESA: E MMPA: depleted stock	E	Waters around all islands	NA
Fin whale (<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>) ⁽³²⁾	ESA: E MMPA: depleted stock	E	Waters around all islands	NA
Sei whale (<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>) ⁽³³⁾	ESA: E MMPA: depleted stock	E	Waters around all islands	NA
Sperm whale (<i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>) ⁽³⁴⁾	ESA: E MMPA: depleted stock	E	Waters around all islands	NA
Humpback whale (<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>) Hawaii DPS ⁽³⁵⁾	ESA: NL MMPA: strategic stock	NL	Waters around all islands.	NA

Table 3-6: Threatened and Endangered Species Known to Occur or Potentially Occurring in the Training Study Area and Presence of Critical Habitat within the Training Study Area

Common Name (Scientific Name)	Federal Status	State Status	Occurrence within Training Study Area	CH Present within Training Study Area?
Hawaiian monk seal (<i>Neomonachus schauinslandi</i>) ⁽³⁶⁾	ESA: E, CH MMPA: depleted stock	E	Haulouts and pupping grounds: all islands. In-water: all islands.	Yes

Notes: CH = critical habitat, DL = delisted, DPS = Distinct Population Segment, E = endangered, MMPA = Marine Mammal Protection Act, NA = not applicable: critical habitat not designated for the species or critical habitat does not fall within the training study area, NL = not listed, PCH = proposed critical habitat, PMRF = Pacific Missile Range Facility, PT = proposed threatened, T = threatened.

Sources: ⁽¹⁾61 Federal Register 53108; 68 Federal Register 9116; USFW 2017c. ⁽²⁾68 Federal Register 9116; USFWS 2015d. ⁽³⁾USFWS 2011c. ⁽⁴⁾USFWS 2011c. ⁽⁶⁾85 Federal Register 164. ⁽⁸⁾USFWS 2011c; 77 Federal Register 57648. ⁽⁹⁾USFWS 2011a. ⁽¹⁰⁾81 Federal Register 67786. ⁽¹¹⁾USFWS 2011d, 2015a. ⁽¹²⁾USFWS 2011d, 2015b. ⁽¹³⁾USFWS 2004, 2011b; 84 Federal Register 69918. ⁽¹⁴⁾USFWS 2011d, 2015c. ⁽¹⁵⁾USFWS 2017a. ⁽¹⁶⁾86 Federal Register 15855; USFWS 2010b, 2011d. ⁽¹⁷⁾ USFWS 2017b. ⁽¹⁸⁾Pyle & Pyle 2017 ⁽¹⁹⁾81 Federal Register 67786; Schonberg et al. 2009c. ⁽²⁰⁾81 Federal Register 67786; Schonberg et al. 2009b. ⁽²¹⁾81 Federal Register 67786; Schonberg et al. 2009d. ⁽²²⁾81 Federal Register 67786; Schonberg et al. 2009e. ⁽²³⁾81 Federal Register 67786; Schonberg et al. 2009a. ⁽²⁴⁾81 Federal Register 67786; Mazzacano 2008; U.S. Department of the Navy 2011a. ⁽²⁵⁾83 Federal Register 4153. ⁽²⁶⁾83 Federal Register 2916. ⁽²⁷⁾81 Federal Register 20058. ⁽²⁸⁾NMFS 2013. ⁽²⁹⁾NMFS and USFWS 2014. ⁽³⁰⁾77 Federal Register 70915; 82 Federal Register 51186; 83 Federal Register 35062. ⁽³¹⁾ NMFS 2016b. ⁽³²⁾ NMFS 2016b. ⁽³³⁾ NMFS 2016b. ⁽³⁴⁾ NMFS 2016b. ⁽³⁵⁾81 Federal Register 62260. ⁽³⁶⁾80 Federal Register 50926; NMFS 2016b. ⁽³⁷⁾77 Federal Register 57648.

The following discussion addresses the known or potential occurrence of each special-status species and associated designated or proposed critical habitat for ESA-listed species within the training study area for each island, not the occurrence across the entire island or all islands in the Hawaiian archipelago.

3.3.2.3.1 Special-Status Plants

Lau ehu (*Panicum niihauense*)

Listed by the USFWS as an endangered species in 1996, *Panicum niihauense* (Hawaiian common name lau ehu), a member of the grass family (Poaceae), is a perennial bunchgrass with unbranched aerial stems. The species is found scattered in sand dunes in coastal shrubland at elevations between 0 and 337 ft. The primary threats to *P. niihauense* are destruction by off-road vehicles, competition with non-native plants, a risk of extinction from naturally occurring events (e.g., landslides or hurricanes), and reduced reproductive vigor due to the small number of individuals in the remaining population (61 Federal Register 53108).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. At the time of listing in 1996, *P. niihauense* was only known historically from Niihau (last observed in 1949) and one population of 23 individuals at Polihale State Park on Kauai (61 Federal Register 53108). Since that time, the species population has never exceeded approximately 35 individuals at Polihale State Park, with 29–34 individuals in 2006, 30–35 individuals in 2008, 4–11 individuals in 2014, and 6 individuals in 2015 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2017c).

In 2003, the USFWS designated 429 acres of critical habitat for this endangered plant on Kauai, with 369 acres occurring within the Kauai training study area, including 177 acres within PMRF and 196 acres within Polihale State Park (Figure 3-5); the designated critical habitat within PMRF is unoccupied (68

Federal Register 9116). As stated above, currently the only known *P. niihauense* population is at Polihale State Park (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2017c).

Ohai (*Sesbania tomentosa*)

Listed by the USFWS as an endangered species in 1994, *Sesbania tomentosa* (Hawaiian common name ohai), a member of the pea family (Fabaceae), is typically a sprawling short-lived perennial shrub, but may also be a small tree (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1999). Within the Kauai training study area and northern Oahu training study area, *S. tomentosa* is found on sandy beaches, dunes, or pond margins at elevations between 0 and 694 ft. It commonly occurs in naupaka (*Scaevola taccada*) shrubland or mixed coastal dry shrubland and mixed coastal dry cliffs with the associated native plant species *Chamaesyce celastroides*, *Cuscuta sandwichiana*, *Dodonaea viscosa*, *Heteropogon contortus*, *Myoporum sandwicense*, *Nama sandwicensis*, *Scaevola sericea*, *Sida fallax*, *Sporobolus virginicus*, *Vitex rotundifolia*, or *Waltheria indica*. The primary threats to *S. tomentosa* are habitat degradation caused by competition with various nonnative plant species; lack of adequate pollination; seed predation by rats (*Rattus* spp.), mice, and, potentially, nonnative insects; fire; and destruction by off-road vehicles and other human disturbances (68 Federal Register 9116; 68 Federal Register 35950). Studies of *Sesbania tomentosa* individuals at Kaena Point on Oahu revealed that yellow-faced bees (*Hylaeus* spp.), themselves recently listed under the ESA as endangered (see below), are the primary pollinators of *S. tomentosa* (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2010a).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. At the time of listing in 1994, the species occurred between Mana town and Mana Point and at Polihale State Park on Kauai. The population on State-owned land at Polihale State Park consisted of about 30 individuals growing in an area of approximately 110–540 ft² in a lithified dune area at approximately 40 ft elevation. At the time of critical habitat designation in 2003, *S. tomentosa* was known from 1 occurrence, with 11 individuals, at Polihale State Park on Kauai (68 Federal Register 9116). Since 2003 the numbers of individuals at Polihale State Park have ranged from a low of 12 in 2008 to a high of 23 in 2005. The most current surveys found 20 individuals in 2011 and 2012 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015d).

In 2003, critical habitat was designated for *S. tomentosa* in one unit totaling 110 acres on Kauai that is within the training study area (68 Federal Register 9116) (Figure 3-5). The currently known PCEs of critical habitat for *S. tomentosa* on Kauai include, but are not limited to, the habitat components provided by:

- sandy beaches, dunes, or pond margins in coastal dry shrublands or mixed coastal dry cliffs, and contain one or more of the following associated native plant species: *Chamaesyce celastroides*, *Cuscuta sandwichiana*, *Dodonaea viscosa*, *Heteropogon contortus*, *Myoporum sandwicense*, *Nama sandwicensis*, *Scaevola sericea*, *Sida fallax*, *Sporobolus virginicus*, *Vitex rotundifolia*, or *Waltheria indica*, and
- elevations between 0 and 427 ft (68 Federal Register 9116).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. In 2008, two self-established plants were discovered at MCBH within the Nuupia Ponds WMA along the coastline of Fort Hase, and they have been monitored since (Figure 3-4) (U.S. Marine Corps, 2017).

Ko oloa ula (*Abutilon menziesii*)

Listed as endangered in 1986, *Abutilon menziesii* is a long-lived perennial shrub in the mallow family (Malvaceae) with coarsely toothed, silvery heart-shaped leaves. Currently, there are three populations

totaling 40–60 individuals on Oahu, all within the Lualualei Annex. There are three populations totaling at least 220 individuals on Maui and two populations totaling several hundred individuals on Lanai; there are no known occurrences on Hawaii Island. Threats to the species include fire, invasive introduced plants that modify habitat, and overgrazing by feral introduced animals (e.g., deer, goats) (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011e).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. Three populations of *A. menziesii* occur on Lualualei Annex (Figure 3-6; *Note:* the single location depicted south of the Niulii Pond Wildlife Refuge consists of two populations). All three populations are found in sparse kiawe forest, with buffel grass as the predominant ground cover. All individuals have been tagged and are monitored regularly (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a).

Puukaa (*Cyperus trachysanthos*)

Listed as endangered in 1986, *Cyperus trachysanthos* is a short-lived perennial sedge found in wet sites (ephemeral streams, seasonal wetlands, mud flats, wet clay soil, or wet cliffseeps) on coastal cliffs or talus slopes at elevations between 10 and 525 ft. Its habitat requires periodic flooding and drying for the species to emerge and reproduce. Historically it occurred on Niihau, Kauai, Oahu, Molokai, and Lanai (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1999). Currently it is known to occur only on Oahu and Kauai. *Cyperus trachysanthos* is threatened by introduced invasive plants, particularly alien grasses; fire; grazing and trampling by introduced ungulates; alteration of wetlands; and climate change (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2013).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. Three small populations of *Cyperus trachysanthos* are found in the southern area of the Lualualei Annex (Figure 3-6) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a).

Ihi (*Marsilea villosa*)

Listed as endangered in 1992, *Marsilea villosa* (Hawaiian common name ihi ihi), a fern in the water clover fern family (Marsileaceae), is known from Niihau, Molokai, and Oahu. Restricted to low elevations, the species is found in areas that flood periodically, such as small depressions and flood plains with clay soils. Standing water is required for sexual reproduction, and drying is required for new plant establishment and for sporocarp maturation. Threats to the species include the encroachment of non-native vegetation, habitat degradation by off-road vehicles, fire, development, small population size, and trampling and other impacts by humans and introduced mammals (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1996).

At the time the USFWS designated critical habitat in 2003, this species was known from five occurrences of an unknown number of individuals on Oahu. Currently, *M. villosa* is found in two naturally occurring populations of an unknown number of individuals in seasonal wetlands of the coastal and lowland dry ecosystems at Koko Head (Ihiihilauakea Crater) and Lualualei in the Waianae and Koolau mountains (77 Federal Register 57648).




Figure 3-5: Critical Habitat for *Panicum niihauense* and *Sesbania tomentosa* Within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: Kauai




Figure 3-6: Occurrence of Endangered Species Act-Listed Plant Species and Critical Habitat at the Lualualei Annex, Oahu Training Study Area

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. Five populations of *M. villosa* are found on the Lualualei Annex (see Figure 3-6). All populations are monitored year round (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a). Although critical habitat for *M. villosa* was designated within the Lualualei Annex in 2003, critical habitat was revised in 2012 and, based on the Navy's 2011 INRMP and addendum for JBPHH, the USFWS exempted the 169 acres of Navy lands within the Lualualei Annex from the final designation of critical habitat for *M. villosa* under section 4(a)(3)(B)(i) of the ESA (77 Federal Register 57648).

Although critical habitat has been designated for 21 plant species within the Lualualei Annex, no critical habitat occurs within the training study area (see Figure 3-6).

Ko oko olau (*Bidens amplexans*)

Listed as endangered in 2012, *Bidens amplexans* (Hawaiian common name ko oko olau), a member of the sunflower family (Asteraceae), is an herb with branched stems from 5 to 10 ft tall. It is restricted to windward cliffs and crests in the coastal and lowland dry ecosystems of Oahu along the northern portion of the Waianae Mountains at elevations of 300-1,400 ft. Threats to the species include the encroachment of non-native vegetation, climate change, habitat degradation, fire, small population size, hybridization with other *Bidens* species, and predation or herbivory by feral pigs, goats, and rodents (77 Federal Register 57648; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2019). Historically, *B. amplexans* was common and ranged from Pu'upueo to Makaleha along the northwestern side of the Waianae Mountains. In 2003, the population was estimated to total fewer than 1,000 individuals. Currently, there are about 10 populations totaling fewer than 500 individuals (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2019).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. During a natural resource assessment of the USAF-leased lands at KPSTS in December 2013 and May 2014, 134 individual *B. amplexans* were observed: 29 within the Transmitter Area and 105 within the Control Area U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 2015). Surveys conducted in 2019 observed 118 individuals (SWCA 2019) (Figure 3-7).

Although *B. amplexans* is known to form hybrid swarms with the unlisted *B. torta*, *B. torta* was not observed within the surveyed areas and all of the observed *B. amplexans* exhibited morphology that agrees with the taxonomic literature (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2015). However, to determine if the *B. amplexans* observed within the KPSTS parcels were *B. amplexans*, *B. torta*, or *amplexans* × *torta* hybrids, samples of six of the previously documented populations (i.e., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 2015) were collected in January 2019 for genetic analysis. Based on the results of field observation and genetic analysis, there is no clear evidence of widespread hybridization of *B. amplexans* with *B. torta* at the KPSTS. All mature individuals examined were found to be morphologically consistent with *B. amplexans*, no individuals of *B. torta* were observed, and no evidence of hybrid swarms were observed based on field observations (Assured Bio Labs, 2020).

Although critical habitat has been designated for *B. amplexans* within the Kaena Point area, critical habitat does not occur within the Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station training study area (77 Federal Register 57648).




Figure 3-7: Occurrence of *Bidens amplexans* at the Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station, Oahu Training Study Area

3.3.2.3.2 Special-Status Mammals

Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*)

Listed by the USFWS in 1970 as an endangered species, the Hawaiian hoary bat (Hawaiian common name ope ape a) is Hawaii's only native terrestrial mammal and occurs on all the major islands in the Hawaiian Archipelago, including Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai, and the Island of Hawaii. Breeding populations occur on all of the main Hawaiian Islands except for Niihau and Kahoolawe (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015a; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998). The largest populations of hoary bats are believed to occur on Kauai and the Island of Hawaii. When originally listed, threats to the species included habitat loss, pesticide use, predation, alteration of prey availability due to the introduction of non-native insects, and roost disturbance. Since that time, the greatest observed mortality of bats has occurred from bats being caught on barb wire fences; however, the actual extent of this problem is unclear. In addition, collision with wind turbines has been documented as an additional threat with 46 Hawaiian hoary bat fatalities recorded at existing wind farms on Maui, Oahu, and the Island of Hawaii from 2006 to 2012 (Na Pua Makani Power Partners, 2016; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998, 2011a). Critical habitat has not been designated for this species.

The Hawaiian hoary bat is a medium-sized insectivorous bat. On the Island of Hawaii, foraging habitats are extremely varied and include forest gaps, clearings, and edges; along planted windrows of trees; above forest canopies; and along roads that include undisturbed native forest, mature eucalyptus plantations having mixed understory trees and shrubs, lowland forest dominated by introduced trees, suburban and urban areas with ornamental trees, grassland/pasture, river gorges, arboretums, macadamia nut orchards, streams and ponds, and coastal embayments. They have been documented foraging from 3 to over 483 ft above the ground or water, and have a diverse diet, feeding on a variety of native and non-native flying insects, including moths, beetles, crickets, mosquitoes, and termites. They have been observed foraging either just before or after sunset depending on the time of year, and activity patterns may also be affected by altitude (Bonaccorso et al., 2015; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998; Whitaker & Tomich, 1983).

Mating occurs between September and December with birth of young during May or June. Mothers likely stay with their pups until they are 6–7 weeks old. Based on studies on the Island of Hawaii, hoary bats are fairly widespread and known to migrate from eastern lowland rainforests, occupied during the summer and fall breeding season, to interior highlands (at 3,280–11,811 ft) during the winter post-lactation period (Bonaccorso et al., 2015; Gorresen et al., 2015; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998). Hoary bats can also range between habitats and elevations within a single night to target optimal local foraging opportunities (Gorresen et al., 2015). Little is known regarding dispersal or movements, but inter-island dispersal is possible. They are solitary roosters, although mothers and pups roost together, and utilize the foliage of both native and nonnative vegetation; they rarely roost in lava tubes, cracks in rocks, or man-made structures (Bonaccorso et al., 2015; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. A 2010 occupancy study for Hawaiian hoary bats revealed that bat presence at PMRF, including its satellite facilities at Makaha Ridge and Kokee, was widespread. Bats were noted to be in all regions sampled during every sampling period with high detectability levels observed between September 2010 and February 2011. Hawaiian hoary bats at PMRF utilized all areas of the facility year-round with seasonal movement patterns indicating use of low elevation habitats (i.e., PMRF) most during the late summer and fall with increased use of high elevation areas (i.e., Makaha Ridge and Kokee) in winter months. In addition, “fall swarming,” a behavior in

preparation for mating noted in Hawaiian hoary bats on the Island of Hawaii, in which adult bats and fledging young gather, was documented at PMRF from September to December highlighting the importance of the facility to the species (Bonaccorso & Pinzari, 2011).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. Although Hawaiian hoary bats have been documented on Oahu (Kahuku Wind Power LLC., 2010; U.S. Army Garrison Hawaii, 2017; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998), little research on the species has been conducted on the island. Gorreson et al. (2015) noted that bats on Oahu were acoustically cryptic and were less frequently detected in windward northern areas than in leeward southern parts of their study area. Seasonal peaks in acoustic detection on Oahu were observed from March through September coinciding with the birthing and raising of young for the species.

The Oahu Army Natural Resources Program conducted acoustic monitoring for the Hawaiian hoary bat from 2010 to 2013 on all Oahu Army Training Areas and Hawaiian hoary bats were present at all training areas: Dillingham Military Reservation, Kahuku Training Area, Kawaihoa Training Area, Makua Military Reservation, and Schofield Barracks Military Reservation (U.S. Army Garrison Hawaii, 2017).

To date, no surveys for the Hawaiian hoary bat have been conducted on MCBH, Kaneohe Bay.

Surveys of only two JBPHH properties, Lualualei Annex and Red Hill Storage Facility, have been conducted to date. Completed in 2014, they included five acoustic monitoring stations in suitable bat habitat. Bat presence was noted at both the Red Hill Storage Facility and at Kolekole Pass; Kolekole recorded the highest number of individual bat detection nights. Most notably, no bats were detected at any of the three stations located at the floor of Lualualei (Bonaccorso et al., 2015).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. Visual observations and echolocation monitoring suggest that the Hawaiian hoary bat is fairly widespread around the Island of Hawaii and would be expected to occur within the training study area (Bonaccorso et al., 2015; Gorreson et al., 2015; Jacobs, 1994).

3.3.2.3.3 Special-Status Birds

The following section provides a discussion of the known occurrence of ESA- and state-listed bird species within the proposed training study area. Note that although the ESA-listed endangered Oahu elepaio (*Chasiempis ibidis*) and associated designated critical habitat occurs in the eastern portion of the Lualualei Annex (Figure 3-8), the proposed training study area and training activities would be sufficiently distant from elepaio habitat that there would be no impacts on either the species or critical habitat. Therefore, the Oahu elepaio is not discussed further.

Hawaiian Coot (*Fulica alai*)

Listed by the USFWS in 1970 as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Preservation Act (later to become the ESA in 1973), the Hawaiian coot (Hawaiian common name alae ke oke) is an endemic Hawaiian species. At the time of its listing as an endangered species, it was considered a subspecies of the American coot and was listed as *Fulica americana alai*. It has been considered a distinct species (*Fulica alai*) since 1993 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d).

Hawaiian coots occur on all of the main Hawaiian Islands except Kahoolawe, with Oahu, Maui, and Kauai currently supporting 80 percent of the population. Coots move between islands in response to rainfall patterns when water levels are low and food sources become concentrated. They nest year-round on open fresh water and brackish ponds, taro ponds, shallow reservoirs, irrigation ditches, and in small

openings of marsh vegetation. They construct floating nests with aquatic vegetation in open water or anchored to emergent vegetation. Coots are generalist feeders, obtaining food near the surface of the water, diving, or foraging in mud or sand. They also graze on upland grassy sites such as golf courses that are adjacent to wetlands, especially during times of drought and when food is unavailable elsewhere. Food includes seeds and leaves of aquatic plants and various invertebrates, including snails, crustaceans, and aquatic or terrestrial insects, tadpoles, and small fish. Threats to Hawaiian coots include loss of wetland habitat and predation of eggs, young, and adults by introduced predators such as cats, dogs (*Canis familiaris*), mongoose, rats, fish, bullfrogs (*Lithobates catesbeianus*), black-crowned night herons, and cattle egrets (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. Hawaiian coots have been documented foraging and loafing at PMRF within the facility's ditches and at the oxidation pond (Figure 3-3, waterbird habitat). They also occur within wetland areas immediately east of the center of the installation boundary (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010b).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. The species is common on Oahu where it is found in a variety of coastal wetlands and reservoirs throughout the island (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d).

At MCBH Hawaiian coots nest, forage, and loaf at the Percolation Ditch wetland, Klipper Golf Course ponds, and Nuupia WMA (Figure 3-4) (U.S. Marine Corps, 2011, 2017).

At JBP HH, Hawaiian coots are regularly observed along the shoreline, estuarine, and freshwater habitats of Pearl Harbor. They are also found at the Niulii Pond Wildlife Refuge at the Lualualei Annex (Figure 3-8) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. Four ponds support the majority of coots on the Island of Hawaii, with only two within the training study area: Aimakapa and Opaehaia ponds (Figure 3-9). These two ponds anchor the continuous network of wetlands along the Kona Coast and together have maintained 90 percent of the Hawaiian coots for the Island of Hawaii (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d).

Hawaiian Stilt (*Himantopus mexicanus knudseni*)

Listed by the USFWS in 1970 as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Preservation Act (later to become the ESA in 1973), the Hawaiian stilt (Hawaiian common name aeo) is an endemic Hawaiian subspecies of the North American black-necked stilt (*Himantopus mexicanus*). In March 2021, the USFWS proposed to downlist the Hawaiian stilt from endangered to threatened (85 Federal Register 15855). The Hawaiian stilt is currently found in wetland habitats below 600 ft elevation on all of the main Hawaiian Islands except Kahoolawe. The species utilizes fresh, brackish, and saline coastal waters for foraging with nesting occurring on freshly exposed mudflats with some low growing vegetation. Nesting normally occurs from mid-February through late August, varying among years, probably due to water levels. Hawaiian stilts are opportunistic feeders, feeding on a wide variety of invertebrates and other aquatic organisms as available in shallow water wetlands and mudflats. Specific prey include aquatic insects, polychaete worms, small crabs and fish, and tadpoles. As with the Hawaiian coot, between-island movements for this species are thought to be associated with seasonal precipitation patterns and food availability in wetlands. Threats to Hawaiian stilts include loss of wetland habitat and predation of eggs, young, and adults by predators such as cats, dogs, mongoose, rats, Hawaiian short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus sandwichensis*), black-crowned night heron, and Western cattle egret (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d).




Figure 3-8: Occurrence of Special-Status Bird Species at the Lualualei Annex and Training Study Area, Oahu




Figure 3-9: Occurrence of Ponds Supporting ESA-Listed Waterbirds within the Training Study Area, Hawaii Island

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. At PMRF, Hawaiian stilts are generally found in the same habitat as Hawaiian coots: within the facility's ditches, at the oxidation pond, and within wetland areas along the center of the installation immediately east of the installation boundary (Figure 3-3, waterbird habitat); they have also been occasionally observed on the beach (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010b).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. Oahu supports the largest number of Hawaiian stilts in the Hawaiian Islands, with most of the population found on the north and windward coasts of the island with smaller numbers utilizing wetland habitats such as those associated with Pearl Harbor and along the leeward coast (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d).

At MCBH, large numbers of Hawaiian stilts utilize wetland habitats for foraging, loafing, and nesting, particularly the Nuupia Ponds WMA (Figure 3-4). Stilts also utilize grassy areas of the facility for loafing and foraging and can be seen on roadsides, in parks, and on lawns throughout the installation (U.S. Marine Corps, 2011).

At JBPHH, Hawaiian stilts are known to regularly loaf and forage along the shoreline, estuarine, and freshwater habitats of Pearl Harbor. They are also found at the Niulii Pond Wildlife Refuge and in drainage ditches and open grassy areas at the Lualualei Annex (Figure 3-7) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. Hawaiian stilts occupy the same Aimakapa and Opaepala ponds along the Kona Coast as Hawaiian coots (Figure 3-9). The Aimakapa and Opaepala ponds anchor the continuous network of wetlands along the Kona Coast and together have maintained 95 percent of the Hawaiian stilts for the Island of Hawaii (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d).

Hawaiian Common Gallinule (*Gallinula galeata sandvicensis*)

The Hawaiian common moorhen (Hawaiian name alae ula) was listed by the USFWS in 1967 as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Preservation Act (later to become the ESA in 1973). At the time of listing, the species was considered a subspecies of the Old World common moorhen (*Gallinula chloropus*). In 2015, research indicated that the New World and Old World populations are separate species and the common and scientific names were changed accordingly to Hawaiian common gallinule (hereafter Hawaiian gallinule) and *Gallinula galeata sandvicensis*, respectively (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015c).

Currently Hawaiian gallinules are found only on the islands of Kauai and Oahu with each island roughly supporting half of the total population. As with the previously discussed Hawaiian coot and Hawaiian stilt, this species uses a variety of freshwater coastal wetland habitats for foraging and nesting. Little is known of the Hawaiian gallinule's breeding biology. Most nests are inconspicuously placed within dense emergent vegetation over shallow freshwater less than 24 inches deep. The emergent vegetation is folded over into a platform nest. Breeding occurs year-round, with peaks from March through August. Nesting phenology is tied to water levels and the presence of appropriately dense emergent vegetation. They are opportunistic feeders, and food items consumed include algae, seeds and other plant material, aquatic insects, and mollusks. Hawaiian gallinules are the most secretive of the native Hawaiian waterbirds, generally foraging and nesting in dense emergent vegetation. Threats to the species are similar to those for Hawaiian coots and stilts (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. At PMRF, the Hawaiian gallinules are known to regularly forage and loaf within the irrigation canals of the facility (e.g., Kinikini Ditch) and within

wetland areas along the center of the installation immediately east of the installation boundary (Figure 3-3, waterbird habitat) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010b).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. On Oahu, the species is widely distributed with most birds found between Haleiwa and Waimanalo; small numbers occur at Pearl Harbor and the leeward coast at Lualualei Valley (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b).

At MCBH, Hawaiian gallinules nest, forage, and loaf at the Percolation Ditch wetland, Klipper Golf Course ponds, and Nuupia Ponds WMA (Figure 3-4) (U.S. Marine Corps, 2011, 2017).

At JBPHH, Hawaiian gallinules are regularly observed along the shoreline, estuarine, and freshwater habitats of Pearl Harbor. They are also found at the Niulii Pond Wildlife Refuge at the Lualualei Annex (Figure 3-8) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a).

Hawaiian Duck (*Anas wyvilliana*)

Listed by the USFWS in 1967 as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Preservation Act (later to become the ESA in 1973), the Hawaiian duck (Hawaiian common name koloa) is currently found along the shoreline, estuarine, and freshwater habitats of Niihau, Kauai, Oahu, Maui, and Hawaii, with approximately 80 percent of the Hawaiian duck population found on Kauai. The species is also known from a wide variety of artificial wetland habitats, including flooded grasslands; taro, lotus, shrimp, and fish ponds; irrigation ditches; and reservoirs. The species typically forages in shallow water (less than 5 inches deep) and are opportunistic in their diet, including snails, dragonfly larvae, earthworms, grass seeds, green algae, and seeds/leaf parts of wetland plants. Nesting occurs year-round, but most activity occurs between January and May. Nests are usually on the ground near water. Threats to Hawaiian ducks are similar to those for coots, stilts, and gallinules (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011d). One of the biggest threats to koloa is hybridization with feral mallards. Oahu and Maui populations have high percentages of hybrid koloa (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015a).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. At PMRF, Hawaiian ducks can be found foraging and loafing in the ditches and oxidation pond of the facility and within wetland areas along the center of the installation immediately east of the installation boundary (Figure 3-3, waterbird habitat) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010b).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. On Oahu, populations are found in a variety of wetland habitats including, but not limited to, those of Kawainui, Hamakua, and Heeia marshes, James Campbell NWR, and in wetland habitats in or near Punahoolapa, Haleiwa, Pearl Harbor, and Lualualei Valley.

At MCBH, Hawaiian ducks nest, forage, and loaf at the Percolation Ditch wetland, Klipper Golf Course ponds, and Nuupia Ponds WMA (Figure 3-4) (U.S. Marine Corps, 2011, 2017).

At JBPHH, Hawaiian ducks are regularly observed along the estuarine and freshwater habitats of Pearl Harbor. They are also found at the Niulii Pond Wildlife Refuge at the Lualualei Annex (Figure 3-8) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. On Hawaii Island, breeding by this species is centered in the Kohala Mountains extending to Hawi and along the Hamakua coast to Hilo. The species is noted to occur infrequently mostly in fall and winter throughout the rest of the island (Pyle & Pyle, 2017) and are expected to occur with Hawaiian coots, stilts, and gallinules within the Aimakapa and Opaepa ponds along the Kona coast (Figure 3-9).

Hawaiian Goose (*Branta sandvicensis*)

Listed by the USFWS in 1967 as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Preservation Act (later to become the ESA in 1973), the Hawaiian goose (Hawaiian common name nene) is currently found on Kauai, Maui, Molokai, and Hawaii, with the majority of the population found on Kauai; a pair nested on Oahu in 2014 at the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge. On January 21, 2020, the USFWS downlisted the nene from endangered to threatened as the species' status has improved such that it is not currently in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range (84 Federal Register 69918).

Hawaiian geese are found in a variety of native and non-native habitats at elevations ranging from sea level to upwards of 8,200 ft elevation. They are ground nesters, building simple nests that consist of a shallow bowl lined with plant material and down, generally built under woody or herbaceous plants that have a somewhat open canopy. Nesting habitat ranges from grasslands and shrublands to mid-to-high elevation lava fields and coastal wetlands. Hawaiian geese have an extended breeding season, and nesting may occur in all months except May, June, and July, although the majority of individuals nest between October and March, and most clutches are laid between October and December. They are known to readily utilize standing water, when present, for bathing, drinking, and predator avoidance. Hawaiian geese graze and browse on the leaves, seeds, flowers, and fruits of at least 50 native and nonnative grasses, sedges, composites, and shrubs. While threats to Hawaiian geese include habitat loss and predation by introduced mammalian predators, vehicular collision is also a persistent problem faced by the species especially in and around heavily trafficked areas (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2004).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. Hawaiian geese are found in the greatest concentration at PMRF within the Kinikini Ditch vicinity (Figure 3-3). A total of 115 banded individuals and numerous unbanded individuals have been recorded at the facility, and regular surveys by PMRF natural resource staff indicate that Hawaiian geese are consistently present on base. Surveys in 2016 documented an average of 27 geese, with up to 79 individuals observed on a single day. Active nesting by the species is common with a total of 15 chicks hatched at PMRF in 2016.

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. Hawaiian geese are not known to occur within the JBPHH parcels. They occasionally visit MCBH (Figure 3-4): four were observed in December 2014 at the Klipper Golf Course, and five briefly visited the Water Reclamation Facility in February 2016 (U.S. Marine Corps, 2017).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. Hawaiian geese are known to occasionally occur with Hawaiian coots, stilts, and gallinules within the Aimakapa and Opaepa ponds along the Kona coast (Figure 3-8), but are generally found at higher elevations on the Island of Hawaii (e.g., Hakalau Forest National Wildlife Refuge, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park) (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2004). Although Hawaiian geese may seasonally use lowlands on Hawaii Island, lowlands are often unsuitable because of intense human activity or dense predator populations (Uyehara & Misajon, 2007).

Hawaiian Hawk (*Buteo solitarius*)

The Hawaiian hawk (Hawaiian common name 'io) was listed as endangered in 1967 based on its restricted range on the island of Hawaii; its small population size, which at the time was thought to be in the low hundreds; and the assumption that it was endangered by loss of native forest habitat from agriculture, logging, and commercial development. The Hawaiian hawk is a small, broad-winged hawk

endemic to the Hawaiian Islands and is the only member of the family Accipitridae (hawks, eagles, kites, harriers, and Old World vultures) that is resident and nests in the Hawaiian Islands. Currently, it is found only on the island of Hawaii; it occurs from low to high elevations and occupies a variety of habitat types, including native forest, secondary forest consisting primarily of non-native plant species, agricultural areas, and pastures. It preys on insects, rats, mice, mongoose, and a wide variety of native and introduced bird species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1984, 2008).

In 2008, the USFWS proposed removing the Hawaiian hawk from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (73 Federal Register 45680). A Draft Post-delisting Monitoring Plan was prepared in 2008 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2008), and delisting was again announced in 2009 and 2014 (74 Federal Register 6853, 74 Federal Register 27004, 79 Federal Register 8413). Several studies have shown that range-wide population estimates have been stable for at least 20 years and this species is not threatened with becoming endangered throughout all or a significant portion of its range in the foreseeable future (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2008). In January 2020, after the November 2018 publication of the Draft EA, the USFWS delisted the Hawaiian hawk from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (85 Federal Register 164).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. The current range of the Hawaiian hawk does not include the Kona Coast within the training study area as the hawk is typically found at elevations of 1,000 ft and higher in the western portion of Hawaii Island (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1984, 2008). However, there is one record of the species from 1990 at the southern end of the southern-most training study area, near Kailua-Kona.

Band-rumped Storm Petrel (*Oceanodroma castro*) (Hawaii DPS)

The band-rumped storm petrel (Hawaiian common name akeake) is a mid-sized pelagic seabird with three widely separated breeding areas in the Pacific: Japan, Hawaii, and Galapagos. The Hawaii population is considered a DPS and was listed by the USFWS as endangered in 2016 due to the small population size and limited distribution. It nests in crevices or holes in remote high cliff locations on the island of Kauai and in steep open to vegetated cliffs and in sparsely vegetated high-elevation lava fields on the Island of Hawaii. Band-rumped storm petrels are regularly seen in coastal waters of Kauai, Niihau, and Hawaii. Predation by nonnative animals on nests and adults during the breeding season is the greatest threat to the Hawaiian population of the band-rumped storm petrel. Attraction of adults and fledglings to artificial lights, and collision with structures and utility lines, are also considered serious threats (81 Federal Register 67786).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. Offshore of Kauai, the species has been documented to “raft” or form concentrations on the water of a few to as many as 100 birds prior to coming ashore to its breeding colonies. Auditory detections on Kauai indicate that nesting occurs predominately on the Na Pali coast and Waimea Canyon with small numbers also found in Wainiha Valley (81 Federal Register 67786).

The band-rumped storm-petrel only occurs at PMRF as it flies over the installation while moving between inland breeding sites and offshore feeding areas. Two band-rumped storm petrels were recovered at PMRF, one in 2008 and one in 2011, due to light attraction and fallout (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2016a).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. The first confirmed documented nesting by the species was in 2015 when two active band-rumped storm petrel nests were discovered on the north slope of Mauna Loa at nearly 7,000 ft above sea level within the boundaries of the Army’s Pohakuloa

Training Area. Nesting has also been observed at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park (81 Federal Register 67786; Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b). The species may occasionally fly over the training study area along the Kona coast on its way to and from offshore foraging areas.

Hawaiian Petrel (*Pterodroma phaeopygia sandwichensis*)

Listed by the USFWS in 1967 as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Preservation Act (later to become the ESA in 1973), the Hawaiian petrel (Hawaiian common name 'ua'u) currently breeds in high elevation colonies primarily on east Maui; on Mauna Loa, in Waimanu Valley in the Kohala Mountains, and Hawaii Volcanoes National Park's Kahuku Unit on Hawaii Island; on Lanai; and on northwestern Kauai. Breeding Hawaiian petrels make their inland flights after dusk and their seaward flight pre-dawn. Predation by nonnative animals on nests and adults during the breeding season is the greatest threat to the Hawaiian petrel. Attraction of adults and fledglings to artificial lights, and collision with structures and utility lines, are also considered serious threats (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2017a).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. From 2007–2015 a single Hawaiian Petrel was found grounded at PMRF due to light attraction and fallout. It is estimated that cumulatively, over the fall fledging season, a significant number of Hawaiian petrels pass over and near PMRF. An estimated mean of 92 shearwater/petrel targets per night and an estimated 5,128 shearwater/petrel targets were documented flying over or immediately adjacent to PMRF during a fall radar sampling period in 2015 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2016a).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. Similar to the band-rumped storm petrel that also breeds in high elevation areas of Hawaii, the Hawaiian petrel may occasionally fly over the training study area along the Kona coast on its way to and from offshore foraging areas.

Newell's Townsend's Shearwater (*Puffinus auricularis newelli*)

Listed by the USFWS in 1975 as a threatened species, the Newell's Townsend's shearwater (Hawaiian common name ao) is an endemic Hawaiian seabird found on Kauai, Hawaii, and Maui, with 90 percent of the population found on Kauai. A colonial, nocturnal burrow and crevice nester at high elevations, the Newell's Townsend's shearwater makes its inland flights after dusk and its seaward flight pre-dawn. The breeding season for the Newell's Shearwater runs from April to November. The species, much like other nocturnal seabirds in the islands, is threatened by predation from non-native mammals, collision with powerlines, light attraction, and fallout (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2017b).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. On Kauai, fallout for this species has occurred on an annual basis at PMRF with 29 birds having been grounded as a result of light attraction and fallout at the facility from 2010–2016. It is estimated that, cumulatively over the fall fledging season, a significant number of Newell's Townsend's shearwaters pass over and near PMRF. An estimated mean of 92 shearwater/petrel targets per night and an estimated 5,128 shearwater/petrel targets were documented flying over or immediately adjacent to PMRF during a fall radar sampling period in 2015 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2016a).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. Similar to the band-rumped storm petrel and Hawaiian petrel that also breed in high elevation areas of Hawaii, the Newell's Townsend's shearwater may occasionally fly over the training study area along the Kona coast on its way to and from offshore foraging areas.

Short-eared Owl (*Asio flammeus sandwichensis*)

The Hawaiian short-eared owl (Hawaiian common name pueo) is not listed under the ESA but is listed by the State of Hawaii as endangered only on Oahu (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b). However, the species is protected under the MBTA on all islands.

The Hawaiian short-eared owl is an endemic subspecies of the short-eared owl that is found worldwide. Found on all the Main Hawaiian Islands from sea level to 8,000 ft, the species is thought to have colonized the Hawaiian Islands sometime after the arrival of Polynesians. Unlike most owls, the short-eared owl is active during the day and is commonly seen hovering or soaring over open areas where it preys primarily on small mammals, and occasionally birds (Snetsinger et al. [1994] and Mostello [1996] as cited in Na Pua Makani Power Partners [2016]). They occur in a variety of habitats, including wet and dry forests, but are most common in open habitats such as grasslands, shrublands, and montane parklands, including urban areas and those actively managed for conservation. Constructed by females, nests have been found throughout the year and are comprised of simple scrapes on the ground lined with grasses and feather down. Young may fledge from nest on foot before they are able to fly and depend on their parents for approximately two months. Threats to the species are likely the same factors that threaten other native Hawaiian birds, including loss and degradation of habitat and predation by introduced mammals. Because short-eared owls nest on the ground, their eggs and young are vulnerable to predation by rats, feral cats, and the small Indian mongoose.

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. Short-eared owls are known to occur within or in the vicinity of the Kahuku Training Area, Makua Military Reservation, JBPHH (including the Lualualei Annex), Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station, and MCBH (Kahuku Wind Power LLC., 2010, 2017; Na Pua Makani Power Partners, 2016; The Pueo Project, 2018; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2015; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a; U.S. Marine Corps, 2011). They are expected to occur within all portions of the Oahu training study area in appropriate nesting and foraging habitat (e.g., open areas, particularly grasslands, wetlands, coastal dunes, and rangelands).

White Tern (*Gygis alba*)

The white tern (Hawaiian common name manu o ku) is not listed under the ESA but is listed by the State of Hawaii as threatened (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b). The white tern that breeds throughout the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and on Oahu. Not as colonial or social as most other terns, it prefers to nest in loosely associated groups or singly, typically near coastal foraging areas. White terns remain paired for several seasons and often return to the same nest site year after year. No nest is constructed and a single egg is laid wherever a suitable depression is found, typically on tree branches, buildings or other man-made structures, rock ledges, or on the ground. In Hawaii, white terns breed year round, with some pairs successfully raising two or three broods per year. Fledglings are dependent on adults for up to two months. White terns often join mixed species feeding flocks where they feed on mostly juvenile goatfish and flying fish by dipping the surface or surface diving. White terns typically remain near their breeding sites year round, seldom venturing far from shore. Like all seabirds, adults and nests are susceptible to predation by rats and feral cats (Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, 2015b).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. White terns commonly nest in Honolulu, from Sand Island in the west, to Interstate H1 to the north, and east to Waiaiae, northeast of Diamond Head (Whiteterns.org, 2018). They have also been observed at the Pearl Harbor National Wildlife Refuge Honouliuli and Waiawa Units and MCBH (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a; U.S. Marine Corps, 2011).

3.3.2.3.4 Special-Status Invertebrates

Yellow-faced Bees (*Hylaeus* spp.)

Listed by the USFWS as endangered in 2016, seven endemic species of bees in the genus *Hylaeus* historically occurred on the Main Hawaiian Islands except for Kauai and Niihau: *H. anthracinus*, *H. longiceps*, *H. facilis*, *H. assimulans*, *H. hiliaris*, *H. mana*, and *H. kuakea*. Commonly known as yellow-faced bees or masked bees for their yellow-to-white facial markings, they were found in a variety of habitats ranging from coastal to lowland dry and lowland mesic habitats. The coastal ecosystem includes mixed herblands, shrublands, and grasslands, from sea level to 980 ft elevation, generally within a narrow zone above the influence of waves to within 330 ft inland. The lowland dry ecosystem is found on all the main Hawaiian Islands and includes shrublands and forests generally below 3,300 ft elevation that receive less than 50 inches annual rainfall or are in otherwise prevailing dry substrate conditions. Areas consisting of predominantly native species in the lowland dry ecosystem are now rare and are best represented on the leeward sides of the islands. The lowland mesic ecosystem includes a variety of grasslands, shrublands, and forests, generally below 3,300 ft elevation, that receive 50-75 inches of annual rainfall (80 Federal Register 58820).

These bees are important pollinators of native Hawaiian plants, many of which are also endangered. Protection of these pollinators could aid the recovery of endangered Hawaiian plants. These bees require a habitat with a diversity of plants that flower throughout the year so that a consistent source of pollen and nectar is available. Many species nest in the ground, but some nest in hollow stems of plants; the availability of nest sites is another important habitat requirement for these animals (Schonberg et al., 2009a; Xerces Society, 2018).

Hawaiian yellow-faced bees are threatened by development (especially in coastal areas), fire, feral ungulates such as pigs, invasive ants, and the loss of native vegetation to invasive plant species. Because remnant populations of many species of Hawaiian yellow-faced bees are small and isolated, they are especially vulnerable to habitat loss, predation, stochastic events, and other changes to their habitat (Xerces Society, 2018).

Occurrence within the Kauai Training Study Area. Yellow-faced bees did not historically occur nor do they currently occur on Kauai (80 Federal Register 58820).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. All of the species except *H. hiliaris* historically occurred on Oahu and *H. assimulans* is considered extirpated from Oahu. Although *H. mana* was first recorded on Oahu in the leeward Koolau Mountains at an elevation of about 1,400 ft and *H. kuakea* in the Honouliuli Preserve in the Waianae mountains at an elevation of about 1,900 ft, there are no historical records of these species for Oahu (Schonberg et al., 2009a).

H. anthracinus is currently known only from Kaena Point Natural Area Reserve, along the Ka Iwi Scenic Shoreline, and at the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge (Schonberg et al., 2009c). Surveys conducted at MCBH in November 2016 and May 2017 confirmed *H. anthracinus* in coastal strand habitat of Pyramid Rock, North Beach, and Fort Hase (U.S. Marine Corps, 2017).

H. longiceps is currently known only from Kaena Point Natural Area Reserve and Kahuku Point. The species is found in relatively high densities in these areas on *Sesbania tomentosa* and tree heliotrope (*Heliotropium foertherianum* [= *Tournefortia argentea*]) (Magnacca & King, 2013; Schonberg et al., 2009d).

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. Of the seven yellow-faced bee species, only *H. anthracinus* was historically found on the Island of Hawaii. Currently, the species is known from three locations potentially within the training study area: Kona Coast State Park, Kaloko-honolohau National Historic Park, and Makalawena Beach (Schonberg et al., 2009c). Within these areas *H. anthracinus* are restricted to a 33 – 66-ft-wide corridor along the coast; they do not occur on sandy beaches or inland. They are, however, found on rocky shorelines with naupaka (*Scaevola* spp.) and tree heliotrope (Magnacca & King, 2013).

Orangeblack Hawaiian Damselyfly (*Megalagrion xanthomelas*)

Listed by the USFWS in 2016 as an endangered species, the endemic orangeblack Hawaiian damselyfly occurs in suitable aquatic habitat in coastal and lowland dry and lowland mesic habitats. Because of its ability to use a variety of aquatic habitats for breeding sites, it was considered Hawaii's most abundant damselyfly species. It was historically present on Nihau, Oahu, Lanai, Molokai, Maui, Hawaii, and possibly Kauai; the species is now extirpated on Maui and Kauai (81 Federal Register 67786).

The orangeblack Hawaiian damselyfly breeds primarily in coastal wetlands and lower or terminal stillwater reaches of perennial streams. In the absence of predators, especially introduced fish species, it can breed successfully in standing pools of intermittent mid-elevation streams, freshwater marshes, reservoirs, garden pools, and ornamental ponds. Adults do not disperse far from the nymphal habitat, and lay their eggs in the tissues of aquatic plants found in slow reaches of streams and in stream pools (Mazzacano, 2008).

The primary reason for the species listing is the loss of suitable aquatic habitat across all islands, including past and present land use and water management practices (e.g., agriculture, urban development, ground water development, and destruction of perched aquifer and surface water resources), habitat modification and destruction by feral ungulates (i.e., pigs, goats, axis deer), and predation by non-native fish, non-native aquatic invertebrates, and the non-native bullfrog (81 Federal Register 67786).

Occurrence within the Oahu Training Study Area. The species was believed to have been extirpated on Oahu until the discovery of a single population in 1994 on the grounds of the Tripler Army Medical Facility (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2014). Occurrences within suitable aquatic habitat within the Training Study Area is currently unknown.

Occurrence within the Island of Hawaii Training Study Area. Although the current status is not known, the species was known to occur in a number of coastal wetlands on Hawaii (Anaehoomalu Bay, Hawa Bay, Hilea Stream, Hilo, Honokohau, Kiholo Bay, Ninole Springs, Onomea Bay, Whittington Beach, Keaukaha, Kapoho, Honaunau, and Pahue Bay) (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2014). Honokohau is the only location that occurs within the Hawaii training study area.

3.3.2.3.5 Special-Status Marine Fish

Oceanic Whitetip Shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)

On December 29, 2016, NMFS published a proposed rule to list the oceanic whitetip shark as threatened (81 Federal Register 96304). On January 30, 2018, NMFS published the Final Rule listing this species as threatened and also concluded that critical habitat is not determinable because data sufficient to perform the required analyses are lacking (83 Federal Register 4153).

Oceanic whitetip sharks are found worldwide in warm tropical and subtropical waters between the 30° North and 35° South latitude near the surface of the water column (Young et al., 2016). Oceanic whitetips occur throughout the Central Pacific, including the Hawaiian Islands south to Samoa Islands and in the eastern Pacific from Southern California to Peru, including the Gulf of California. This species has a clear preference for open ocean waters, with abundances decreasing with greater proximity to continental shelves. Allen and Cross (Allen & Cross, 2006) categorized oceanic white tip sharks as holoepipelagic with individuals found mostly far from shore. Preferring warm waters near or over 68°F, and offshore areas, the oceanic whitetip shark is known to undertake seasonal movements to higher latitudes in the summer (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016) and may regularly survey extreme environments (deep depths, low temperatures) as a foraging strategy (Young et al., 2016). Oceanic whitetip sharks could occur in deep open ocean areas throughout the Hawaiian Islands and in the offshore portions of the training study areas.

Giant Manta Ray (*Manta birostris*)

The giant manta ray was proposed to be listed as a threatened species under ESA by NMFS on January 12, 2017 (82 Federal Register 3694). Based on the best scientific and commercial information available, including the status review report (Miller & Klimovich, 2016), and after taking into account efforts being made to protect these species, NMFS determined that the giant manta ray is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout a significant portion of its range. In January 2018, NMFS published the Final Rule listing this species as threatened and also concluded that critical habitat is not determinable because data sufficient to perform the required analyses are lacking (83 Federal Register 2916).

Giant manta rays are visitors to productive coastlines with regular upwelling, including oceanic island shores, and offshore pinnacles and seamounts. They utilize sandy bottom habitat and seagrass beds, as well as shallow reefs, and the ocean surface both inshore and offshore. The species ranges globally and is distributed in tropical, subtropical, and temperate waters. They migrate seasonally usually more than 600 miles, however are not likely across ocean basins (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2020b).

Giant manta rays are found throughout the Hawaiian Islands, including the training study area, and large aggregations are known to occur primarily along the Kona coast off the Island of Hawaii (Defenders of Wildlife, 2015). These aggregations are likely timed to peak seasonal abundances of prey, such as zooplankton.

3.3.2.3.6 Special-Status Marine Reptiles

Of the five sea turtle species that are found in Hawaiian waters or that nest on beaches within the Hawaiian Islands, all are designated as either threatened or endangered under the ESA. Information on sea turtle in-water occurrence and nesting and basking activities (green turtles only) within coastal waters of islands within the training study area are compiled from sea turtle stranding summaries (Murakawa, 2014; Richie et al., 2016) and map guides for basking and nesting activity (Parker et al., 2015), and summarized by Roberson et al. (2016).

Three species of sea turtles are known to occur in waters surrounding the islands within the training study area (Roberson et al., 2016): green, hawksbill, and olive ridley.

Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) Central North Pacific DPS

The green turtle was first listed under the ESA in 1978. In 2016, the NMFS and USFWS reclassified the species into 11 DPSs, which maintains federal protections while providing a more tailored approach for managers to address specific threats facing different populations. The geographic areas that include these DPSs are (1) North Atlantic Ocean, (2) Mediterranean Sea, (3) South Atlantic Ocean, (4) Southwest Indian Ocean, (5) North Indian Ocean, (6) East Indian Ocean – West Pacific Ocean, (7) Central West Pacific Ocean, (8) Southwest Pacific Ocean, (9) Central South Pacific Ocean, (10) Central North Pacific Ocean, and (11) East Pacific Ocean (81 Federal Register 20058). Only the Central North Pacific DPS occur within the training study area.

The green turtle is distributed worldwide across tropical and subtropical coastal waters generally between 45° north and 40° south. The optimal developmental habitats for late juveniles and foraging habitats for adults are warm shallow waters with abundant submerged aquatic vegetation and close to nearshore reefs or rocky areas (Holloway-Adkins, 2006; Seminoff et al., 2002). Climate change and ocean warming trends may impact the habitat and range of this species over time (Fuentes et al., 2013).

The green turtle is by far the most abundant sea turtle in Hawaiian waters and is present year round (Richie et al., 2016; Roberson et al., 2016). Green turtles nest on beaches within the training study area, while they feed and migrate throughout all waters off the Hawaiian Islands. Green turtles are reported to bask at 62 beaches within the Main Hawaiian Islands, with most of these reported locations on Oahu (34 percent) and Island of Hawaii beaches (31 percent) (Roberson et al., 2016). Nesting for green turtles are believed to be most numerous within the Main Hawaiian Islands on Kauai, with Kauai accounting for 40 percent of green turtle nesting activity mostly reported from the southern and western coasts of the island (including along PMRF beaches) (Dollar & Brock, 2007). Oahu accounts for 23 percent of nesting activities, with reports of regular nesting events (at least one report every year) at Police Beach and near Kahuku along the north and windward-facing coasts (Roberson et al., 2016).

Hawksbill Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*)

The hawksbill turtle is listed as endangered under the ESA (35 Federal Register 8491). While the current listing as a single global population remains valid, data may support separating populations, at least by ocean basin, under the DPS policy. The most recent status review document was released in 2013 by the NMFS and USFWS (National Marine Fisheries Service & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2013).

The hawksbill is the most tropical of the world's sea turtles, rarely occurring above 35° north or below 30° south (Witzell, 1983). While hawksbills are known to occasionally migrate long distances in the open ocean, they are primarily found in coastal habitats and use nearshore areas more exclusively than other sea turtles (Witzell, 1983). Hawksbill turtles are considered rare within Pearl Harbor, with one sighting reported in 2004 and another in 2008. No other sightings have been reported; the Navy conducted regular dive surveys in Pearl Harbor between 2000 and 2011 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a). No detections of hawksbills were reported during marine species surveys of Pearl Harbor from 2013 through 2015 (Ritchie, 2016).

Hawksbill turtles also nest on Hawaiian beaches and may be concentrated around the Island of Hawaii (particularly along the Hamakua Coast and eastern shores of the Island of Hawaii). Fewer than 20 hawksbills are estimated to nest in the Main Hawaiian Islands each year and, based on nesting data compiled by Roberson et al. (2016), hawksbill nesting does not occur on beaches within the training study area. A few females nest each year on Maui and Molokai and have been observed occasionally nesting on Oahu (Parker et al., 2009).

Olive Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*)

Olive ridley turtles that are found in the training study area are listed as threatened under the ESA (43 Federal Register 32800). Based on genetic data, the worldwide olive ridley population is composed of four main lineages: east India, Indo-Western Pacific, Atlantic, and eastern Pacific Ocean. Most olive ridley turtles found in Hawaiian waters are of the eastern Pacific Ocean lineage, with about a third from the Indo-Western Pacific lineage (National Marine Fisheries Service & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2014; Shankar et al., 2004).

Rare instances of nesting occur in the Hawaiian Islands, with the first olive ridley nest documented in 1985 at Paia, Maui. A second nest was recorded in Hilo, Hawaii, in 2002, and a third olive ridley nest was recorded at MCBH in 2009 (U.S. Marine Corps, 2017). None of these reported nesting locations are within the training study area. In contrast, offshore long-line fisheries interaction data in Hawaii suggest that approximately 19 percent of the sea turtles in offshore waters are olive ridleys (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a).

3.3.2.3.7 Special-Status Marine Mammals

False Killer Whale (*Pseudorca crasidens*) Main Hawaiian Islands Insular DPS

NMFS currently recognizes three stocks of false killer whale in Hawaiian waters: the Hawaii pelagic stock, the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands stock, and the Main Hawaiian Islands insular stock (Bradford et al., 2012; Bradford et al., 2015; Carretta et al., 2015; Forney et al., 2010; Oleson et al., 2010; 77 Federal Register 71260). The Main Hawaiian Islands insular stock (considered resident to the Main Hawaiian Islands consisting of Kauai, Oahu, Molokai, Lanai, Kahoolawe, Maui, and Hawaii) is listed as endangered as a DPS under the ESA (Carretta et al., 2017a). The other two stocks of false killer whales in Hawaii, which are not listed under the ESA, are not discussed further.

Critical habitat was designated in July 2018 (83 Federal Register 35062), and a recovery plan is still under development (82 Federal Register 51186). Designated critical habitat creates a zone around the Main Hawaiian Islands, from west of Niihau east to Hawaii, in water depths from 45 to 3,200 m (83 Federal Register 35062). These areas contain the physical and biological features needed for the conservation and recovery of the species: (1) prey species of sufficient quantity, quality, and availability to support individual growth, reproduction, and population growth; (2) waters free of pollutants of a type and amount harmful to the false killer whale; and (3) habitat free of anthropogenic noise that would significantly impair the value of the habitat for false killer whale use or occupancy development. The following DoD areas in the training study area are excluded from the designated critical habitat based on national security impacts: PMRF offshore ranges (including the Shallow Water Training Range, the Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range, and the Barking Sands Underwater Range Extension), Warning Area 188, Fleet Operational Readiness Accuracy Check Site Range, and the Shipboard Electronic Systems Evaluation Facility. The Ewa Training Minefield and the Naval Defensive Sea Area are precluded from the critical habitat designation because they are managed under the JBPHH INRMP (83 Federal Register 35062).

Individuals of the insular stock use habitats surrounding the main Hawaiian islands and show habitat use patterns closely associated with the islands, generally within 40 kilometers of the main Hawaiian Islands, but ranging up to 140 kilometers. This stock also relies on the submerged habitats around the main Hawaiian islands for its major activities of foraging (primarily in the pelagic areas of the submerged habitat), socializing, and reproducing (82 Federal Register 51186).

Blue Whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*)

Blue whales were listed as endangered throughout their range on December 2, 1970 (35 Federal Register 18319). The blue whale inhabits all oceans and typically occurs near the coast, over the continental shelf; however, they are also found in oceanic waters, having been sighted, acoustically recorded, and satellite tagged in the eastern tropical Pacific (Ferguson, 2005; Stafford et al., 2004). The first published sighting record of blue whales near Hawaii is that of Berzin and Rovnin (1966), though two blue whales were seen with fin whales and an unidentified rorqual in November 2010 during a survey of Hawaiian U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) waters (Bradford et al., 2013); (Carretta et al., 2014). Four sightings have been made by observers on Hawaii-based longline vessels. Additional evidence that blue whales occur in the Hawaiian Islands comes from acoustic recordings made off Oahu and Midway Islands which showed bimodal peaks throughout the year, with central Pacific call types heard during winter and eastern Pacific calls heard during summer (Stafford et al., 2001).

Fin Whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*)

The fin whale was listed as endangered under the ESA on June 2, 1970. During the 20th century, more fin whale were taken by industrialized whaling than any other species (Rocha et al., 2014). In the North Pacific, NMFS recognizes three fin whale stocks: (1) a Northeast Pacific stock in Alaska; (2) a California, Oregon, and Washington stock; and (3) a Hawaii stock (Allen & Angliss, 2013; Carretta et al., 2014).

Although some fin whales migrate seasonally (Falcone et al., 2011; Mate et al., 2015; Mate et al., 2016), NMFS does not recognize fin whales from the Northeast Pacific stock as being present in Hawaii. There are known sightings from Kauai, Oahu, Hawaii, and a single stranding record from Maui (Mobley et al., 1996; Shallenberger, 1981; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011b). A single sighting was made during aerial surveys from 1993 to 1998, five sightings were made in offshore waters during a 2002 survey of waters within the Hawaiian EEZ, and there were two fin whales sighted during a 2010 survey of the same area (Barlow et al., 2006; Bradford et al., 2015; Carretta et al., 2010; Mobley et al., 1996; Mobley et al., 2000). A single juvenile fin whale was reported off Kauai during Navy sponsored marine mammal research in 2011 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011b). Based on sighting data and acoustic recordings, fin whales are likely to occur in Hawaiian waters mainly in fall and winter (Barlow et al., 2004; Barlow et al., 2006; Barlow et al., 2008; Klinck et al., 2015).

Sei Whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*)

The sei whale was listed as endangered under the ESA on December 2, 1970. A recovery plan for the sei whale was completed in 2011 and provides a research strategy for obtaining data required to estimate population abundance and trends, and to identify factors that may be limiting the recovery of this species (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2011a). Sei whales in Hawaii are assigned to the Hawaii stock and along the U.S. west coast (Carretta et al., 2017b). Sei whales are distributed far out to sea in temperate regions of the world and do not appear to be associated with coastal features. The most recent stock assessment for this species estimates a minimum of 93 sei whales are within the Hawaiian Islands EEZ (Carretta et al., 2014).

Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*)

The sperm whale has been listed as endangered since 1970 under the precursor to the ESA (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2009). Sperm whales are divided into three stocks in the Pacific; only the Hawaii and California/Oregon/Washington stock occurs within the training study area.

Sperm whales occur in Hawaii waters and are one of the more abundant large whales found in that region (Baird et al., 2003; Barlow, 2006; Bradford et al., 2017; Mobley et al., 2000). A total of 21 sperm whale sightings were made during a summer/fall 2002 shipboard survey of waters within the U.S. EEZ of the Hawaiian Islands, although only four of these sightings were around the Main Hawaiian Islands (Barlow, 2006). During a follow-up survey conducted in 2010, there were 41 sperm whale sightings, mainly concentrated in offshore areas in the northwestern portion of the U.S. EEZ of the Hawaiian Islands (Bradford et al., 2017). Based on predictive habitat-based density models derived from line-transect survey data collected between 1997 and 2012 within the central North Pacific, relatively high densities of sperm whales are predicted within the U.S. EEZ of the Hawaiian Islands during the summer and fall, particularly in the northwest Hawaiian islands (Forney et al., 2015). In 2015, acoustic detections of sperm whales occurred over the abyssal plain to the south of Oahu and did not seem to be related to bathymetric features such as seamounts (Klinck et al., 2015), while the number of sperm whales in the main Hawaiian islands remains low (Forney et al., 2015). Sperm whales have a preference for deep waters (Baird, 2013; Jefferson et al., 2015) and are unlikely to occur in the training study areas.

Hawaiian Monk Seal (*Neomonachus schauinslandi*)

The Hawaiian monk seal was listed as endangered under the ESA in 1976 (41 Federal Register 51611) and is listed as depleted under the MMPA. The species is considered a high priority for recovery, based on the high magnitude of threats, the high recovery potential, and the potential for economic conflicts while implementing recovery actions (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2007, 2011b, 2016a). Hawaiian monk seals are managed as a single stock. There are six main reproductive subpopulations: French Frigate Shoals, Laysan Island, Lisianski Island, Pearl and Hermes Reef, Midway Island, and Kure Atoll in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands. There are small numbers of monk seals also occurring across the main Hawaiian Islands. In 2013 there were an estimated minimum of 179 individuals in the main Hawaiian Islands; the total population based on those counted in the Northwest Hawaiian Islands is estimated to be 909 individuals (Carretta et al., 2017a). The approximate area encompassed by the northwestern Hawaiian Islands was designated as the Papahānaumokuākea National Marine Monument in 2006, in part to protect the habitat of the Hawaiian monk seal.

A recovery plan for the Hawaiian monk seal was completed in 1983 and is undergoing revision (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2007, 2011b, 2016a). Due to the proximity of the monk seal to human development, commerce, recreation, and culture, the 2007 revised recovery plan included a recommendation to develop a management plan specifically addressing issues in the main Hawaiian Islands. In response to that recommendation, a “Main Hawaiian Islands Monk Seal Management Plan” was developed.

NMFS designated critical habitat for the Hawaiian monk seal on beaches and offshore areas for all of the islands included in the training study area (Figure 3-10 through Figure 3-18). There are no recent sightings of monk seals within Pearl Harbor, but historic sightings suggest that they periodically enter Pearl Harbor (Johanos et al., 2015). The training study areas overlaps with critical habitat designated for the Hawaiian monk seal. Where designated, Hawaiian monk seal critical habitat in the main Hawaiian Islands includes terrestrial habitat that extends 5 m inland from the shoreline between designated boundary points. The final rule designating the critical habitat for Hawaiian monk seals included the following essential features (80 Federal Register 50926): (1) terrestrial areas and adjacent shallow, sheltered aquatic areas with characteristics preferred by monk seals for pupping and nursing, (2) marine areas from 0 to 200 m in depth that support adequate prey quality and quantity for juvenile and adult monk seal foraging, and (3) significant areas used by monk seals for hauling out, resting, or molting.




Figure 3-10: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat Within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: Kauai




Figure 3-11: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat Within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: South Oahu




Figure 3-12: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat Within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: Windward Oahu




Figure 3-13: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat Within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: West Oahu




Figure 3-14: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: North Oahu




Figure 3-15: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: Molokai




Figure 3-16: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: Lanai




Figure 3-17: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: Maui




Figure 3-18: Hawaiian Monk Seal Critical Habitat within and Adjacent to the Training Study Area: Island of Hawaii

3.3.3 Environmental Consequences

This analysis focuses on wildlife or vegetation types that are important to the function of the ecosystem or are protected under federal or state law or statute. The Navy has identified three primary potential stressors from the proposed action that may impact biological resources and are described below:

1. **Physical Presence.** The physical presence of submersibles, swimmers, surface vessels, and trainees on land may cause temporary behavioral impacts on animal species.
2. **Acoustic Stressors.** Some training activities would generate noise in the environment, such as the use of surface vessels, vehicles, simulated munitions, and aircraft (e.g., sonar navigational devices similar commercial fish finders, sUAS, tiltrotor aircraft, and helicopters).
3. **Physical Disturbance and Strike.** Training activities described in this EA may directly contact or strike a species.

A number of activity-specific protection measures, installation-specific natural resource training constraints, and other factors reduce the potential impacts of stressors on biological resources and are summarized below. These measures are common to all alternatives analyzed in this EA.

Activity-specific Protection Measures. In order to reduce the potential impacts of the stressors from the proposed action, training activities are designed with activity-specific protection measures that ensure compliance with existing agreements between the Navy and regulatory agencies. Examples of these measures include watch-out and avoidance procedures for marine mammals in water and on land, as well as avoiding potential impacts on seagrass beds by avoiding sensitive areas and timing of activities (e.g., avoiding low tides for some sensitive locations). In addition, trainees reference the PMAP Mitigation Report for in-water training activities, and reference other restrictions during training activities on land. PMAP is a decision support and situational awareness software tool that the Navy uses to facilitate compliance with mitigation measures when conducting certain training activities. PMAP ensures that trainees involved in an activity are aware of the mitigation requirements and that all mitigations are implemented appropriately. For example, operators are required to obtain a PMAP Mitigation Report prior to each training cycle. Specific mitigation measures for in-water activities are discussed in more detail under each resource area where PMAP is applicable.

Location-specific Natural Resource Training Restrictions. Proposed training activities would adhere to location-specific training restrictions defined in installation INRMPs (for DoD-owned properties) and land use and real estate agreements for any non-DoD properties where training activities would occur. INRMP restrictions are the result of stewardship and compliance actions in consultation with USFWS and NMFS for other military proposed actions. These training constraints are also adhered to for training activities and are considered in the analysis of potential impacts of the proposed action. These constraints are discussed in the following analyses for potential impacts of the proposed training activities. For activities that may occur on non-DoD properties, sensitive ecological resources may be defined in land use and real estate agreements. For example, training activities that may occur on state parks would be by agreement with the Hawaii DLNR State Parks Division. Training activities would be consistent with management objectives of individual parks, including prohibiting training in sensitive areas containing important natural and cultural resources.

Biosecurity SOPs. Biosecurity planning is a standard operating procedure during exercise planning and execution. All training events would be conducted in accordance with existing military training procedures, approved SOPs, and protective mitigation measures that are in place to avoid or minimize the potential for biosecurity concerns. NSO personnel would follow site-specific recommendations in

Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, Army, and USCG installations in Hawaii, where activity planners and resource managers have a suite of recommendations to reduce, to the maximum extent practical, the transport, introduction, and establishment of potentially invasive species. Other recommendations may be sourced from the Navy-funded *Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii*, completed in 2015. Volume I, Appendix K of the biosecurity plan addresses general biosecurity recommendations for the State of Hawaii, and Appendix M includes recommendations for U.S. DoD activities. Volume II includes a risk assessment for potential introductions of invasive species to freshwater environments, Volume III includes a risk assessment for marine environments, and Volume IV includes a risk assessment for potential introductions on land in terrestrial environments (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015a).

Host installations and property owners/managers are responsible for relaying any installation-specific biosecurity instructions. For example, biosecurity concerns may be identified in land use and real estate agreements for activities that may occur on state parks and other non-DoD properties. Site-specific instructions for Navy, Marine Corps, USCG, and Army installations in Hawaii may also be applicable for non-DoD properties. These same instructions would be followed to the maximum extent practicable in areas not under DoD jurisdiction. Because of the types of training activities discussed in this EA, and with biosecurity procedures actively in place, the potential for invasive species transport and spread associated with the proposed training activities is not analyzed as a potential stressor on biological resources.

Siting for Potentially Invasive Training Activities. Siting of certain activities is an important consideration for the analysis of potential impacts on biological resources. For example, the use of simulated munitions would only occur at specific locations during simulated building clearance training activities, in existing structures and occasionally outdoors. These structures are located in previously developed areas, and the noise generated from simulated munitions would not likely impact biological resources in any measurable way. For those activities that would occur outside, the noise generated from firing the simulated munition would be similar to that of firing an air rifle or slamming a car door and significantly less than the noise produced from firing actual live rounds. It also would not likely impact biological resources in any measurable way. Training locations for sUAS are sited only on DoD and USCG properties or in already-approved airspace. These siting restrictions for potentially disturbing training activities reduces the potential for biological resources to be exposed to noise-related stressors.

Low Impact/Minimally Invasive Training Activities. Training activities considered in this EA are designed to be minimally invasive. Potential impacts from stressors on biological resources are minimized by the nature and objectives of the training activity. In addition, the stressors that would potentially impact biological resources are similar to factors that may alert potential adversaries and non-combatants in real-world operations.

3.3.3.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX for DoD and non-DoD land and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. NSW activities that occurred in the Hawaii region under the various Records of CATEX and the HSTT EIS/OEIS would have no adverse effects with regard to biological resources. Therefore, no significant impacts on biological resources would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.

3.3.3.2 Alternative 1

3.3.3.2.1 Terrestrial Biological Resources

Terrestrial Vegetation, Including Special-Status Plants

The stressor analyzed for potential impacts on terrestrial vegetation is physical disturbance and strike. Foot traffic during training exercises and vegetation management to maintain landing zones are the only activities that would introduce physical disturbance and strike stressors for terrestrial vegetation. Physical presence and acoustic stressors are not applicable to terrestrial vegetation. Secondary stressors are not analyzed because terrestrial vegetation would not be impacted by temporary impacts on water quality.

Physical Disturbance and Strike. There is the potential for trainees to step on vegetation as they move through an area. Because the goal of training is for the trainees to be in the field undetected, the environment would be minimally disturbed and materials (e.g., gear and trash) would not be left behind. In addition, identical travel routes would be rarely used; the level of foot traffic associated with each group would not wear paths in the training study area. Training activities on DoD and USCG property would be in compliance with installation INRMPs, and sensitive biological resources would be identified and avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Similarly, land use and real estate agreements would also identify sensitive biological resources within state parks and other non-DoD properties. These areas would be avoided in accordance with land use and real estate agreements.

Existing vegetation management (mowing grass) would be continued at areas proposed for landing zone and drop zone training activities (JBPHH Region: Pearl City Peninsula, Ford Island; North Oahu Region: Kanies (drop zone only); and West Oahu Region: Lualualei Annex). To maintain safe and accessible helicopter landing zone and drop zone training at Waipio Peninsula (JBPHH Region), minor vegetation removal is required (i.e., selective cutting of larger non-native brush and trees). Processing of cut vegetation is required to use the JBPHH's green waste protocol to prevent the spread of the coconut rhinoceros beetle (*Oryctes rhinoceros*) (Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, 2016).

Proposed training activities within the West Oahu Region portion of the training study area at Lualualei Annex and Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station would overlap the occurrence of four endangered plant species: *Marsilea villosa*, *Cyperus trachysanthos*, *Abutilon menziesii*, and *Bidens amplexens*. There is no critical habitat within the Lualualei Annex or Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station training study areas. Because of the non-intrusive nature of proposed training that would occur within the Lualualei Annex and Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station training study areas, and because trainees would avoid areas that may support individual listed plant species identified in the JBPHH INRMP and by the installation Natural Resources Manager, there would be no significant impacts on individual plants with implementation of Alternative 1.

On Kauai, over-the-beach training would overlap 196 acres of designated critical habitat for *P. niihauense* and 110 acres for *S. tomentosa* within Polihale State Park. Both species are known to occur only within state-owned land at Polihale State Park (68 Federal Register 9116). Although designated critical habitat occurs within four areas on PMRF, proposed training activities would not occur within these areas. Because of the non-intrusive nature of proposed over-the-beach training that would occur in critical habitat within Polihale State Park, and because trainees would avoid areas that may support individual *P. niihauense* and *S. tomentosa* identified in the real estate agreements between the Navy and the Hawaii DLNR State Parks Division, there would be no significant impacts on individual *P. niihauense* and *S. tomentosa* or associated critical habitat with implementation of Alternative 1.

Impact Summary. Impacts on vegetation from Alternative 1 are expected to be minimal, short term, and temporary due to the following: relatively low intensity of the impacts, localized nature of the impacts, infrequent nature of the impacts, and brief duration of the activities (Table 2-2). Overall, the non-invasive nature of the NSO training activities (e.g., no live-fire, no construction, no digging, no fires, no human waste) would have minimal effects on terrestrial vegetation because of the short duration, infrequency of occurrence, and low intensity of the proposed training activities. Because the goal of training is for the trainees to be in the field undetected, the environment would be minimally disturbed and materials (e.g., gear and trash) would not be left behind. In addition, identical travel routes would rarely be used; the level of foot traffic associated with each group would not wear paths in the training study area. Long-term consequences to terrestrial vegetation are not expected under Alternative 1. Therefore, no significant impacts on vegetation would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

ESA Conclusion. Pursuant to the ESA, proposed training activities, as described above, may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed plants and associated critical habitat. As required by ESA section 7(a)(2), the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat. On March 14, 2019 and March 16, 2021, the USFWS issued letters concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and critical habitat under their jurisdiction within the action area (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*). As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the USFWS regarding potential impacts on ESA-listed terrestrial species and critical habitat within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1.

Terrestrial Wildlife, Including Special-Status Species

Physical presence, physical disturbance and strike, and acoustic stressors were analyzed because these stressors may potentially impact terrestrial wildlife resources. Potential impacts on migratory birds and the ESA-listed Hawaiian coot, Hawaiian moorhen, Hawaiian duck, Hawaiian stilt, and Hawaiian goose are assessed below. In addition, there is potential for the ESA-listed Hawaiian hoary bat, Newell's Townsend's shearwater, band-rumped storm petrel, and Hawaiian petrel to fly through areas where training activities would occur on Kauai and the Island of Hawaii.

Physical Presence. If trainees are in close proximity to birds, birds may flush or flee from nests and roosts, stop normal activities (e.g., foraging), or may not react at all. Once the trainees have passed and the perceived threat is gone, flushed birds would return to previous activities (Wright et al., 2007). The Hawaiian hoary bat, with year-round occurrence likely at all the proposed land training areas, may forage in close proximity to trainees during night-time and early evening training activities. Responses from bats, if any, may include moving to other foraging areas away from the training activity. Because the goal of training is for trainees to be in the field undetected, the environment would be minimally disturbed. In addition, identical travel routes would not be used; trainees would not pass through the same areas in the training study area. Because these are trainees in training, support vehicles are on standby for safety and may disturb birds; however, the support vehicles would stay on established roads. These disturbances are expected to be short term and infrequent.

On military installations where land training activities are proposed, a number of mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce potential training impacts on terrestrial wildlife species. JBPHH, MCBH, and PMRF support a number of ESA-listed waterbird species. Within the land portions of the

training study area where training activities are proximate to sensitive wildlife resources, the Navy continues to prohibit some activities within 1,000 m of posted signs marking the presence of rare and protected plant and animal species or restoration projects. In addition, night training would use no or minimal lighting, which would avoid visual disturbance to nocturnal species (e.g., shearwaters). Training activities would be consistent with training area restrictions defined in installation INRMPs, where training activities would either be limited or prohibited to avoid potential impacts on sensitive ecological resources (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2010b, 2011a, 2012; U.S. Marine Corps, 2011, 2017). Where areas are not clearly marked, coordination with installation environmental personnel would occur prior to training activities. For example, at PMRF, training activities would be coordinated with installation personnel to avoid locations of Laysan albatross and wedge-tailed shearwater nests and other areas where the birds may be present.

For activities that may occur on non-DoD properties, sensitive ecological resources may be defined in land use and real estate agreements. For example, training activities that may occur on state parks would be by agreement with the Hawaii DLNR State Parks Division. Training activities would be consistent with management objectives of individual parks, including prohibiting training in sensitive areas containing important natural and cultural resources.

Physical Disturbance and Strike. Helicopters used during training activities may present strike risk and physical disturbance from rotor wash for ESA-listed and migratory birds and Hawaiian hoary bats. Drop zones and landing zones are proposed for use during training activities on Oahu. These sites are at locations on: JBPHH Region: JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula, Ford Island, Waipio Peninsula; North Oahu Region: Kanies (drop zone only); Windward Oahu Region: MCBH and West Oahu Region: Lualualei Annex. Sites proposed for drop zones and landing zones are in previously disturbed areas that are either abandoned paved areas overgrown with vegetation (e.g., former runway on Ford Island), previously disturbed areas now overgrown with shrubby non-native vegetation (e.g., kiawe and haole koa), or mowed areas. None of these sites are in wetland areas where waterbirds would be expected to nest and forage, however, waterbirds and other birds may transit through the area while a helicopter approaches a landing zone or drop zone. In addition, access to proposed drop zones within the marine environment offshore of MCBH may impact migratory birds, particularly seabird colonies, with the potential for bird strikes or disturbance to adults and young at the nests. In accordance with standard Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard measures for aircrew safety and to avoid and minimize impacts on migratory birds and ESA-listed species, proposed aircraft activities would avoid all known seabird colonies and wetland areas that support migratory birds and ESA-listed waterbirds at JBPHH, PMRF, and MCBH by 500 ft AGL and 1,000 ft laterally. Strike risk for bats would only occur while bats are actively foraging in open areas in and around landing zones (during twilight and nighttime training activities). Behavioral responses would likely include fleeing an area or moving away from the disturbance. Therefore, strike risk of birds or bats by helicopters would be considered unlikely.

Proposed sUAS training would be restricted to DoD and USCG installations on Oahu and Kauai within authorized airspace, including restricted areas and warning areas. There is a strike risk of birds and bats when these species are in the same airspace as sUAS, which typically operate below 3,500 ft elevation. Bats typically fly lower to the ground and would only be at risk for strikes when they are active (primarily at dusk and at night), and when sUAS operate at lower altitudes and are taking off or landing. Proposed training activities using sUAS would occur routinely at locations already used by other military and USCG aircraft. Birds and bats are already exposed to, and likely habituated to, flight training activities in these locations. Therefore, strike risk by sUAS would be considered minimal.

Trainees traversing beaches where bird nesting occurs have the potential to step on nests (crushing eggs or recently hatched chicks, or destroying nests, which may induce adult birds to abandon nests). Some nests are more difficult to detect. The potential for foot traffic during training to step on nests is not likely to occur for the same reasons specified above for physical presence (e.g., installation-specific training constraints specified in INRMPs and communicated to operators by natural resource specialists, and training constraints specified in land use and real estate agreements for non-DoD properties). Similarly, potential strikes by surface vehicles used to support training activities are considered unlikely as vehicles would drive within specified speed limits on designated existing roads.

Existing vegetation management (mowing grass) would be continued at areas proposed for landing zone and drop zone training activities (JBPHH Region: Pearl City Peninsula, Ford Island; North Oahu Region: Kanes (drop zone only); and West Oahu Region: Lualualei Annex). To maintain safe and accessible helicopter landing zone and drop zone training at Waipio Peninsula (JBPHH Region), minor vegetation removal is required (e.g., selective cutting of larger brush and trees). Trees over 15 ft in height would not be felled during the endangered Hawaiian Hoary bat pupping season (approximately June 1–September 15). Processing of cut vegetation is required to use the JBPHH's green waste protocol to prevent the spread of the coconut rhinoceros beetle (*Oryctes rhinoceros*) (Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, 2016).

Acoustic Stressors. Numerous studies have documented that wild animals respond to human-made noise (Bowles et al., 1995; Goldstein et al., 2005; Krausman et al., 1998; Larkin et al., 1996; National Park Service, 1994; Weisenberger et al., 1996). The manner in which animals respond to noise depends on several factors, including life history characteristics of the species, characteristics of the noise source, loudness, how suddenly the sound occurs (onset rate), presence/absence of associated visual stimuli, distance from the noise source, and previous exposure to the sound. Noise may cause physiological or behavioral responses that reduce the animals' fitness or ability to grow, survive, and reproduce successfully. The potential effects of noise on wildlife can take many forms, including changing habitat use and activity patterns, increasing stress response, decreasing immune response, reducing reproductive success, increasing predation risk, degrading communication, and damaging hearing if the sound is sufficiently loud or prolonged (Larkin et al., 1996).

Studies on the effects of aircraft noise on wildlife have been predominantly conducted on mammals and birds. Some studies have shown that the responses of large mammals to aircraft noise are transient and of short duration and suggest that animals acclimate to the sounds (Krausman et al., 1993; Krausman et al., 1998; Weisenberger et al., 1996). Similarly, the effect on raptors and other non-migratory birds (e.g., waterfowl, grebes) from aircraft low-level flights were found to be brief and not detrimental to reproductive success (Ellis et al., 1991; Grubb & Bowerman, 1997; Lamp, 1989; Smith et al., 1988).

A strong and consistent behavioral or physiological response is not necessarily indicative of negative consequences to individuals or to populations (Bowles, 1995; Larkin et al., 1996; National Park Service, 1994). For example, many of the reported behavioral and physiological responses to noise are within the range of normal adaptive responses to external stimuli, such as predation, that wild animals face on a regular basis. In many cases, individuals would return to homeostasis or a stable equilibrium almost immediately after exposure. The individual's overall metabolism and energy budgets would not be affected, assuming it had time to recover before being exposed again. If the individual does not recover before another exposure, physiological responses could be cumulative and lead to reduced fitness. However, it is also possible that an individual would have an avoidance reaction (i.e., move away from the noise source) to repeated exposure or habituate to the noise when repeatedly exposed.

A primary concern with implementation of the proposed action is that low-altitude overflights may cause physiological or behavioral responses that reduce the animals' fitness or ability to survive. High-noise events (like a low-altitude aircraft overflight or sudden sonic boom) may cause animals to startle or engage in escape or avoidance behaviors, such as flushing or running away. These activities impose an energy cost that, over the long term, may affect survival or growth. In addition, the animals may spend less time engaged in necessary activities like feeding, foraging, or caring for their young because they spend time in noise avoidance activity. However, most of the effects of noise are mild enough that they may never be detectable as changes in population size or population growth against the background of normal variation (Bowles, 1995). Many other environmental variables (e.g., predators, weather, changing prey base, ground-based human disturbance) may influence reproductive success and confound the ability to identify the ultimate factor in limiting productivity of a certain nest, area, or region.

The only noise source analyzed for potential impacts on terrestrial wildlife is the use of helicopters and sUAS. Helicopters typically operate below 3,000 ft AGL when supporting drop zone training activities utilizing parachutes and may occur as low as 5–100 ft AGL when supporting helicopter rope suspension techniques. This low altitude increases the likelihood that birds would respond to noise from helicopter overflights with reactions such as flushing (Stalmaster & Kaiser, 1997). Helicopters travel at slower speeds (less than 100 knots), which increases the duration of noise exposure compared to fixed-wing aircraft. Nearshore areas of the coast are the primary foraging habitat for many bird species. The presence of dense aggregations of birds associated with coastal habitats (including Pearl Harbor and inland wetlands within the training study area) is a potential concern during low-altitude helicopter activities. Although birds may be more likely to react to helicopters than to fixed-wing aircraft, Navy helicopter pilots avoid large flocks of birds to protect aircrews and equipment, thereby also reducing disturbance to birds.

In accordance with the MCBH Kaneohe Bay Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) Plan and the implementation of standard measures for aircrew safety, and to avoid and minimize impacts on migratory birds and ESA-listed species, proposed aircraft activities would avoid all known seabird colonies and wetland areas that support migratory birds and ESA-listed waterbirds at JBPHH and MCBH by 500 ft AGL and 1,000 ft laterally. Noise from drop zone activities and low-altitude helicopter overflights would only be expected to elicit short-term behavioral or physiological responses in exposed birds. Occasional startle or alert reactions to aircraft noise are not likely to disrupt major behavior patterns (such as migrating, breeding, feeding, and sheltering) or to result in serious injury to any birds.

Proposed sUAS training activities would occur during approximately 10 percent of the land-based training activities, and only on DoD and USCG property. Proposed sUAS training is not expected to adversely affect any wildlife species in and around the DoD or USCG property where sUAS would be used. In addition, many of the species that occur on military properties and around airfields are already exposed to, and likely habituated to, military flight training activities.

Impact Summary. Impacts on terrestrial wildlife resulting from physical presence, physical disturbance and strike, and acoustic stressors are expected to be minimal, short term, and recoverable based on the (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts, (4) brief duration of the activities, and (5) SOPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on sensitive species and their habitats. Overall, the non-invasive nature of the training activities (e.g., no live-fire, no construction, no digging, no fires, no human waste) would have minimal effects on terrestrial biological resources because of the short duration, infrequency of occurrence, and low

intensity of the proposed training activities. Training activities associated with the proposed action are low impact and activities would occur at infrequent intervals and for a brief duration of time. Because the goal of training is for the trainees to be in the field undetected, the environment would be minimally disturbed. In addition, identical travel routes would rarely be used; the level of foot traffic associated with each group would not wear paths in the training study area. For these reasons, long-term consequences to individuals or populations of terrestrial wildlife are not expected to result from the proposed activities under Alternative 1. Therefore, no significant impacts on terrestrial wildlife would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

MBTA Conclusion. A variety of bird species would be encountered in the training study area, including those listed under the MBTA. Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), with implementation of the aircraft flight restrictions listed above, impacts from proposed training activities under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on migratory bird populations.

ESA Conclusion. The proposed training activities may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect two species of yellow-faced bees (*Hylaeus anthracinus* and *H. longiceps*), orangeblack damselfly, Hawaiian coot, Hawaiian common gallinule, Hawaiian duck, Hawaiian stilt, Hawaiian goose, Hawaiian petrel, band-rumped storm petrel, Newell's Townsend's shearwater, Hawaiian hawk, Hawaiian hoary bat, and three species of sea turtles (green turtle, hawksbill turtle, and olive ridley turtle) when they occur in the terrestrial environment because these species may be exposed to physical disturbance and strike and acoustic stressors. As required by ESA section 7(a)(2), the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat. On March 14, 2019 and March 16, 2021, the USFWS issued letters concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed terrestrial species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*). As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the USFWS regarding potential impacts on ESA-listed terrestrial species and critical habitat within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1.

3.3.3.2.2 Marine Biological Resources

Marine Vegetation

Physical disturbance and strike is the only stressor from training activities that may impact marine vegetation. Other stressors, such as physical presence, are not analyzed because proposed training activities would not introduce these stressors to submerged marine vegetation, and acoustic stressors are not applicable to marine vegetation. For example, the proposed action does not include construction on undeveloped lands or permanent ground-disturbing activities over an undisturbed area, and the footprint of each training activity would not measurably change the water quality in any given area or result in turbidity that would affect the marine environment. There are no ESA-listed marine plant species within the training study area and no designated critical habitat for marine plants.

Physical Disturbance and Strike. Under Alternative 1, activities that involve vessels and personnel in the water and on the seafloor could impact marine vegetation present in the training study area. Such activities would include inflatable boat landings and foot traffic from trainees swimming from boats to shore and walking in the intertidal and beach zones. As a general practice, small inflatable boats used during activities land at the sandier areas where less vegetation is present to avoid damage to vessels.

The shoreline environment is also typically very dynamic because of its exposure to wave action and cycles of erosion and deposition. Marine vegetation disturbed by training activities would also be influenced by natural disturbances, such as waves, tide, current, and storm energy. Marine vegetation, if disturbed by training activities, is expected to recover shortly after the disturbance.

Impact Summary. Proposed training activities would have minimal impacts on submerged vegetation because the types of training activities that would occur in areas supporting marine vegetation (e.g., swimming, personnel insertions using small rubber craft) are minimally invasive to marine environments. Because marine vegetation is already adapted to natural disturbances, any disturbances from activities under Alternative 1 would not be expected to cause long-term or permanent impairment to the surrounding marine vegetation, particularly at the proposed training frequency. Therefore, no significant impacts on marine vegetation would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

Marine Invertebrates

Physical disturbance and strike stressors could potentially impact corals and marine invertebrates within the training study area and are analyzed below. Other stressors (physical presence and acoustic stressors) are not analyzed because introduction of these stressors would be limited, and some stressors (acoustic) would not apply to marine invertebrates. No ESA-listed marine invertebrates or associated designated critical habitat are found within the training study area.

Physical Disturbance and Strike. Under Alternative 1, small inflatable boat landings and foot traffic from trainees swimming from boats and submersibles to shore and walking in the intertidal and beach zones could impact marine invertebrates, such as corals, that are present in the training study area by damaging or removing those species during training activities. Recovery from potential damage could be slow depending on the species. However, as a general practice, small inflatable boats would be used during these activities and would be used more on sandy areas, where fewer invertebrates are present and where damage to the boats could be more readily avoided.

In the 2014 and 2015 Biological Opinions for the U.S. Navy's Training Exercises and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2014, 2015), NMFS determined that eight species of coral (*Acropora paniculata*, *Alevopora verrilliana*, *Pocillopora elegans* - Indo Pacific, *Euphyllia paraancora*, *Montipora dilatata*, *Montipora flabellata*, *Montipora turgescens*, and *Montipora patula* [verrilli]) that were proposed for listing at the time would not be affected by the proposed action (including amphibious warfare activities and NSO training activities) because of existing Navy SOPs that avoid impacts on corals. The applicable SOPs and mitigation measures listed in Section 2.6 (Table 2-6) would be implemented, therefore avoiding or minimizing potential impacts on corals.

Impact Summary. Proposed training activities would have minimal impacts on marine invertebrates because of the minimally invasive training activities and avoidance measures (e.g., timing of activities to avoid low tides and geographic restrictions on sensitive coral reef areas). Any disturbances from activities under Alternative 1 would not be expected to cause long-term or permanent impairment to the surrounding benthic habitats because any damage would likely be very small and localized. Therefore, no significant impacts on marine invertebrates would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

Marine Fish, Including Special-Status Species

Stressors analyzed below include physical presence, physical disturbance and strike, and acoustic stressors because of their potential to impact fishes in the training study area. There are two ESA-listed fish species, the oceanic whitetip shark and giant manta ray, within the training study area and no designated critical habitat for fishes. Numerous fish species are managed by the WPRFMC, and potential impacts on those species are analyzed below.

Physical Presence. Activities proposed under Alternative 1 that involve vessels, personnel, and parachute operations in the water could impact fish present in the training study area. Such activities would include landing on shore with small inflatable boats, moving through water in the submersible vehicle, foot traffic from trainees swimming from boats to shore, and trainees being deployed from aircraft into the water to conduct drop zone training activities (e.g., parachute operations, cast and recover, or helicopter rope suspension training). These activities are proposed to occur nearshore and in the waters off any one of the training locations, as well as other nearshore areas of the training study area. Water-based drop zone training activities are proposed at JBPHH and MCBH. Fish would likely only respond to trainees in the water by fleeing the area and return to normal activities (e.g., foraging, resting) after the training activity has concluded. These impacts would be short term and minor, with no long-term impacts on fish or fish populations in coastal waters where training activities would occur.

Physical Disturbance and Strike. Vessels do not normally collide with fish, most of which can detect and avoid them. One study on Barents Sea capelin (*Mallotus villosus*) behavioral responses to vessels showed that most adults exhibit avoidance responses to engine noise, sonar, depth finders, and fish finders, reducing the potential for vessel strikes (Jørgensen et al., 2004). Activities involving vessel movements occur intermittently and range in duration from a few minutes to a few hours. While vessel movements have the potential to expose fish occupying the water column to sound and general disturbance, potentially resulting in short-term behavioral or physiological responses, such responses would not be expected to compromise the general health or condition of individual fish.

Acoustic Stressors. Noise from submersible sonar, vessels, and aircraft has the potential to expose fish to sound and general disturbance, which could result in short-term temporary behavioral or physiological responses (e.g., avoidance, stress, increased heart rate) (Popper & Hawkins, 2016).

Submersibles use a sonar device to report depths to aid in navigation during a training activity. These devices have similar specifications to commercially available “fish finders” and other hand-held sonar devices, which typically generate frequencies over 200 kilohertz (kHz) and source levels less than 160 decibels (dB) reference 1 micropascal (dB re 1 μ Pa). In the NMFS’ 2014 and 2015 Biological Opinions of U.S. Navy’s Training Exercises and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2014, 2015), devices with these specifications are considered *de minimis* sources of sound in the water. For fishes, the frequencies over 200 kHz overlaps with the hearing sensitivities of some fish species (e.g., a few species of shad within the Clupeidae family), but the low-intensity sound levels generated by these devices, the rapid dissipation of high-frequency sonar in water, and the localized area of impacts are unlikely to impact fishes (Popper & Hawkins, 2016).

Fishes may be exposed to sound from vessel movement, which involves transits to and from ports to various locations within the training study area. Proposed training activities involve maneuvers by various types of surface ships, boats, small personal watercraft, and submarines (collectively referred to as vessels). Moderate- to low-level passive sound sources, including vessel noise, would not likely cause

any direct injury or trauma due to characteristics of the sounds and the moderate source levels. Training activities involving vessel movements would occur intermittently and are widely dispersed throughout the training study area. All fish species should be able to detect vessel noise due to its low-frequency content and their hearing capabilities, and exposure to vessel noise would only result in short-term behavioral or physiological responses (e.g., avoidance, stress).

Rotary-wing aircraft (helicopters) produce low-frequency sound and vibration (Pepper et al., 2003). Aircraft would pass quickly overhead and helicopters may hover for up to 15 minutes at a time at a distance of 5–15 ft above the water surface during water-based drop zone activities. Even though fish may be exposed to fixed-wing or helicopter aircraft-generated noise wherever aircraft overflights occur, the sound is primarily transferred into the water from air in a narrow cone under the aircraft. Fish would have to be at or near the surface at the time of an overflight to be exposed to significant sound levels.

Impact Summary. The risk of physical presence of trainees, physical disturbance or strike from vessels, and acoustic energy (noise) generated during training activities under Alternative 1 would be extremely low because (1) most fish can detect and avoid vessel (surface and submersible) and human movements, and (2) activities occur at infrequent intervals and for a brief duration of time. Potential impacts of exposure to vessels and noise generated by vessels are not expected to result in substantial changes to an individual's behavior, fitness, or species recruitment and are not expected to result in population-level impacts. Since impacts from these stressors would be unlikely, impacts on individual fish or fish populations would be negligible. Therefore, no significant impacts on marine fish would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

EFH Conclusion. As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and conducted consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. Pursuant to the EFH requirements of the MSA and implementing regulations, proposed training activities that involve vessels and personnel in the water could potentially impact EFH species and habitats present in the training study area. Such activities would include landing on shore with small inflatable boats, and foot traffic from trainees swimming from boats and submersibles to shore and walking in the intertidal and beach zones. These areas are typically very dynamic because of their exposure to wave action and cycles of erosion and deposition. Some temporary behavioral or physiological responses (e.g., avoidance, stress, increased heart rate) would occur from increased vessel and aircraft noise, but these impacts would be short term and temporary in nature. In addition, the physical presence of training activities in nearshore areas where EFH species and habitats occur could disturb, damage, or remove habitat used by EFH species. However, it is expected that most of these impacts would be temporary, and recovery would occur over a short period of time.

Disturbances from activities under Alternative 1 would also not be expected to cause long-term or permanent impairment to EFH because of the dynamic nature of these nearshore habitats, and BMPs and SOPs would be used to avoid impact on marine invertebrates, vegetation, and fish that are protected under EFH (see Table 2-6). These procedures include restricting vessel activity to high-tide periods to avoid direct impacts on corals when activities would occur over sensitive benthic habitats (other SOPs that would avoid impacts on other marine resources are described under sea turtles and marine mammals). Therefore, no significant impacts on EFH species or habitat would occur with implementation of Alternative 1. In addition, no direct or indirect changes to EFH that would have a considerable impact on waters, substrate, or prey necessary for spawning (fish, invertebrates, or vegetation), breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity of aquatic species would occur. The Navy has

determined that under Alternative 1 there would be no adverse effect on EFH within the training study area.

On June 28, 2019, NMFS concurred that the proposed training activities may have temporary effects on EFH and provided EFH conservation recommendations that would minimize adverse effects to EFH if fully implemented (refer to Section 3.3.3.3 below). The Navy responded on November 21, 2019 and agreed to implement the proposed conservation recommendations. Consultation for EFH under the MSA was completed on December 2, 2019 with receipt of a concurrence email from NMFS (see Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*). As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from NMFS regarding potential impacts on EFH within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1.

ESA Determination. Pursuant to the ESA, proposed training may affect oceanic whitetip shark and giant manta ray in all marine portions of the Training Study Area. As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a Biological Evaluation and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed marine fish species. On April 30, 2020, NMFS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*). As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from NMFS regarding potential impacts on ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1.

Sea Turtles

Physical presence, physical disturbance and strike, and acoustic stressors are analyzed below because they have the potential to impact sea turtles in the training study area. There are no critical habitat designations for sea turtle species within the training study area.

Physical Presence. Activities proposed under Alternative 1 that involve vessels, personnel, and parachute operations in the water could impact sea turtles present in the training study area. Such activities would include small vessel movements, in-water presence of trainees swimming to beaches, and trainees being deployed from aircraft into the water to conduct drop zone training activities (e.g., parachute operations, cast and recover, or helicopter rope suspension training). These activities are proposed to occur nearshore and in the waters off any one of the training locations, as well as other nearshore areas of the training study area. Water-based drop zone training activities are only proposed at JBPHH and MCBH. Sea turtle presence in the training study area would be common and occur in the same areas where training activities are proposed. Swimmer presence, boat traffic, and submersible use have the potential to disturb turtles and elicit an alerting, avoidance, or other behavioral reaction. As stated previously, minimal to no lighting is used during training activities, which avoids disturbance to nesting females and emergent hatchlings from artificial lighting.

Physical Disturbance and Strike. Sea turtles can detect approaching vessels, likely by sight rather than by sound (Bartol & Ketten, 2006). During water-based training, use of NSWC vessels such as small personal watercraft operated at high speeds within nearshore waters could present a relatively greater risk for strike because of the higher concentrations of sea turtles in these areas and the difficulty for vessel operators to avoid collisions when conducting high-speed activities. Vessel-related injuries to sea turtles are more likely to occur in areas with high boating traffic, such as harbors and marinas. NMFS maintains a sea turtle stranding database, which tracks stranding event locations and likely causes

(e.g., boat impacts, fishing gear interactions). Of the 176 sea turtle stranding events reported for sea turtles in 2015, 22 (12.5 percent) were from boat impacts (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015). Of the 22 strandings that likely resulted from boat impacts, 19 were from Oahu, 1 from Kauai, 1 from Maui, and 1 from the Island of Hawaii. Two of the 19 Oahu strikes were reported from Pearl Harbor (the NMFS database does not indicate if the strike was from a Navy vessel). Depending on the training location, the risk for vessel strike varies based on where the training activity would occur. During proposed water-based training activities, a crewman would act as a lookout during training evolutions on boats and support vessels to avoid sea turtles that may enter the area during training activities. During nighttime training, the lookout would be equipped with night vision goggles. If a sea turtle is observed in the vicinity of the training area when submersibles are used, the support vessel would signal the submersible for recall, or training may be shifted to avoid the sea turtle. If a sea turtle is in the immediate area of a training activity, the activity would cease until the sea turtle leaves the area. In some instances, canceling the training for the night may be necessary.

Strikes to sea turtles from water-based drop zone activities would be unlikely because safety personnel observe areas prior to activities taking place to ensure sea turtles and marine mammals are not present.

Over-the-beach training activities presents risks to sea turtle nests and hatchlings. SOPs that are captured in pre-activity planning and part of installation training restrictions include the following: (1) prior to conducting a landing exercise, an inspection and survey protocol includes a pre-landing survey (within one hour of the activity) of sea turtles on the beach and sea turtle nesting sites; (2) sea turtle nesting sites are marked, and no trespassing by persons or vehicles within 50 ft of the nest is permitted; and (3) should sea turtles be found on the beach, the landing activity is delayed until the animal(s) have voluntarily left the area or moved to another location free of such animals.

Acoustic Stressors. Noise from submersible sonar, vessels, and aircraft has the potential to expose sea turtles to sound and general disturbance, which could result in short-term temporary behavioral or physiological responses (e.g., avoidance, stress, increased heart rate). Submersibles use a sonar device to report depths to aid in navigation during a training activity. These devices have similar specifications to commercially available “fish finders” and other hand-held sonar devices, which typically generate frequencies over 200 kHz and source levels less than 160 dB re 1 μ Pa. In NMFS’ 2015 *Biological Opinion of U.S. Navy’s Training Exercises and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area* (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2014, 2015), devices with these specifications are considered *de minimis* sources of sound in the water. The proposed sonar devices are downward facing, which limits the volume of water that carries the high-frequency sound and sea turtles cannot hear frequencies as high as 200 kHz. In addition, the behavioral effects threshold for sea turtles used by NMFS is 175 dB or greater; therefore, no behavioral effects would be expected because the sonar devices would not exceed the source level threshold for behavioral effects.

Popper (2014) suggests that the relative risk of a sea turtle behaviorally responding to a continuous noise, such as vessel noise, is high when near a source (tens of meters), moderate when at an intermediate distance (hundreds of meters), and low at farther distances. Sea turtles exposed to noise generated from Navy vessels during training activities may not respond at all or exhibit brief startle dive reactions. For example, if a sea turtle is observed basking on the surface near a passing vessel, it is not clear that the individual would exhibit any reaction other than a brief startle and avoidance reaction, if they react at all. Rotary-wing aircraft (helicopters) produce low-frequency sound and vibration; most of the underwater sounds from aircraft would be strongest just below the surface and directly under the aircraft, and the amount of sound entering the ocean from aircraft would be very limited in duration,

sound level, and affected area. Some animals at or near the water surface may exhibit startle reactions to certain aircraft overflights if aircraft altitude is low. This could mean a hovering helicopter, for which the sight of the aircraft and water turbulence could also cause a temporary behavioral response.

Impact Summary. Impacts on sea turtles in water and on land are expected to be minimal, short term, and recoverable based on the (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts, (4) brief duration of the activities, and (5) SOPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on sea turtles in water, at basking locations, and on nesting beaches. For these reasons, long-term consequences to individuals or populations of sea turtles in the terrestrial and marine environment are not expected to result from the activities under Alternative 1. Therefore, no significant impacts on sea turtles would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

ESA Conclusion. Pursuant to the ESA, proposed training may affect green turtles, olive ridley, and hawksbill turtles in all marine portions of the training study area and over-the-beach training locations on Oahu and Kauai. As required by ESA section 7(a)(2), the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed sea turtle species within the terrestrial environment. On March 14, 2019, the USFWS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, nesting ESA-listed sea turtle species within the action area under their jurisdiction (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*). As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the USFWS regarding potential impacts on nesting sea turtles under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1.

As required by ESA section 7(a)(2), the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed sea turtle species within the marine environment. On April 30, 2020, NMFS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed sea turtle species in the marine environment within the action area under their jurisdiction (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*). As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from NMFS regarding potential impacts on sea turtles in the marine environment under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1.

Marine Mammals

Physical presence, physical disturbance and strike, and acoustic stressors are analyzed below because of their potential to impact marine mammals in the training study area.

Physical Presence. Physical presence of trainees in the water may induce temporary behavioral changes. Because small craft and submersibles in the water would likely cause the initial response, behavioral changes associated with the physical presence of trainees are considered under the physical disturbance and strike stressor category. The Hawaiian monk seals and other ESA-listed marine mammals such as blue whales, fin whales, sei whales, and main Hawaiian island insular false killer whales could occur where training activities are proposed. The only designated critical habitat within the training study area is for the Hawaiian monk seal. Critical habitat for the main Hawaiian island insular false killer whales has been proposed in nearshore areas from the 45-meter to 3,200-meter depth contours around the main Hawaiian Islands from Niihau east to the Island of Hawaii. Numerous non-ESA-listed toothed whale species likely occur in nearshore waters of the training study area. These species are protected under the MMPA.

Physical Disturbance and Strike. Activities proposed under Alternative 1 that involve vessels, personnel, and parachute operations in the water could impact marine mammals such as humpback whales, main Hawaiian Island insular false killer whales, and Hawaiian monk seals, as well as other marine mammals (e.g., spinner dolphins) that are present in the training study area. Such activities would include small vessel movements, submersible movements through the water, and in-water presence of trainees swimming to beaches. These activities are proposed to occur nearshore and in the waters of the training study area. Water-based drop zone training activities are proposed to occur within the waters surrounding MCBH and within JBPHH. Strikes to marine mammals from water-based drop zone activities would be unlikely because safety personnel observe areas prior to activities taking place to ensure marine mammals are not present.

Most vessel use would be in nearshore waters using small craft within the training study area. Marine mammals generally occur in deeper waters than the training study area, although spinner dolphins commonly occur close to land, and humpback whales occasionally venture close to shorelines (Costa & Kendall, 2016). Marine mammals engage in avoidance behavior when surface vessels move toward them (Magalhães et al., 2002; Senigaglia et al., 2016). It is not clear whether these responses are caused by the physical presence of a surface vessel, the underwater noise generated by the vessel, or an interaction between the two, though the noise generated by the vessels is probably an important contributing factor to the responses of cetaceans to the vessels. In one study, North Atlantic right whales were documented to show little overall reaction to the playback of sounds of approaching vessels, but they did respond to an alert signal by swimming strongly to the surface (Nowacek et al., 2016). Aside from the potential for a risk of collision, physical disturbance from vessel use is not expected to result in more than a short-term behavioral response, because marine mammals engage in these avoidance behaviors.

It is most likely that any marine mammal in the training study area would have an initial reaction to the boat's presence, such as leaving the area or tolerating the activity (e.g., continuing feeding, socializing, migrating, sleeping); a secondary reaction to the multiple trainees' presence in the water would not be likely to occur. Due to the passage of time (less than an hour) between the boat presence and trainees entering the water, animals are likely to continue with their initial reaction of either retreating from the area or tolerating the activity at the site.

Vessel speed, size, and mass are all important factors in determining potential impacts of a vessel strike to marine mammals (Conn & Silber, 2013; Gende et al., 2011; Silber et al., 2010; Vanderlaan & Taggart, 2007; Wiley et al., 2016). Overall, collision avoidance success is dependent on a marine mammal's ability to identify and locate the vessel from its radiated sound and the animal's ability to maneuver away from the vessel in time. For example, based on hearing capabilities and dive behavior, some whales may not be capable of successfully completing an escape maneuver, such as a dive, in the time available after perceiving a fast-moving vessel.

Boats carrying trainees for specific qualification training activities comply with established boating laws, reduce speed in accordance with established safety procedures, and avoid contact and proximity to marine mammals. During proposed water-based training activities, a crewman would act as a lookout during training evolutions on boats and support vessels to avoid marine mammals that may enter the area during training activities. During nighttime training, the lookout would be equipped with night vision goggles. If a marine mammal is observed in the vicinity of the training area when submersibles are used, the support vessel would signal the submersible for recall, or training may be shifted to avoid the marine mammal. If a marine mammal were in the immediate area of a training activity, the activity

would cease until it leaves the area. In some instances, canceling the training for the night may be necessary.

All vessels would avoid direct “head-on” approaches to marine mammals and maneuver to maintain a mitigation zone of 500 yards around whales and 200 yards around all other marine mammals (with the exception of bow-riding dolphins). These requirements do not apply when a vessel’s safety is at risk (e.g., a course correction would cause an imminent and serious threat to personnel and equipment). If a marine mammal other than a whale (e.g., dolphins riding bow waves) continues to close in on the vessel after there has already been one maneuver or speed change to avoid the marine mammal, no further action is required. During over-the-beach training, trainees would look for hauled-out Hawaiian monk seals while coming ashore. If a Hawaiian monk seal were spotted on the beach, trainees would stay at least 50 yards away to make sure the resting monk seal is not disturbed. In addition, strikes to marine mammals from water-based drop zone activities would be unlikely because safety personnel observe areas prior to activities taking place to ensure marine mammals are not present.

In addition to the above measures, SOPs would be implemented to minimize and avoid potential impacts on sensitive resources before training activities occur. For example, Navy Training and Operations staff adhere to Navy policies regarding education, inspections of training areas, and other protections at Pearl Harbor Naval Complex and nearshore training areas pertaining to marine mammals (including Hawaiian monk seals) and other protected species (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a, 2015d). NSO personnel would adhere to military installation-specific SOPs or other measures such as those detailed in installation INRMPs. INRMPs integrate conservation measures as SOPs to minimize and avoid potential impacts on natural resources on military installations while maintaining military readiness. Prior to any training activities, training areas are inspected for the presence of marine mammals (including Hawaiian monk seals). If marine mammals are observed during these inspections, training activities are delayed until the marine mammals voluntarily leave the area. If a Hawaiian monk seal is observed in Pearl Harbor, in nearshore training areas, or on property actively used by the Navy, the animal is reported to the Port Operations Tower, which controls vessel traffic. All vessels are advised of the sighting, advised that the animal is a highly endangered species, and cautioned to stay clear. The Navy continues to require that established procedures are followed during amphibious crew inserts. These include having designated lookouts watching for other vessels, obstructions to navigation, marine mammals (including whales and Hawaiian monk seals), and sea turtles. Training coordinators are required to review training overlays that identify the insertion points and any nearby restricted areas. All sensitive biological receptors are avoided during training exercises (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011a). NSO personnel would also utilize the PMAP tool as appropriate to ensure compliance with mitigation requirements that may be applicable to a selected in-water training area.

Acoustic Stressors. Submersibles use a sonar device to report depths to aid in navigation during a training activity. These devices have similar specifications to commercially available “fish finders” and other hand-held sonar devices, which typically generate frequencies over 200 kHz and source levels less than 160 dB re 1 μ Pa. In NMFS’ 2015 *Biological Opinion of U.S. Navy’s Training Exercises and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area* (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2014, 2015), devices with these specifications are considered *de minimis* sources of sound in the water and are not considered in models that estimate potential behavioral or injurious effects on marine mammals. This is because these types of devices do not produce pressure waves that are considered dangerous or that would cause temporary changes in behavior when exposed to the sound source. In

addition, because the frequency bands used in these types of devices are very narrow, masking of underwater sounds that marine mammals use for orientation or underwater vocalizations would not occur, as would be expected for broader frequency band widths of other sonar systems.

In most cases, exposure of a marine mammal to noise from fixed-wing aircraft or helicopters' aircraft presence would last for only seconds as the aircraft quickly passes overhead. However, during water-based drop zones activities, helicopter aircraft may lower to a distance of 5–15 ft above the water surface and hover for up to 15 minutes, which may elicit a stronger behavioral response due to the proximity to marine mammals, the slower airspeed and therefore longer exposure duration, and the downdraft created by the helicopter's rotor. Marine mammals would likely avoid the area under the helicopter. It is unlikely that an individual would be exposed repeatedly for long periods. Marine mammals at or near the surface when an aircraft flies or hovers overhead at low altitude may startle, divert their attention to the aircraft, or avoid the immediate area by swimming away or diving. No more than short-term reactions are likely. No long-term consequences for individuals, species, or stocks would be expected.

Impact Summary. Impacts on marine mammals in water and on land are expected to be minimal, short term, and recoverable based on the (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts, (4) brief duration of the activities, and (5) SOPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on marine mammals in water and hauled-out Hawaiian monk seals on beaches. For these reasons, long-term consequences to individuals or populations of marine mammals are not expected to result from the activities under Alternative 1. Therefore, no significant impacts or long-term effects on marine mammals would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

ESA Conclusion (marine species). Pursuant to the ESA, proposed training activities may affect Hawaiian monk seals during over-the-beach training activities on Oahu and Kauai and may affect Hawaiian monk seals in all marine training areas. Because proposed training activities would also occur in water and on land in areas designated as critical habitat for the Hawaiian monk seal, the proposed action may affect designated critical habitat for the Hawaiian monk seal. Under Alternative 1, proposed training activities would not impact the essential features of monk seal critical habitat, including (1) areas with characteristics preferred by monk seals for pupping and nursing; (2) shallow, sheltered aquatic areas adjacent to coastal locations preferred by monk seals for pupping and nursing; (3) marine areas from 0 to 500 m in depth preferred by juvenile and adult monk seals for foraging; (4) areas with low levels of anthropogenic disturbance; (5) marine areas with adequate prey quantity and quality; and (6) significant areas used by monk seals for hauling out, resting, or molting (80 Federal Register 50926).

The proposed in-water training activities may affect the blue whale (Central North Pacific Stock), Main Hawaiian Islands Insular false killer whale, fin whale, sei whale, and sperm whale. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed marine mammals and associated critical habitat. On April 30, 2020, NMFS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed marine mammal species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*). As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from NMFS regarding potential impacts on ESA-listed marine

mammal species and critical habitat within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1.

MMPA Conclusion. Pursuant to the MMPA, the Navy has determined that under Alternative 1, Level A and Level B harassment of marine mammals are not expected to occur. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes) and would not be considered Level B harassment. Therefore, consultation under MMPA is not required.

3.3.3.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 includes the training study area and all activities as described under Alternative 1, with an increase in training tempo of activities conducted in the state of Hawaii. Training would occur throughout the training study area, but the annual utilization of specific sites would increase to accommodate training requirement changes and facilitate adaptation of training to meet emerging real-world tasking. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional impacts on terrestrial vegetation and wildlife, marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, marine fish, sea turtles, or marine mammals are expected. The proposed training activities under Alternative 2 would likely induce a slight increase in the number of individual animals that would potentially experience temporary behavioral effects; however, these animals would quickly resume normal activities after the disturbance ceases or trainees move through an area. There would be no detectable increases in impacts compared to those discussed under Alternative 1. Therefore, no significant impacts on terrestrial and marine biological resources, including ESA-listed species and MBTA-listed species, would occur with implementation of Alternative 2.

ESA Conclusion (terrestrial species). As required by ESA section 7(a)(2), the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat. On March 14, 2019, the USFWS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's findings that the proposed project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and designated critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*). After submission of the BE and receipt of the letter of concurrence from the USFWS, the ESA-listed endangered plant *Bidens amplexans* was found to occur within the KPSTS training study area (West Oahu region). On November 30, 2020, Navy requested consultation and concurrence from USFWS on the Navy's determination of may affect, not likely to adversely affect for the federally endangered *Bidens amplexans* in the KPSTS training study area on Oahu. On March 16, 2021, the USFWS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's determination (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

ESA Conclusion (marine species). As required by ESA section 7(a)(2), the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat: Main Hawaiian Islands insular false killer whale DPS and critical habitat, Hawaiian monk seal and critical habitat, Central North Pacific green turtle, hawksbill turtle, olive ridley turtle, oceanic whitetip shark, and giant manta ray. On April 30, 2020, NMFS issued a letter concurring with the Navy's findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction (Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

EFH Conclusion. As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and initiated consultation with NMFS on December 13, 2018 to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. Pursuant to the EFH requirements of the MSA and implementing

regulations, activities proposed under Alternative 2 that involve vessels and personnel in the water could potentially impact EFH species and habitats present in the training study area. Such activities would include landing on shore with small inflatable boats, and foot traffic from trainees swimming from boats and submersibles to shore and walking in the intertidal and beach zones. These areas are typically very dynamic because of their exposure to wave action and cycles of erosion and deposition. Some temporary behavioral or physiological responses (e.g., avoidance, stress, increased heart rate) would occur from increased vessel and aircraft noise, but these impacts would be short term and temporary in nature. In addition, the physical presence of training activities in nearshore areas where EFH species and habitats occur could disturb, damage, or remove habitat used by EFH species. However, it is expected that most of these impacts would be temporary, and recovery would occur over a short period of time.

Disturbances from activities under Alternative 2 would also not be expected to cause long-term or permanent impairment to EFH because of the dynamic nature of these nearshore habitats, and BMPs and SOPs would be used to avoid impact on marine invertebrates, vegetation, and fish that are protected under EFH (see Table 2-6). These procedures include restricting vessel activity to high-tide periods to avoid direct impacts on corals when activities would occur over sensitive benthic habitats (other SOPs that would avoid impacts on other marine resources are described under sea turtles and marine mammals). Therefore, no significant impacts on EFH species or habitat would occur with implementation of Alternative 2. In addition, no direct or indirect changes to EFH that would have a considerable impact on waters, substrate, or prey necessary for spawning (fish, invertebrates, or vegetation), breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity of aquatic species would occur. Under Alternative 2, there would be no adverse effect on EFH within the training study area.

On June 28, 2019, NMFS concurred that the proposed training activities may have temporary effects on EFH and provided EFH conservation recommendations that would minimize adverse effects to EFH if fully implemented. The Navy responded on November 21, 2019 and agreed to implement the following conservation recommendations (see Table 2-6).

1. Conduct surveillance and site-specific training reconnaissance as described in the proposed BMPs.
2. Training exercises within areas designated as MLCDs on Oahu and Lanai will be modified to avoid impacts to marine resources (see Figures 3-1 and 3-2). No motorized vessels (e.g., submarine, zodiacs, or jet-skis) will be utilized in either MLCD. All vessels/crafts will be left at the outer boundary of the MLCDs. Self-contained underwater breathing apparatus (scuba) diving, an approved activity within the MLCDs, will be conducted within both MLCDs. Over-the-beach training is allowed at the Pupukea MLCD, Oahu; however, over-the-beach training will not be conducted at the Hulopo'e Bay MLCD, Lanai.
3. Ensure no anchors, equipment, tools, and personnel are in contact with any organism, especially coral; instead place anchors in soft sediment in unconsolidated bottom habitats only.
4. All vessels should operate at "no wake/idle" speeds at all times while in water depths where the draft of the vessel provides less than a 6 ft (2 m) clearance.
5. When conducting activities in shallow water, all vessels should employ a dedicated and qualified "lookout" to assist the pilot with avoiding large coral colonies and other benthic organisms.

Consultation for EFH under the MSA was completed on December 2, 2019, with receipt of a letter of concurrence from NMFS (see Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

MMPA Conclusion. Marine mammal species with the potential to occur in the training study areas include the Main Hawaiian Islands Insular false killer whale DPS, blue whale, fin whale, sei whale, sperm

whale, humpback whale, short-finned pilot whale, bottlenose dolphin, and spinner dolphin, and Hawaiian monk seal. The Navy has determined that under Alternative 2, Level A and Level B harassment of marine mammals are not expected to occur. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes) and would not be considered Level B harassment. NSWCC will employ BMPs, SOPs (e.g., activity-specific protection measures, including watch-out and avoidance procedures), and comply with established boating laws and reduce speed in accordance with established safety procedures, avoiding contact and proximity to marine mammals. Submersibles use a sonar device to report depths to aid in navigation during a training activity. These devices have similar specifications to commercially available “fish finders” and other hand-held sonar devices, which typically generate frequencies over 200 kilohertz and source levels less than 160 decibels reference 1 micropascal (dB re 1 μ Pa). NMFS considers devices with these specifications “de minimis” sources of sound in the water that are unlikely to cause behavioral or injurious effects on marine mammals. Therefore, consultation under the MMPA is not required.

3.4 Cultural Resources

This discussion of cultural resources includes prehistoric and historic districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Cultural resources can be divided into three major categories:

- Archaeological resources (prehistoric and historic) are locations where human activity measurably altered the earth or left deposits of physical remains.
- Historic architecture includes standing buildings, structures, and other built-environment resources of historic or aesthetic significance.
- Traditional cultural properties may include archaeological resources, structures, neighborhoods, prominent topographic features, habitat, plants, animals, and minerals that Native Americans or other groups consider essential for the preservation of traditional culture.

3.4.1 Regulatory Setting

Cultural resources are governed by federal laws and regulations, including the NHPA, Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990. Federal agencies' responsibility for protecting historic properties is defined primarily by Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA. Section 106 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. Section 110 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to establish—in conjunction with the Secretary of the Interior—historic preservation programs for the identification, evaluation, and protection of historic properties.

Additional regulations and guidelines for submerged cultural resources include the *Abandoned Shipwreck Guidelines* prepared by the NPS (National Park Service, 2007) and, for the purposes of conducting research or recovering Navy ship and aircraft wrecks, the *Guidelines for Archaeological Research Permit Applications on Ship and Aircraft Wrecks under the Jurisdiction of the Department of the Navy* (36 CFR Part 767), overseen by the Naval History and Heritage Command. These resources are also protected under the Submerged Lands Act of 1953, the Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987, and the Sunken Military Craft Act of 2004.

Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on cultural resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. In order to satisfy this requirement, the regulations implementing Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800) require federal agencies to consult with the appropriate SHPO; Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; Native American tribes; Native Hawaiian Organizations; other local, state, and federal agencies; and the public. The Navy has evaluated, in consultation with the Hawaii SHPO, what effects the proposed action may have on identified historic properties. The Hawaii SHPO has concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect, completing the Navy's Section 106 requirements (refer to Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*).

3.4.2 Affected Environment

Cultural resources that are listed in the NRHP or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP are “historic properties” as defined by the NHPA. The list was established under the NHPA and contains listed historic properties. It does not include eligible historic properties. It is administered by the NPS on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior. The NRHP includes properties on public and private land. Properties can be determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by a federal agency official with

concurrence from the applicable SHPO. A NRHP-eligible property has the same protections as a property listed in the NRHP. The historic properties may include archaeological and architectural resources and Traditional Cultural Properties. The DoD has conducted inventories of cultural resources at the SHPO for areas outside of DoD lands and at all installations, including MCBH, JBPHH Region, Barbers Point, and Kahuku Training Area on Oahu; and the PMRF on Kauai, to identify historic properties that are listed or potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP.

The APE for historic properties is the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking (project, activity, program, or practice) may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of the undertaking and may be different for various kinds of effects caused by the undertaking. For this proposed action, the Navy determined that the APE includes the footprint of the NSO training area in the State of Hawaii. The APE is made up of locations on six of the main Hawaiian islands: Oahu (including JBPHH, South, Windward, North, and West), Island of Hawaii (along three stretches of the Kona coast), Kauai, Lanai (in-water), Maui (in-water), and Molokai (in-water) (shown as the Training Study Area in Figures 1-2 through 1-12).

- Oahu APE: within five traditional districts: Ewa, Kona, Koolaupoko, Waialua, and Waianae. These districts include DoD properties JBPHH, Lualualei Annex, USCG Station Barbers Point, Iroquois Point Harbor, Puuloa Range Training Facility, Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station, MCBH, and Kahuku Training Area. The APE on Oahu also contains Hawaii state, county, and city parks and private property.
- Island of Hawaii APE: three stretches of the western coast from Mahukona Bay/Beach Park south to Kawaihae Harbor in Kohala, from Kahuwai Bay south to Puhili Point, and from the Honokohau Small Boat Harbor south to Kahului Bay.
- Kauai APE: one area on the western side of the island including PMRF, Polihale State Park, Barking Sands beach, and nearshore waters off the western shore of the island.
- Lanai APE: two water areas along the west coast between Kaholo Pali and Honopu Bay near Nanahoa (two sea stacks) including Kaumalapua Harbor, and between Puupehe near Hulope Beach and Huawai Bay near the islet of Poopoo.
- Maui APE: one water area on the northwestern side of Maalaea Bay on the mid-southern side of the island.
- Molokai APE: waters of Hale O Lono Harbor and Kaunakakai Harbor on the southern shore and waters to the east and west of both harbors⁽¹⁾.

The chronology, or historical sequence, for the Hawaiian Islands is detailed in the Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans for Barbers Point, JBPHH, Kahuku Training Area, and MCBH on Oahu; and the PMRF on Kauai (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2008b). The Hawaiian cultural sequence has been divided into four general phases through archaeological research. These phases include the Colonization Period (Anno Domini [A.D.] 300–600), the Development Period (A.D. 600–1300), the Expansion Period (A.D. 1300–1650), and the Late Pre-Contact Period (A.D. 1650–1778).

⁽¹⁾Based on consultations with the Molokai community after publication of the November 2018 Draft EA, the proposed training study area (or APE) along the southern shore of Molokai was clarified to only include two specific areas centered at Hale O Lono Harbor and Kaunakakai Harbor and not the entire area between the harbors along the southern shore (see Appendix C, *Public Comments*).

During the Colonization Period (A.D. 300–600), the Hawaiian Islands were populated by the first people that sailed there from eastern Pacific islands. This led to the Development Period (A.D. 600–1300), during which the first permanent settlements appear on the Hawaiian Islands around A.D. 1220–1261 (Rieth et al., 2011) and utilized optimum environments such as fertile valleys and coastal resources. Traditional Hawaiian artifacts include bone and shell fishhooks, basalt net sinkers, basalt grinding stones (poi pounders), awls and scrapers, shell beads, dog tooth pendants, expedient flake tools, and basalt adzes for wood work such as carving outrigger canoes. Midden deposits indicate that traditional Hawaiians gathered nearshore shellfish, fished in both nearshore and deep water, and cultivated sweet potato, taro, and coconut.

The Hawaiian population increased in the following years during the Expansion Period (A.D. 1300–1650), inland regions were utilized more extensively, and the wetland agricultural system intensified. By the early 14th century, a more complex political organization was developed, increasing the political power of chiefs. Large temples (heiau) and fishponds (loko), which were related to political power, began appearing at this time (Cordy, 1996). Fishponds were used for food production, and an estimated 360 fishponds were built across the island chain (Hommon, 2013). Between the 15th and 18th centuries during the Late Pre-Contact Period (A.D. 1650–1778), there were several shifts of power throughout the islands, resulting in warfare within and between the islands.

British explorer Captain James Cook arrived in the Hawaiian Islands in 1778, bringing Western ideas and influences. Captain Cook was followed by British captain George Vancouver in 1788, who presented cows to King Kamehameha I. By 1815, Palmer Parker was working for King Kamehameha I as a bullock hunter. He established the first cattle ranch on the Island of Hawaii. Kamehameha I united the Hawaiian Islands in 1818 with help from British and American traders. Hawaii assumed importance in the East-West fur trade during this period as vessels began regularly stopping in Hawaii to replenish supplies. Hawaii also became the focal point for the Pacific whaling industry. By the 1840s, approximately 600 whaling vessels were arriving in Hawaii each year (Kelley, 2006).

In 1841, sugarcane was introduced to Hawaii and quickly became an important commercial enterprise. In 1848, the Mahele (once called the Great Mahele) ended the traditional land tenure (ahupuaa) system and introduced the new concept of private property in Hawaii. This required that the islands be surveyed and mapped for the first time. The Mahele was strongly supported by western business men, who stood to gain from owning private land in economic profits. By the 1850s, steamships were brought to the Pacific for inter-island commerce, including transportation of people and products such as sugar and beef. This introduction of steamships and interisland travel required navigation aids such as the building of light houses. Along with these new industries, roads and railroad lines were built on the islands to transport sugarcane and people. As industry and infrastructure from the west came to the islands, a new way of life and culture grew and people began to move to towns and cities for new available jobs. This led to the development of the city of Honolulu on Oahu and districts such as China Town and Merchant Street. These are now districts that have been nominated to the NRHP and include a number of historic buildings due to the historic architecture in the area.

After the Late Pre-Contact Period in the early 1800s, early development of military installations (approximately late 1800s–early 1900s) began to take shape in the Hawaiian Islands by both the Hawaiians, Americans, and other foreigners such as the Russians. Later during World War II, the coastal defenses were developed further, and Japan's attack on Hawaii and Pearl Harbor led to the War in the Pacific and the United States involvement in World War II. The attack and involvement lead to a build-up of military structures such as hangars, batteries, and other military bases. The Cold War (between

1947 and 1991) was a state of tension between powers in the Eastern and Western Blocs after World War II. Differences in political ideology between the two blocs led to a buildup in military weaponry and defenses as tensions increased between the two powers. Cold War-era buildings, districts, and sites were created on Oahu at various military installations and Kauai at the PMRF.

The Navy reviewed existing information on historic properties within the APE from the SHPO, from the DoD cultural resources reports, and from the NPS's Focus digital library. This review resulted in the identification of 852 historic properties (listed and eligible) in the APE: 580 from Oahu, 182 from Hawaii Island, 80 from Kauai, 0 from Lanai, 4 from Maui, and 6 from Molokai. Although these historic properties are within the APE, the majority will not be utilized for training. These traditional and historic resources are located in the waters and on the shores of the Hawaiian Islands, many of which have not been evaluated for National Register eligibility. However, they will be treated as eligible for consultation purposes.

The Navy also reviewed the inventory of properties listed in the NRHP through the National Park Service's Focus digital library and found 33 listed properties in the APE: 5 National Historic Landmarks (NHLs), 6 historic districts, 14 buildings and structures, 2 historic objections, and 6 archaeological sites.

3.4.2.1 Archaeological Resources

Many traditional Hawaiian site types are present within the APE ranging from agriculture, aquaculture, burials, trails, habitation, markers (cairns), religious, petroglyphs, and salt production sites. Historic archaeological sites are found on all of the Hawaiian Islands. Historic archaeological sites in the APE can be classified into the following categories: Agriculture, Burial, Habitation, Military, Ranching, Religious, Transportation, and Other. Archaeological resources listed on the NRHP and within the APE are shown in Table 3-7.

Table 3-7: NRHP-Listed Archaeological Resources within the APE

#	PROPERTY NAME	LOCATION	DATE LISTED	RESOURCE ID
1	Huilua Fishpond (NHL)	Kaneohe, Oahu	10/15/1966	66000295
2	Mokapu Burial Area	Kaneohe, Oahu	11/15/1972	72000428
3	Molii Fishpond	Kaneohe, Oahu	12/5/1972	72000429
4	Heeia Fishpond	Kaneohe, Oahu	1/17/1973	73000671
5	Kahaluu Fishpond	Honolulu, Oahu	3/14/1973	73000668
6	Okiokilepe Pond	Pearl Harbor, Oahu	3/14/1973	73000673
7	Oahu Rail and Land Right of Way	Nanakuli, Oahu	12/1/1975	75000621
8	Puupehe Platform	Lanai	10/6/1986	86002745
9	Hale Halawai O Holualoa (NHL)	Kailua-Kona, Hawaii Island	6/5/1987	87000794
10	Kiholo-Puako Trail (Ala Loa [Long trail])	South Kohala, Hawaii Island	6/5/1987	87001127
11	<i>USS Arizona</i>	Honolulu, Oahu	5/5/1989	89001083
12	<i>USS Utah</i>	Honolulu, Oahu	5/5/1989	89001084
13	Kalaoa Permanent House	Kailua-Kona, Hawaii Island	11/21/1992	92001552

3.4.2.1.1 Terrestrial Archaeological Resources

Types of archeological resource sites eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP in the APE include religious sites (heiau), large complexes (archaeological districts and complexes), and other eligible sites such as salt pans, petroglyphs, and trails on Oahu and Hawaii Island. At the PMRF Barking Sands on Kauai, 31 of the sites have been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. The PMRF operates under two significant agreements, a Memorandum of Agreement from 1999 for ground-disturbing activities and burial treatment with SHPO, and a Programmatic Agreement for Navy

undertakings in Hawaii. Fishponds are the terrestrial archaeological resources in the waters off Molokai. No terrestrial archaeological resources are within the APE on Maui or Lanai (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2014).

3.4.2.1.2 Submerged Archaeological Resources

The most likely types of submerged cultural (i.e., archaeological) resources, including ship and plane wrecks, to occur around the Hawaiian Islands are 19th and 20th century cargo ships; whaling and merchant ships (e.g., steamships); fishing boats; aircraft, amphibious craft, and warships; and recreational craft. The Automated Wreck and Obstruction Information System, Region 16 (2010), records the approximate locations of some deep-water submerged cultural resources (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013).

Numerous known cultural resources are located in the waters surrounding Oahu, many of which are related to military actions during World War II. Pearl Harbor, which is listed in the NRHP as an NHL, contains major shipwrecks: the *USS Arizona* and the *USS Utah*, both of which are listed in the NRHP (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2013). Submerged cultural resources located near the Island of Hawaii are concentrated along the coastline where rugged shorelines created hazards for vessels within the APE. Within and near the APE on the northeastern coastline, multiple surveys have been conducted by various state and commercial agencies documenting the location of submerged cultural resources.

No submerged cultural resources have been identified within the APE on Kauai. Submerged cultural resources within the APE at Maalaea Bay on Maui include three tracked amphibious vehicles, which sank during training exercises close to shore, and the wreck of a World War II plane just outside the bay. Other submerged cultural resources in the APE near Molokai have been identified. Historic properties in the waters off Molokai include six fishponds along the southwestern coast between Hale O Lono Harbor and Kaunakakai Harbor: Kikauhi, Keanakalole, Kukuku, Pakanaka, Kaluaapuhi, and Kalokoeli fishponds. None of the submerged cultural resources in the APE on the Island of Hawaii, near Maui, or near Molokai are listed on the NRHP; however, they may be eligible for listing. No submerged historic properties have been identified within the APE on Lanai.

3.4.2.2 Historic Architecture

Types of previously recorded historic architecture (e.g., buildings) in the APE include commerce, habitation, military, religious, transportation, and other. NHLs within the APE consist primarily of features of the built environment, such as buildings, structures, and campuses; however, several NHLs are comprised of archaeological resources and are listed in the archaeological section (Section 3.4.2.1, Archaeological Resources). NRHP-listed architecture within the APE are shown in Table 3-8.

Types of architectural resource sites eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP in the APE include roads, highways, houses, parks, lighthouses, batteries, towers, ships, hotels, revetments, and complexes. On Oahu, Hawaii Island, and Kauai, these architectural resources are from many eras such as the Cold War, World War II, military occupation, plantation living, and modern building. Architectural resource sites are generally found on land and therefore are not found in the APE on Maui, Molokai, or Lanai (Thompson, 1986; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2014).

Table 3-8: NRHP-Listed Architectural Resources in the APE

#	PROPERTY NAME	LOCATION	DATE LISTED	DAHP RESOURCE ID
1	United States Naval Base Pearl Harbor (NHL)	Pearl City, Oahu	10/15/1966	66000940
2	<i>USS Arizona</i> Memorial (NHL)	Pearl City, Oahu	10/15/1966	66000944
3	<i>USS Missouri</i> (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	5/14/1971	71000877
4	Moana Hotel (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	8/7/1972	72000417
5	Kapapa Island Complex	Kapapa Island, Hawaii Island	8/21/1972	72000430
6	Kealalakua Bay Historical District	Captain Cook, Hawaii Island	12/12/1973	73000651
7	Hulihee Palace (NHL)	Kailua-Kona, Hawaii Island	5/25/1973	73000653
8	Lapakahi Complex	Mahukona, Hawaii Island	7/2/1973	73000654
9	Chinatown Historic District	Honolulu, Oahu	1/17/1973	73000658
10	Falls of Clyde (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	7/2/1973	73000659
11	Merchant Street Historic District	Honolulu, Oahu	6/19/1973	73000661
12	Waianae District	Waianae, Oahu	1/21/1974	74000720
13	Aloha Tower at Pier 9 (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	5/13/1976	76000660
14	U.S. Coast Guard Makapuu Light House (NHL)	Waimanalo, Oahu	12/7/1977	77000447
15	Mokuaikaua Church (NHL)	Kailua-Kona, Hawaii Island	10/3/1978	78001015
16	World War I Memorial Natatorium (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	8/11/1980	80001283
17	<i>USS Bowfin</i> (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	11/16/1982	82000149
18	Battery Hasebrouck (NHL) (Facility 3341H, 3342H, 3343H, 3344H, 3345H, 3346H, 3347H, 3348H, 3349H)	Honolulu, Oahu	6/5/1984	84000925
19	Battery Hawkins (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	6/5/1984	84000928
20	Battery Hawkins Annex	Honolulu, Oahu	6/5/1984	84000948
21	Battery Jackson (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	6/5/1984	84000954
22	Battery Randolph (Fort DeRussy)	Honolulu, Oahu	6/5/1984	84000971
23	Battery Selfridge (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	6/5/1984	84000975
24	Hickam Field (NHL)	Honolulu, Oahu	9/16/1985	85002725
25	NAS Kaneohe (NHL) (Facilities 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 [MCBH Seaplane Ramp])	Kailua, Oahu	5/28/1987	87001299
26	<i>USS Arizona</i>	Honolulu, Oahu	5/5/1989	89001083
27	<i>USS Utah</i>	Honolulu, Oahu	5/5/1989	89001084

Notes: DAHP = Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation; MCB = Marine Corps Base.

3.4.2.3 Traditional Cultural Properties

Traditional Cultural Properties are defined by the National Parks Service American Indian Liaison Office as “a property that is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP based on its associations with the cultural practices, traditions, beliefs, lifeways, arts, crafts, or social institutions of a living community” (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2012). No Traditional Cultural Properties have been identified in the APE on Oahu or Hawaii Island.

Studies at the PMRF Barking Sands in the APE on Kauai have identified one traditional cultural property (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2014). This traditional cultural property, called Nohili Dunes, includes Elekuna Heiau, an ancient burial ground, and habitation sites. The legend of Nohili Dunes identifies a

fisherman who went out to sea, tying his nine dogs to three stakes before he left. When he returned home, exhausted after battling heavy seas, he forgot to untie his dogs. In the morning, the dogs had disappeared, but three mounds of sand remained and, upon each step on the sand, he heard a low bark. He dug for the dogs, but this only generated more “barking” sands, and he continued to hear the barks daily as he crossed the beach. For this reason, the Nohili Dunes are known as Barking Sands (Dlendorf, 2013). This traditional cultural property is eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Traditional Cultural Properties are generally found on land and therefore are not found in the APE on Maui, Molokai, or Lanai.

3.4.3 Environmental Consequences

Analysis of potential impacts on cultural resources considers both direct and indirect impacts. Direct impacts may be the result of physically altering, damaging, or destroying all or part of a resource; altering characteristics of the surrounding environment that contribute to the importance of the resource, introducing visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that are out of character for the period the resource represents (thereby altering the setting); or neglecting the resource to the extent that it deteriorates or is destroyed. Indirect effects may be the result of direct effects such as a physical damage to an architectural resource, with the indirect effect that people are no longer able to see or access that resource. The Navy has evaluated, in consultation with the Hawaii SHPO, what effects the proposed action may have on identified historic properties.

3.4.3.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX for DoD and non-DoD land and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. NSWC activities that occurred in the Hawaii region under the various Records of CATEX and HSTT EIS/OEIS would have no adverse effects with regard to archaeological resources, historic architecture, or traditional cultural properties. Therefore, no significant impact on existing cultural resources would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.

3.4.3.2 Alternative 1

3.4.3.2.1 Archaeological Resources

Implementation of Alternative 1 would not include explosives, construction of facilities or infrastructure, tree climbing, digging, or building of camp fires. Impacts on archaeological resources are not expected because: (1) vehicles supporting training events would remain on existing established roadways; (2) live-fire would only occur at designated live-fire facilities at JBPHH Region, Puuloa Training Range Facility; JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula; and MCBH Kaneohe Bay Training Range Facility; (3) there would be no ground-disturbing activities; and (3) surface sites such as heiau and other sacred sites would be avoided during training activities.

NSO training would avoid known burial sites and known archaeological sites. In the event archaeological materials not previously identified are discovered, all training activities in the immediate area would be stopped, and the Navy’s Cultural Resources Manager would be contacted to take actions to resolve adverse effects and notify the SHPO and any Native Hawaiian organization that might attach religious and cultural significance to the affected property, per NHPA Section 800.13(b)(3).

Water-based training would avoid known shipwrecks or sunken resources that may be present within the APE. In addition, proposed training activities would avoid contact with hard surfaces that may be present within the training study area in the interest of trainee safety and avoidance of potential adverse effects.

Air-based training would include the use of sUAS and helicopters utilizing existing or new proposed drop zones and landing zones. These existing or new proposed drop zones and landing zones include JBPHH Region Pearl City Peninsula, MCBH, Ford Island, Lualualei Annex, Kanes drop zone at the Kahuku Training Area, and JBPHH Region Waipio Peninsula. The Pearl City Peninsula drop zone and the MCBH drop zones would occur over the water. Activities at these water drop zone locations would not impact submerged historic resources because activities would occur within the water column and would not contact the seafloor. Use of the drop zones and landing zones on Pearl City Peninsula would not alter the appearance of the peninsula and thus would not adversely affect the NHL.

Two proposed landing zones and drop zones are located on Ford Island. One is near the *USS Utah*, which is a historic property, and the other is on the Ford Island Airfield, another historic property. The area proposed for use would not impact the *USS Utah* because no construction, vegetation clearing, or ground disturbance would be conducted. Ford Island is part of the Pearl Harbor NHL; utilizing drop zones and landing zones on the island is consistent with its historic use as an airfield and would not adversely affect the historic property.

The proposed Lualualei landing zones and drop zones and existing Kanes drop zone within the Kahuku Training Area are located within an area that lacks integrity and does not contain any known historic properties or archeological sites. No construction or vegetation removal would be necessary at the proposed Lualualei or existing Kanes landing zones or drop zones.

Vegetation removal or cutting would be limited to the proposed drop zone/landing zone at Waipio Peninsula on Oahu, which consists of a large area where trainees (and sometimes the helicopter) would land after parachuting from an aircraft or participating in helicopter rope suspension techniques. This area consists of a filled-in fishpond and former sugarcane fields. It is vegetated with non-native plants such as red mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle*) and kiawe (*Prosopis pallida*). Portions of Waipio Peninsula were acquired during World War II and used for storage. Little construction appears to have occurred during World War II in the former sugarcane fields where the landing zone/drop zone vegetation clearing is proposed. Furthermore, no historic properties have been identified in this area. Waipio Peninsula falls within the boundaries of the Pearl Harbor NHL. Removal of the non-native vegetation on Waipio Peninsula and use of the landing zone/drop zone would not adversely affect the NHL.

Training activities would not disturb known burial and other sites and would avoid known shipwrecks or submerged resources that may be present within the APE. When applicable, the proposed training would follow the protocols established under (1) existing Programmatic Agreements; (2) Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plans and requirements of landowners, where applicable; and (3) minimization and avoidance measures established during the Section 106 consultation to further avoid and minimize the potential for impact on or disturbance of archeological resources. Therefore, no adverse effects with regard to archaeological resources would occur under Alternative 1.

3.4.3.2.2 Historic Architecture

Under Alternative 1, simulated building clearance training would occur on DoD property, and any use of historic buildings would follow established protocols to protect the buildings, including removal of all

training material afterwards. Therefore, no adverse effects with regard to historic architecture would occur under Alternative 1.

3.4.3.2.3 Traditional Cultural Properties

Under Alternative 1, training activities would be non-invasive in nature and would not restrict the ability of individuals to use or access traditional cultural property sites such as the Nohili Dunes. Training activities would avoid the Nohili Dunes, including Elekuna Heiau, an ancient burial ground, and habitation sites. The proposed training would follow the appropriate protocols established under existing approved SOPs (protective measures that are in place to avoid and minimize the potential for impact to traditional cultural properties on Kauai). When applicable, the proposed training also would follow protocols established as part of the Section 106 consultation, which may result in specific minimization and avoidance measures. Alternative 1 would not impact or disturb traditional cultural properties present within the training study area. Therefore, a finding of no historic properties adversely affected with regard to traditional cultural properties would occur under Alternative 1.

NHPA Section 106 Consultation. As required by NHPA Section 106, the Navy consulted with the Hawaii SHPO, Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic partners, and the public to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on historic properties. As the APE is the same for Alternatives 1 and 2 and the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the Hawaii SHPO regarding potential impacts historic properties within the APE under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, the proposed undertaking under Alternative 1 would result in no historic properties affected in accordance with NHPA Section 106 Implementing Regulations at 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1). On May 29, 2020, the Hawaii SHPO concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect, completing the Navy's Section 106 requirements. Correspondence regarding the NHPA Section 106 consultation effort is presented in Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*.

3.4.3.3 Alternative 2

3.4.3.3.1 Archaeological Resources

While there is an increase in training frequency under Alternative 2 when compared to Alternative 1, there would be no change in anticipated effects, as activities would be non-invasive in nature as described under Alternative 1. Training activities would not disturb known burial or other archaeological sites and would avoid known shipwrecks or sunken resources that may be present within the APE. Therefore, a finding of no historic properties adversely affected with regard to archaeological resources would occur under Alternative 2.

3.4.3.3.2 Historic Architecture

Under Alternative 2, training activities would be the same as described under Alternative 1. Simulated building clearance training would occur on DoD property, and any use of historic buildings would follow established protocols to protect the buildings, including removal of all training material afterwards. Therefore, a finding of no historic properties adversely affected with regard to historic architecture would occur under Alternative 2.

3.4.3.3.3 Traditional Cultural Properties

Under Alternative 2, training activities would be non-invasive in nature as described above under Alternative 1. In addition, proposed increases under Alternative 2 would not restrict the ability of individuals to use or access sites. Training activities would avoid the Nohili Dunes, including Elekuna

Heiau, an ancient burial ground, and habitation sites. When applicable, the proposed training would follow the appropriate protocols established under existing approved SOPs and protective measures that are in place to avoid and minimize the potential for impact on traditional cultural properties. Therefore, a finding of no historic properties adversely affected with regard to traditional cultural properties would occur under Alternative 2.

NHPA Section 106 Consultation. The Navy initiated the NHPA Section 106 process August 22, 2018. The Navy consulted with the Hawaii SHPO, and Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic partners, and the public. The Navy determined that the proposed undertaking under Alternative 2 for NSWC to conduct land-, water-, and air-based training activities in the State of Hawaii will result in no adverse effect on historic properties in accordance with NHPA Section 106. Since the proposed training activities will be ongoing, the Navy has agreed to brief SHPO annually regarding effects to historic properties, if any, as well as locations of training in accordance to Operational Security requirements. In addition, the Navy shall review the Section 106 consultation with the SHPO 7 years following receipt of SHPO's concurrence letter. Prior to the 7-year review, reinitiation of the Section 106 process would be warranted if there is a change in the undertaking or the APE. On May 29, 2020, the Hawaii SHPO concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect, completing the Navy's Section 106 requirements. Correspondence regarding the NHPA Section 106 consultation effort is presented in Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*.

3.5 Noise

This discussion of noise includes the types or sources of noise and the associated points of interest in the human environment. Noise in relation to biological resources and wildlife species is discussed in the Biological Resources section.

Sound is a physical phenomenon consisting of minute vibrations that travel through a medium, such as air or water, and are sensed by the human ear. Sound is all around us. The perception and evaluation of sound involves three basic physical characteristics:

- Intensity – the acoustic energy, which is expressed in terms of sound pressure, in dB.
- Frequency – the number of cycles per second the air vibrates, in Hertz or kHz.
- Duration – the length of time the sound can be detected.

Noise is defined as unwanted or annoying sound that interferes with or disrupts normal human activities. Although continuous and extended exposure to high noise levels (e.g., through occupational exposure) can cause hearing loss, the principal human response to noise is annoyance. The response of different individuals to similar noise events is diverse and is influenced by the type of noise, perceived importance of the noise, its appropriateness in the setting, time of day, type of activity during which the noise occurs, and sensitivity of the individual.

3.5.1 Basics of Sound and A-Weighted Sound Level

The loudest sounds that can be detected comfortably by the human ear have intensities that are a trillion times higher than those of sounds that can barely be detected. This vast range means that using a linear scale to represent sound intensity is not feasible. The decibel (dB) is a logarithmic unit used to represent the intensity of a sound, also referred to as the sound level. All sounds have a spectral content, which means their magnitude or level changes with frequency, where frequency is measured in cycles per second or Hz. To mimic the human ear's non-linear sensitivity and perception of different frequencies of sound, the spectral content is weighted. For example, environmental noise measurements are usually on an "A-weighted" scale that filters out very low and very high frequencies in order to replicate human sensitivity. It is common to add the "A" to the measurement unit in order to identify that the measurement has been made with this filtering process (A-weighted decibels [dBA]). In this document, the dB unit refers to A-weighted sound levels. Table 3-9 provides a comparison of how the human ear perceives changes in loudness on the logarithmic scale.

Table 3-9: Subjective Responses to Changes in A-Weighted Decibels

Change	Change in Perceived Loudness
3 dB	Barely perceptible
5 dB	Quite noticeable
10 dB	Dramatic – twice or half as loud
20 dB	Striking – fourfold change

Figure 3-19 provides a chart of A-weighted sound levels from typical noise sources. Some noise sources (e.g., air conditioner, vacuum cleaner) are continuous sounds that maintain a constant sound level for some period of time.




Figure 3-19: A-Weighted Sound Levels from Typical Sources

(Source: Cowan, 1994).

Other sources (e.g., automobile, heavy truck) are the maximum sound produced during an event like a vehicle pass-by. Other sounds (e.g., urban daytime, urban nighttime) are averages taken over extended periods of time. A variety of noise metrics have been developed to describe noise over different time periods, as discussed below.

3.5.2 Noise Metrics

A metric is a system for measuring or quantifying a particular characteristic of a subject. Since noise is a complex physical phenomenon, different noise metrics help to quantify the noise environment. While the day-night average sound level (DNL) noise metric is the most commonly used tools for analyzing noise in the community, the DoD has been developing additional metrics (and analysis techniques). These supplemental metrics and analysis tools provide more detailed noise exposure information for the decision process and improve the discussion regarding noise exposure.

3.5.2.1 Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL)

The DNL metric is the energy-averaged sound level measured over a 24-hour period, with a 10-dB penalty assigned to noise events occurring between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. (acoustic night). DNL values are average quantities, mathematically representing the continuous sound level that would be present if all of the variations in sound level that occur over a 24-hour period were averaged to have the same total sound energy. The DNL metric quantifies the total sound energy received and is therefore a cumulative measure, but it does not provide specific information on the number of noise events or the individual sound levels that occur during the 24-hour day. DNL is the standard noise metric used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, FAA, USEPA, and DoD. Studies of community annoyance in response to numerous types of environmental noise show that DNL correlates well with impact assessments; there is a consistent relationship between DNL and the level of annoyance. Most people are exposed to sound levels of 50–55 DNL or higher on a daily basis.

Research has indicated that about 87 percent of the population is not highly annoyed by outdoor sound levels below 65 dB DNL (Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise, 1980). Therefore, the 65 dB DNL noise contour is used to help determine compatibility of military operations with local land use.

3.5.2.2 Equivalent Sound Level (L_{eq})

A cumulative noise metric useful in describing noise is the L_{eq} , which is the continuous sound level that would be present if all of the variations in sound level occurring over a specified time period were smoothed out as to contain the same total sound energy. The same calculation for a daily average time period such as DNL but without the penalties is a 24-hour L_{eq} , abbreviated $L_{eq}(24)$. Other typical time periods for L_{eq} are 1 hour and 8 hours.

3.5.2.3 Sound Exposure Level (SEL)

The SEL metric is a composite metric that represents both the intensity of a sound and its duration. Individual time-varying noise events (e.g., aircraft overflights) have two main characteristics: a sound level that changes throughout the event and a period of time during which the event is heard. SEL provides a measure of total sound energy of the entire acoustic event, but it does not directly represent the sound level heard at any given time. During a time-varying noise event, SEL captures the total sound energy from the beginning of the acoustic event to the point when the receiver no longer hears the sound. It then condenses that energy into a 1-second period of time and the metric represents the total sound exposure received. The SEL has proven to be a good metric to compare the relative exposure of transient sounds, and is the recommended metric for sleep disturbance analysis (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009).

3.5.2.4 Maximum Sound Level (L_{max})

The highest A-weighted sound level measured during a single event where the sound level changes value with time is called the maximum A-weighted sound level or L_{max} . During a noise event, the noise level starts at the ambient or background noise level, rises to the maximum level, and returns to the background level. L_{max} defines the maximum sound level occurring for a fraction of a second. In this EA, L_{max} is used in the analysis of speech interference.

3.5.2.5 Number of Events Above a Threshold Level

The “Number of Events Above a Threshold Level” metric provides the total number of noise events that exceed a selected noise level threshold during a specified period of time (U.S. Department of Defense,

2009). Combined with the selected noise metric, L_{\max} or SEL, the number of events above metric is symbolized as $NAXX_{\text{metric}}$ (NA = number of events above, XX = dB level, metric = L_{\max} or SEL). For example, the L_{\max} and SEL number of events above metrics are symbolized as $NA75L_{\max}$ and $NA75SEL$, respectively, with 75 dB as the example dB level. In this EA, an L_{\max} threshold is selected to analyze speech interference and an SEL threshold is selected for analysis of sleep disturbance.

3.5.3 Noise Effects

An extensive amount of research has been conducted regarding noise effects, including annoyance, potential hearing loss, speech interference, noise effects on children in the classroom, sleep interference, workplace noise, and non-auditory health effects to children and the elderly. These effects are summarized below.

3.5.3.1 Annoyance

As previously noted, the primary effect of noise on exposed communities is long-term annoyance, defined by USEPA as any negative subjective reaction on the part of an individual or group. The scientific community has adopted the use of long-term annoyance as a primary indicator of community response and there is a consistent relationship between DNL and the level of community annoyance (Federal Interagency Committee on Noise, 1992).

3.5.3.2 Potential Hearing Loss

People living in high noise environments for an extended period of time (40 years) can be at risk for hearing loss called Noise Induced Permanent Threshold Shift (NIPTS). The NIPTS defines a permanent change in hearing level, or threshold, caused by exposure to noise (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1982). According to the USEPA (1974), changes in hearing level of less than 5 dB are generally not considered noticeable. There is no known evidence that an NIPTS of less than 5 dB is perceptible or has any practical significance for the individual affected. Furthermore, the variability in audiometric testing is generally assumed to be plus or minus 5 dB. The preponderance of available information on hearing loss risk is from the workplace with continuous exposure throughout the day for many years.

Based on a report by Ludlow and Sixsmith (1999), there were no major differences in audiometric test results between military personnel who, as children, had lived in or near installations where fast jet operations were based, and a similar group who had no such exposure as children. Hence, for the purposes of this EA, the limited data are considered applicable to the general population, including children, and are used to provide a conservative estimate of the risk of potential hearing loss.

3.5.3.3 Speech Interference

Speech interference associated with noise is a primary cause of annoyance for communities. Speech interference can cause disruption of routine activities, such as enjoyment of radio or television programs, telephone use, or family conversation, giving rise to frustration or irritation. In extreme cases, speech interference may cause fatigue and vocal strain to individuals who try to communicate over the noise. In this EA, speech interference is measured by the number of daily indoor events (from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) that exceed 50 dB L_{\max} at selected locations.

3.5.3.4 Classroom Criteria and Noise Effects on Children

Research suggests that environments with sustained high background noise can have variable effects, including effects on learning and cognitive abilities and various noise-related physiological changes. Research on the impacts of noise in general on the cognitive abilities of school-aged children has

received more attention in recent years. Several studies suggest that high noise levels can affect the academic performance of school children. Physiological effects in children exposed to noise and the potential for health effects have been the focus of limited investigation (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009).

Analyses for school-aged children are similar to speech interference by using the indoor number of events exceeding 50 dB L_{max} , but also has the added restriction of using an outdoor equivalent noise level of 60 dB $L_{eq}(9)$. This represents a level that a person with normal hearing can clearly hear a speaker (teacher) speaking at a level of 50 dB indoors in a classroom setting.

3.5.3.5 Sleep Disturbance

The disturbance of sleep is a major concern for communities exposed to nighttime noise. In this EA, sleep disturbance uses the SEL noise metric and calculates the probability of awakening from a single noise event. The results are then presented as a percent probability of people awakening (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1974).

3.5.3.6 Workplace Noise

In 1972, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) published a criteria document with a recommended exposure limit of 85 dBA as an 8-hour time-weighted average. This exposure limit was reevaluated in 1998 when NIOSH made recommendations that went beyond conserving hearing by focusing on the prevention of occupational hearing loss. Following the reevaluation using a new risk assessment technique, NIOSH published another criteria document in 1998, which reaffirmed the 85 dB recommended exposure limit (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 1998).

3.5.4 Nonauditory Health Effects

Studies have been conducted to examine the nonauditory health effects of noise exposure, focusing primarily on stress response, blood pressure, birth weight, mortality rates, and cardiovascular health. Exposure to noise levels higher than those normally produced in the community can elevate blood pressure and the levels of stress hormone. However, the response to such loud noise is typically short in duration: after the noise goes away, the physiological effects reverse and levels return to normal. In the case of repeated exposure to noise, the connection is not as clear. The results of most cited studies are inconclusive, and it cannot be conclusively stated that a causal link exists between noise exposure and the various type of nonauditory health effects that were studied (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009).

3.5.4.1 Noise Effects on Children

A review of the scientific literature indicated that there has not been a tremendous amount of research in the area of noise effects on children. The research reviewed does suggest that environments with sustained high background noise can have variable effects, including effects on learning and cognitive abilities and various noise-related physiological changes. Research on the impacts of noise, and noise in general, on the cognitive abilities of school-aged children has received more attention in recent years. Several studies suggest that noise can affect the academic performance of school children. Physiological effects in children exposed to noise and the potential for health effects have been the focus of limited investigation (U.S. Department of Defense, 2009).

3.5.4.2 Noise Effects on the Elderly

Based upon a study by the Harvard School of Public Health, older people exposed to noise, especially at higher levels, may experience an increased risk of hospitalization for cardiovascular disease (Correia et

al., 2013). This study concluded a statistically significant association between exposure to high level noise and risk of hospitalization for cardiovascular diseases among older people living near airports.

3.5.5 Regulatory Setting

Under the Noise Control Act of 1972, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration established workplace standards for noise. The minimum requirement states that constant noise exposure must not exceed 90 dBA over an 8-hour period. The highest allowable sound level to which workers can be constantly exposed is 115 dBA and exposure to this level must not exceed 15 minutes within an 8-hour period. The standards limit instantaneous exposure, such as impact noise, to 140 dBA. If noise levels exceed these standards, employers are required to provide hearing protection equipment that will reduce sound levels to acceptable limits.

3.5.6 Affected Environment

3.5.6.1 Points of Interest

Many components may generate noise and warrant analysis as contributors to the total noise impact. Response to noise varies, depending on the type and characteristics of the noise, distance between the noise source and whoever hears it (the receptor), receptor sensitivity, and time of day. A noise-sensitive receptor (point of interest) is defined as a land use where people involved in indoor or outdoor activities may be subject to stress or considerable interference from noise. Such locations or facilities often include residential dwellings, hospitals, nursing homes, educational facilities, and libraries. Points of interest may also include noise-sensitive cultural practices, some domestic animals, or certain wildlife species.

The training study area and contiguous nearshore waters encompass a broad spectrum of populations and landownership types, including DoD facilities, private lands, public parks, harbors, golf courses, and recreation areas. Commercial, institutional, recreational, and military activities take place simultaneously within this area. Private lands and DoD facilities are typically restricted from public use and access. Within the training study area on Oahu, DoD lands include JBPHH, MCBH, Kahuku Training Area, Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station, Lualualei Annex, and PMRF on Kauai. The remaining lands in the training study area are generally publicly accessible to recreation, commercial, and institutional activities where authorized by the landowners or land managers. The affected environment includes five Oahu regions (JBPHH, South, Windward, North, and West), along with the Island of Hawaii, Kauai, Maui, Lanai, and Molokai. Training at the islands of Maui, Lanai, and Molokai are water-based training only.

All five Oahu regions and Island of Hawaii training areas include private lands and public state, county, and parks, harbors, golf courses, and recreation areas, including Lapakahi State Historical Park and Polihale State Park. Commercial, educational, institutional, recreational, and military activities take place simultaneously within all five Oahu regions and Island of Hawaii training areas. While recreational activities can occur simultaneously with training activities on Kauai, and in waters surrounding Maui, Lanai, and Molokai, there are no churches, schools, hospitals, or private residences near these training areas.

3.5.6.2 Ambient Noise Conditions

Ambient sound levels would likely vary by location. Ambient background noise in urbanized areas typically varies from 60 to 70 dBA. Typical residential noise has been measured at 65 dBA (Cavanaugh & Tocci, 1998). Noise measurements taken on Ford Island and in locations near Joint Base Pearl Harbor-

Hickam indicated nighttime hourly sound levels between 50 and 60 dBA, with daytime noise levels between 55 and 65 dBA (U.S. Army Garrison Hawaii, 2010).

Additional ambient noise measurements were taken in 2010 along the eastern shore of the Pearl City Peninsula in support of the Sea-Based X-Band Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair EA (ManTech International Corporation, 2010). The location of these ambient noise conditions is approximately 0.75 mile south of the Lehua Elementary School. Daytime noise levels (1-hour Leq) at this location were between 53 and 55 dBA. Over the course of a 3-day data collection period, the ambient noise level exceeded 56.3 dBA only 5 percent of the time. Nighttime ambient noise levels were noted between 45 and 50 dBA. Most noises at this location were road and wind noise.

Noise measurements at MCBH indicated that, during active runway use by helicopters and other aircraft or amphibious training, noise levels typically range between 70 and 75 dBA. During periods of no runway use or training, the noise levels are equal to or less than 55 dBA during the day and fall to less than 45 dBA during the evening and night hours. The nearest point of interest to the runways at MCBH is Hale Koa Beach, where noise levels are similar to the noise levels described at the runway (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2008a).

In more remote areas, ambient noise conditions are typically lower than those in more urbanized areas. For instance, at the Makua Military Reservation (within the Oahu West region and north of the Lualualei Annex), noise is generated from infantry and helicopter gunnery training events and other low-level noise sources such as wind, surf, birds, insects, and light highway traffic. Ambient noise levels at Makua Beach are estimated to be between 40 and 50 dBA, with peaks reaching noise levels greater than 70 dBA during high tide and afternoon winds. When there are no training events in progress at Makua Military Reservation, noise conditions are dominated by wind, bird songs, and insects. Under these conditions, noise levels typically vary between approximately 25 and 45 dBA (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2008a).

3.5.7 Environmental Consequences

Analysis of potential noise impacts includes estimating likely noise levels from the proposed action and determining potential effects to points of interest. Noise in relation to biological resources and wildlife species is discussed in Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*.

3.5.7.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations as scheduled in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Given the nature and level of NSWC training activities that occurred in the Hawaii region under the various Records of CATEX and the HSTT EIS/OEIS (i.e., personnel swimming, over-the-beach, and use of submersibles, small boats, and ships), current NSO training activities have not introduced any new noise sources that have changed the baseline noise environment. Therefore, no significant impact on the existing noise environment would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.

3.5.7.2 Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, sources of in-air noise include the aircraft utilized for drop or landing zones, marine support vessels, and surface vehicles that accompany trainees on land or provide transport to trainees. The intent of NSO training activities is to remain undetected and to leave no trace of their presence

during or after the training activity. These operational procedures minimize noise and potential noise impacts.

3.5.7.2.1 Aircraft Noise

The proposed air-based training activities would utilize aircraft including fixed-wing (such as C-17 or C-130), CH-53, or MV-22. The analysis of potential noise impacts from the proposed action presents a conservative approach assuming that MV-22 aircraft have the highest noise level of all the aircraft proposed for use. Table 3-10 presents the estimated received maximum noise levels from the MV-22 at the closest point of interest to the drop or landing zone. The estimated maximum noise levels are based on values reported in the 2009 EIS for the basing of the MV-22 on the West Coast (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2009).

Table 3-10: Estimated Received Maximum Sound Levels (L_{max}) at Points of Interest

Site	Distance in Miles to Points of Interest (from center of Drop/Landing Zone)	Flight Elevation (AGL) and Estimated Received Maximum Noise Level (L_{max})*			
		500	1000	2000	5000
Ford Island (center)	1.5 (McGrew Point Residences)	64	63	62	59
Ford Island (northeast grassy area)	1.0 (McGrew Point Residences)	67	66	65	61
Waipio Peninsula	0.95 (Waipahu District Residences)	68	67	65	61
JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula (southwest land)	0.9 (Lehua Elementary School)	68	67	66	61
JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula (southwest water)	0.5 (Pearl City Residences/Neal Blaisdell Park)	73	72	70	63
JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula (northeast)	0.3 (Waiawa Road Residences)	78	76	72	64
MCBH (southwest water)	0.95 (Kaneohe Residences)	68	67	65	61
MCBH (waters off Pyramid Beach)	1.9 (Kaneohe Residences)	61	61	59	55
MCBH (waters off Fort Hasse Beach)	0.9 (North Kailua residences)	68	67	66	61
Kanes (Kuhuku Training Area)	0.95 (Kawela Gulch Residences)	67	67	65	61
Lualualei Annex	0.4 (Hakimo Place Residences)	75	74	71	63

*Estimated L_{max} values are based on estimated slant distances (elevation of flight + horizontal distance from center of drop zone/landing zone to point of interest).

Source: U.S. Department of the Navy (2009).

The majority of drop zones and landing zones where aircraft would hover are located at distances great enough from points of interest such that received maximum levels would be below 65 dBA and would not elevate the DNL above 65 dBA. For example, drop zones that are offshore are typically conducted for a duration of up to 15 minutes, over 3,000 ft from the points of interest, and received noise levels from activities conducted offshore are expected to be negligible.

For drop/landing zones on Ford Island, the closest points of interest are to the northeast across Pearl Harbor in the McGrew Point area of Aiea (as military housing is not analyzed in this EA), approximately 1 mile from the northeast landing/drop zone on Ford Island and 1.5 miles from the landing/drop zone in the center of Ford Island. Typically, aircraft maintain an elevation between 2,000 and 5,000 ft and only drop below 2,000 ft for up to 15 minutes during the activity to land and takeoff, or to hover during deployment of training participants. At this location, rotary-wing noise would be audible, but the maximum sound level would not be in excess of 65 dBA for flight activities above 2,000 ft. Received maximum sound levels in this region would be anticipated to be between 65 and 70 dBA for lower

hovering or landing activities (activities below 2,000 ft) and would be audible to receptors that are outside. At these received levels, it is anticipated that recreational activities would not be significantly affected. Indoor sound levels such as those within houses or buildings are expected to be lower than outdoor sound levels, reducing the potential for speech interference or classroom interference. Further, these activities are expected to last minutes, thus reducing their potential to impact hourly sound levels or overall DNL.

At the Lualualei Annex, the northeast portion of land on JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula, and the water drop zone at JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula, there are points of interest less than 0.5 mile from the training activities. At Lualualei Annex, residences on Hakimo Place are approximately 0.4 mile from the center of the landing/drop zone. The potential impact at these locations is determined by the length of time that the MV-22 is operating below 2,000 ft AGL. Typically, the aircraft maintains an elevation between 2,000 and 5,000 ft and only drops below 2,000 ft for up to 15 minutes during the activity to land and takeoff, or to hover during deployment of training participants. In this scenario, the contribution to the noise environment will be noticeable. Of note, a recent study (*Environmental Review for Basing MV-22 Aircraft at Marine Corps Air Station Futenma and Operating in Japan - Final, May 2012*) (U.S. Marine Corps, 2012) showed that an MV-22 at arrival or near touchdown has a maximum sound level of 83 dBA, measured at a distance of 500 ft abeam of the aircraft on the left side. A single event may be considered “noisy,” but a single event lasting no more than a few minutes at low elevation would not affect the hourly L_{eq} , and thus the DNL would not change. It is important to note that while DNL levels may not change, the perceived impact of the noise from these activities would be greater in more rural areas, such as the residences near the Lualualei Annex drop zone and landing zone, where ambient daytime noise levels are lower than those in the JBPHH region.

As indicated in Table 3-10, residences on Hakimo Place near the Lualualei Annex could experience received maximum sound levels of up to 75 dBA for activities below 2,000 ft. Typical maximum sound levels from training (between 2,000 and 5,000 ft) would be between 63 and 71 dBA. During landing or hovering activities, these activities would be audible at outdoor locations. Indoor sound levels are expected to be lower, thus reducing the potential for speech interference. Further, though the landing or hovering noise would be audible at sensitive receptors, the levels are not high enough to create indoor levels that result in learning interference, nor are they loud enough to impact hearing abilities.

For the JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula, points of interest within 0.5 mile of the zones include houses (along Waiawa Road to the north), parks (Lehua Community Park), schools (Lehua Elementary School), the Pearl Harbor National Wildlife Refuge, and churches. As indicated in Table 3-10, activities that are below 2,000 ft would create received maximum noise levels at these points of interest above 70 dBA. Landing zones on JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula would be utilized 5–12 times/year. Training would occur from 1:30 pm to 10:00 pm. Given these operational constraints, potential impacts at Lehua Elementary would be reduced, as the school completes its day at 2:00 pm. Nearby residences could still experience maximum received sound levels (outside) between 70 and 78 dBA. This outdoor maximum noise level would be audible, but it would not be at levels that would damage hearing. Additionally, indoor levels are expected to be lower than outdoor levels. As such, indoor speech interference would not be anticipated. Further, as the training activities at JBPHH Pearl City Peninsula would only occur between 1:30 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., sleep disturbance would not be anticipated to be significant.

Proposed sUAS training would take place in the context of military installations where training operations occur. Small hand-launched or catapult launched sUAS would be used during training activities and would operate below 3,500 ft AGL. For reference and comparative purposes only, at a

distance of 28 ft, the received level from a Shadow UAS is approximately 108 dBA; at 204 ft, the received level drops to 85 dBA (National Guard Bureau & U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2008). Once the UAS reaches approximately 3,000 ft AGL, the Shadow would no longer be heard on the ground. The hand held sUAS proposed for use in this EA are smaller and are designed to be quieter than the Shadow; thus, noise levels would be inaudible at a lower altitude than that of the Shadow, though would be expected to be audible at operating elevations (between 65 and 85 dBA depending on elevation). Based on the low proposed frequency of operations (10 percent of the time training is occurring) and the low noise levels of sUAS equipment, sUAS noise would not be expected to have any measurable effect on overall noise levels or to add measurably to the existing DNL.

3.5.7.2.2 Marine Support Vessel Noise

In 2012, an independent study modeled airborne noise emissions for a multipurpose ship and a fishing research vessel and compared with field measurements in 2012 (Badino et al., 2012). At 25 m from the operating vessels, the modeled received noise level was approximately 60 dBA for the fisheries vessel, and 70 dBA for the multipurpose vessel. At distances of 100 m, these received levels would drop to approximately 48 and 58 dBA, respectively, due to propagation loss. During the proposed training activities, surface support vessels would likely be at or greater than 100 m from shore. Further, vessel operation associated with training activities would be intermittent, and not at a fixed position. Given the discussion above, points of interest along the shoreline and further inland would not be impacted from sounds emitting from surface ships at levels that would contribute enough energy to exceed 65 dBA DNL. Sound levels up to 65 dBA DNL are considered to be compatible with land uses such as residences, transient lodging, and medical facilities.

3.5.7.2.3 Land-Based Training Noise

Noise-generating events from proposed land-based activities would be intermittent and the contribution of noise from training activities to the hourly sound levels (L_{eq}) would be low (and thus, their contribution to the DNL would be low). As mentioned above, the trainees strive to avoid detection and try to avoid or minimize civilian exposure. As such, the main noise sources on land are not from the training activities, but from the vehicles used to transport trainees or provide training support. Typical sound levels from a single diesel truck driving by is approximately 88 dBA at 50 ft (U.S. Department of Transportation, 2006). There is minimal travel of personnel and equipment from the staging areas on DoD property to the individual training sites. Personnel utilize government and public waterways and roads, and travel includes military support vehicles towing small boats and the movement of safety and maintenance equipment. Transportation also includes military personnel involved in the safety and training phases of the event. As such, the noise contribution from vehicles would be intermittent and would not contribute enough energy to exceed 65 dBA DNL. A single event may be considered “noisy,” but a single event of 88 dBA lasting no more than a few seconds would not affect the hourly L_{eq} , and thus the DNL would not change.

3.5.7.2.4 Summary

Training events are performed with the training goal that the activities be undetected. Independent of location, the amount of noise created by these activities would not be sufficient enough to affect the community noise levels. Aircraft activities would create noticeable noise at points of interest proximate to the training activity, however, their contribution to the noise environment is expected to be minimal due to the short amount of time that the aircraft is below 2,000 ft. While community noise levels are not expected to be impacted, individual disturbances from maximum sound levels will still occur.

However, any disturbances are expected to be short term and infrequent and any impacts on points of interest are minimal and short term based on the (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts, and (4) brief duration of the activities. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in significant impacts on the noise environment.

3.5.7.3 Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, the same training parameters and considerations as Alternative 1 would take place, but the number of training events at these locations would increase. Under Alternative 2, the increase in training when compared to Alternative 1 would result in the same parameters and considerations as described above. Noise generating events from land-based activities would remain intermittent and the contribution of noise from training activities to the hourly sound levels (L_{eq}) would be low (and thus, their contribution to the DNL would be low). Training activities would have the same requirements and safety restrictions as Alternative 1. Given the nature of the action (i.e., teaching trainees the skills needed to avoid detection and not leaving any trace of presence during or after training activities), Alternative 2 would not have a substantially greater impact on the noise environment compared to Alternative 1.

Aviation flight time would increase approximately 40 percent under Alternative 2 to a total of 40 drop zone and 30 landing zone activities. An increase in activities at any of the proposed landing or drop zone would result in a commensurate rise in received noise levels, and as described above, the mission profile will determine the amount of noise surrounding the training activity. However, given the number of proposed training locations and the low total number of air-based training activities proposed annually, the contribution to the noise environment at any given drop zone or landing zone site is expected to be infrequent and only occasionally impact the overall noise exposure levels. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts on the noise environment.

3.6 Public Health and Safety

This discussion of public health and safety includes consideration for any activities, occurrences, or operations that have the potential to affect the safety, well-being, or health of members of the public. The primary goal is to identify and prevent potential accidents or impacts on the general public.

A safe environment is one in which there is no, or optimally reduced, potential for death, serious bodily injury or illness, or property damage. The public health and safety section within this EA discusses information pertaining to community emergency services, operations, and environmental health and safety risks to children.

Community emergency services are organizations that ensure public safety and health by addressing different emergencies. The three main emergency service functions include police, fire and rescue service, and emergency medical service.

Operational safety may refer to the actual use of the facility or built-out proposed project, or training or testing activities and potential risks to inhabitants or users of adjacent or nearby land and water parcels. Safety measures are often implemented through designated safety zones, warning areas, or other types of designations.

Environmental health and safety risks to children are defined as those that are attributable to products or substances a child is likely to come into contact with or ingest, such as air, food, water, soil, and products that children use or to which they are exposed.

3.6.1 Regulatory Setting

Aircraft safety is based on the physical risks associated with aircraft flight. Military aircraft fly in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations Part 91 (*General Operating and Flight Rules*) which govern such things as operating near other aircraft, right-of-way rules, aircraft speed, and minimum safe altitudes. These rules include the use of tactical training and maintenance test flight areas, arrival and departure routes, and airspace restrictions as appropriate to help control air operations. In addition, military aviators must also adhere to the flight rules, air traffic control, and safety procedures provided in Navy guidance.

The FAA issues a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) to disseminate information on upcoming or ongoing military training exercises with airspace restrictions (including the operation of sUAS). Operators of civilian aircraft are responsible for being aware of any NOTAMs that are in effect.

The FAA issues Certificates of Authorization to public and government operators for specific sUAS activities. Certificates of Authorization may include specific safety provisions or limitations that a sUAS operator must follow as part of the approval. The DoD has signed a memorandum of agreement with the FAA that includes the procedure for obtaining a Certificate of Authorization and requires additional safety measures (U.S. Department of Defense, 2013). For example, under this memorandum, sUAS cannot be operated over populated areas unless airworthiness allows.

In accordance with 33 CFR Part 72, the USCG, National Ocean Service, and National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) issue Notice to Mariners (NOTMARs), which provide timely marine safety information for the correction of all U.S. Government navigation charts and publications from a wide variety of sources, both foreign and domestic. To ensure the safety of life at sea, the information published in the NOTMAR is designed to provide for the correction of unclassified nautical charts, the unclassified NGA/Defense Logistics Information Service Catalog of Hydrographic Products, U.S. Coast

Pilots, NGA List of Lights, USCG Light Lists, and other related nautical publications produced by NGA, National Ocean Service, and the USCG.

EO 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, requires federal agencies to “make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and shall ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks.”

3.6.2 Affected Environment

The training study area and contiguous nearshore waters encompass a broad spectrum of populations and landownership types, including private lands, public parks, harbors, golf courses, and recreation areas. Commercial, institutional, recreational, and military activities take place simultaneously within this area.

The American Community Survey's 5-year estimate for 2011–2015 estimated that the state of Hawaii had a population of approximately 308,197 children below the age of 18 (21.9 percent of the total population of Hawaii). These estimates do not include tourists or other visitors potentially within the training study area. Approximately 10.6 percent of the Hawaii population is below the poverty line (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016).

Several federal, State, and local emergency services respond to emergencies within the training study area, including local fire, police, and the USCG. NSWC currently designs and implements the safety and inspection procedures for operations and activities within the training study area. In the absence of specific guidance on matters of safety, NSWC follows the most prudent course of action to ensure the safety of all training participants and the nonparticipating public. The following paragraphs briefly provide general rules and practices for recreational, commercial, institutional, and military use in sea surface areas, on land, and in airspace.

Although much of the offshore navigable and public waters in the training study area are freely accessible to the public for recreational and commercial activities, these waters include restricted areas, safety zones, danger zones, and prohibited areas, which limit or prohibit the public's access to certain waters. Public access is restricted in the waters around MCBH, located on the Mokapu Peninsula in the Windward Oahu Region. MCBH is surrounded by a security buffer zone which extends 500 yards seaward from the shore of the Mokapu Peninsula and restricts access to the sea space within the buffer, including access by recreation activities. The purpose of the security buffer zone is to maintain military security and public safety.

For periodic training events currently conducted within the training study area, the USCG ensures that private and commercial vessels are aware of operations that could affect them and that they comply with all maritime regulations as administered by the USCG. NSWC safety measures ensure public health and safety primarily through published and periodically reviewed SOPs that are designed to minimize or avoid civilian exposure to training activities.

DoD facilities are typically restricted from public use. Within the training study area, this would include JBPHH, Puuloa Range Training Facility, MCBH, Kahuku Training Area, Barbers Point, Air Force Tracking Station, Lualualei Annex on Oahu, and PMRF on Kauai. The remaining lands in the training study area are, generally, accessible to recreation, commercial, and institutional activities by the public where authorized by the landowners or land managers.

The airspace in the training study area is accessible to general aviation (recreational, private, corporate) and commercial aircraft. The FAA is responsible for the safe and efficient use of U.S. airspace by military and civilian aircraft and for supporting national defense requirements. Within the training study area, controlled airspace is categorized into five separate classes within the National Airspace System: Class A through Class E, where Class B, C, or D is established to regulate air operations within an airport environment. The airspace management and use within the training study area is coordinated through air traffic control, which provides aircraft scheduling in accordance with the individual airspace classifications. The FAA regulates military operations in the National Airspace System through implementation of FAA Order JO 7400.2M (Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters) and other joint agreements for special military operations. The DoD and FAA coordinate to establish policy, criteria, and specific procedures for air traffic control planning, coordination, and services during defense activities and special military operations.

3.6.3 Environmental Consequences

The safety and environmental health analysis contained in the respective sections addresses issues related to the health and well-being of military personnel and civilians living on or in the vicinity of the training study area. Specifically, this section provides information on hazards associated with the training activities identified in Chapter 2 (Proposed Action and Alternatives). Additionally, this section addresses the environmental health and safety risks to children.

3.6.3.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. NSWC activities that occurred in the Hawaii region under the Records of CATEX and HSTT EIS/OEIS would not change public health and safety. Therefore, no significant impact on existing public health and safety would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.

3.6.3.2 Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, land-based and air-based training activities would occur on three Hawaiian Islands and water-based training activities would occur in the waters around six Hawaiian Islands. Navy policy requires that training activities ensure the safety and health of personnel and the public and requires that every possible precaution in planning and executing its actions are enforced to prevent injury to people or damage to property. NSO personnel conduct all training events in accordance with military training procedures, approved SOPs, and protective measures, including OPNAVINST 5100.23H, *Navy Safety and Occupational Health Manual* (2020). These policies assure a thorough consideration of public health and safety in conjunction with Navy personnel and their activities. Proposed training activities would not require assistance from local law enforcement for traffic or pedestrian control. NSWC would coordinate with local police departments and local law enforcement prior to conducting training activities. Therefore, there would be no additional demand on local law enforcement.

As described in Chapter 2 (Proposed Action and Alternatives), proposed training activities would not include using live-fire weapons or explosives; however, in three locations (Puuloa Range Training Facility, Pearl City Peninsula, and MCBH – Kaneohe Bay Range Training Facility), live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges. These three locations are within DoD property with limited and restricted public access and are authorized live-fire training areas. To further

ensure public safety in all other areas of the training study area, trainees would not carry loaded weapons or explosives during training events.

Alternative 1 does not include the construction, improvement, or maintenance of any road or right-of-way. Alternative 1 also does not include designating or altering any special use airspace or restricted waters. All personnel would transit to and from training areas using existing roads, flight paths, and waterways in compliance with all applicable safety regulations.

Supervisor and safety personnel focus on maintaining a safety buffer around the small submersible or watercraft consistent with USCG regulations, namely the USCG Navigation Rules and Regulations Handbook, and as site conditions and the surrounding environment dictate. For example, navigation lights on a dive boat (red over white over red) or a dive flag indicate that a dive is in progress and other vessels should keep well clear and at slow speed. Dive site locations would avoid locations that experience heavy traffic patterns, such as main shipping routes or fishing activities. In the event maritime vessels approach an active dive site, safety personnel would utilize Channel 16 (intended for international distress, safety, and calling) to contact vessels. If an oncoming vessel does not respond, a safety boat would approach the vessel and, depending on the situation, ask it to (1) hold its position; (2) go around the dive site; (3) if necessary, be escorted by the safety boat around the dive site; or (4) recall its divers to the surface or go to deep submerge. This ensures safety for the trainees, training vessels, and any commercial and civilian craft that may transit adjacent to the event location.

In addition to maintaining a safety buffer, supervisor and safety support personnel are responsible for identifying hazards to navigation that could affect the safety of the trainees, and recalling swimmers and divers, or the small submersible, to the surface, if conditions require. If the public enters the training area, the selected training may temporarily cease while the public transits the training area.

In cases where certain training activities involve navigational hazards, primarily parachute drops or cast and recovery, NSWC would coordinate with the USCG to issue NOTMARs that advise mariners on information concerning the safety of navigation. For all open water training events involving broadcast navigational hazards, a Safety Officer would be present to ensure that training areas are clear from non-participating members of the public and training activities can be conducted safely. In addition, on-call medical response personnel would be available throughout each training event.

Trainees use fish-finder type sonar when conducting water-based training. To ensure safe and effective sonar use, NSWC applies safety procedures consistent with the U.S. Navy Diving Manual, Appendix 1A, *Safe Diving Distances from Transmitting Sonar*, the Navy's governing document for protecting divers during active sonar use (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2011b). The manual provides procedures for calculating safe distances from active sonar. These procedures are derived from experimental and theoretical research conducted at the Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory and the Navy Experimental Diving Unit. Safety distances vary based on conditions that include type of sonar, and duration of time in the water. These safety distances would also be applicable to recreational swimmers and divers. The sonar used during NSO training is the same as fish-finder type sonar employed by recreational and commercial fishermen, and commonly used throughout the training study area. Considering the existing use of fish-finder type sonar in the training study area, anticipated infrequent and short-term use of areas proposed for training and the large expanse of the training study area, NSO training is not anticipated to overlap with recreational swimmers or divers or result in impacts on members of the public.

All training events on non-DoD lands and within state-owned harbors would be conducted in accordance with real estate agreements and approvals. NSWC would coordinate with land managers (where applicable), and property owners prior to use of property for training. NSWC would secure the appropriate permits, permissions, passes, or approvals prior to performing activities on these properties. NSWC safety measures include SOPs that are designed to avoid or minimize civilian exposure to training activities. For example, if the public enters the training area, the safety support personnel would assess the situation and, based upon safety considerations, would either continue the training, temporarily suspend the training, completely stop the training, or relocate the training to another approved training site. Prior to land-based training, support staff would typically visit a site. If members of the public are present, then the training event could shift away from the public or would not take place at the selected site. Additionally, support staff would be on site at all times to ensure overall safety in the training environment. While schools and churches are present throughout the training study areas in the JBPHH Region, training is not proposed to occur within schools or church facilities. The measures described above to minimize NSO training interaction with the public would further avoid potential impacts on the public's use of school and church facilities.

When conducting air-based training activities, NSO personnel would be supported by other DoD services, including Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Army and their associated aircraft assets. All aircraft used to support NSO training would be operated in accordance with all FAA safety regulations and NATOPS program. Safety regulations include NOTAMs created and transmitted to alert aircraft pilots of any hazards in route to or at a specific location as needed, which would include the location of parachute training operations. Operators of civilian aircraft are responsible for being aware of any NOTAMs that are in effect.

Proposed sUAS training would occur above DoD and USCG property. Proposed sUAS would carry non-hazardous payloads and would be operated in accordance with all FAA safety regulations and the DoD's memorandum of agreement with the FAA (Federal Aviation Administration, 2002). To operate sUAS, NSWC would obtain a Certificate of Authorization prior to operating these systems. If necessary, the Certificate of Authorization would include additional safety measures that would be adhered to while operating the sUAS. Proposed sUAS training activities would have staff on hand who would be responsible for the safety and oversight of trainees participating in these activities and would utilize ground-based observers when operating sUAS.

During training events, NSWC would dedicate a vehicle for emergency response. Commander Navy Region Hawaii would be contacted if a spill of any hazardous substance or oil were to occur into State waters, the ground, or in air, in accordance with the Navy's Oil and Hazardous Substance Integrated Contingency Plan. Commander Navy Region Hawaii would also be contacted if an oil spill occurred that could violate water quality standards, cause a film or sheen or discoloration on the water surface or shoreline, or cause sludge or emulsion to be deposited beneath the surface of the water. Should any spill pose a threat to human health, 911 would be called immediately. Any petroleum-contaminated soil from an accidental spill would be treated, stored, transported, handled, labeled, and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. This ensures safety for the trainees, training vessels, and any commercial and civilian craft that may transit adjacent to the event location.

As discussed above, Navy policy requires that training activities ensure the safety and health of personnel and the public. Alternative 1 would not result in environmental health or safety risks that would disproportionately affect children. Therefore, no significant impacts on public health and safety would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.

3.6.3.3 Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, the same impacts, analysis, and measures from Alternative 1 would apply to the proposed training activities and regions in the training study area. The increase in the number of training events at locations in the training study area would not result in environmental health or safety risks that would disproportionately affect children. Alternative 2 would have the same safety restrictions and requirements as described under Alternative 1, where personnel would transit to and from training areas using existing roads, and waterways in compliance with all applicable safety regulations. Supervisor and safety personnel would be present at training sites to ensure safety of the training site for trainees and public (if present). The increase in frequency would not have a substantially greater impact on public health and safety compared to Alternative 1. Therefore, no significant impacts on public health and safety would occur with implementation of Alternative 2.

3.7 Summary of Potential Impacts on Resources

A summary of the potential impacts associated with each of the action alternatives and the No Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-11.

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
AIR QUALITY		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in the state of Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impact on air quality would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Transportation vehicles, vessels, aircraft and training equipment associated with proposed training activities would generate emissions; however, the emissions would not result in a significant change from the environmental baseline and would have negligible impacts on the ambient air quality of the region. In addition, the dispersive nature of the proposed activities would prevent pollutants concentrating in a single location and would not result in a new major source of emissions that could cause the state of Hawaii to exceed NAAQS. The state of Hawaii is designated as being in attainment for all criteria pollutants and, therefore, does not require a conformity determination. Therefore, no significant impacts on air quality would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Transportation vehicles, vessels, aircraft and training equipment associated with proposed training activities would generate emissions greater than Alternative 1 due to the increase in tempo. Proposed training activities would not result in a significant change from the environmental baseline and would have negligible impacts on the ambient air quality of the region. In addition, the dispersive nature of the proposed activities would prevent pollutants concentrating in a single location and would not result in a new major source of emissions that could cause the state of Hawaii to exceed NAAQS. The state of Hawaii is designated as being in attainment for all criteria pollutants and, therefore, does not require a conformity determination. Therefore, no significant impacts on air quality would occur with implementation of Alternative 2.</p>
LAND USE/RECREATION		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in the state of Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed training activities under Alternative 1 would not restrict the ability of individuals to use or access areas used for recreation, hunting, fishing, or other existing land uses. Proposed training activities would not affect the public’s ability to use recreation areas as training activities would be localized, infrequent, and brief in duration. Right-of-entry permits and/or real estate agreements would be obtained prior to conducting training in areas where consent is needed. Minimization measures employed during training activities would limit encounters with the public during training events. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of Alternative 1. • In accordance with the CZMA, the Navy completed the Federal CCD process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020 and February 17, 2021, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning conditionally concurred with the Navy’s determinations that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional impacts on land use/recreation are expected. Impacts on land use/recreation with implementation of Alternative 2 are expected to be similar to Alternative 1 and would be minimal, short term, and temporary due to the following: relatively low intensity of the impacts, localized nature of the impacts, infrequent nature of the impacts, brief duration of the activities, and implementation of SOPs and BMPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on land use/recreation. • The proposed training activities under Alternative 2 would not restrict the ability of individuals to use or access areas used for recreation, hunting, fishing, or other existing land uses. Proposed training activities would not affect the public’s ability to use recreation areas as training activities would be localized, infrequent, and brief in duration. Right-of-entry permits and/or real estate agreements would be obtained prior to conducting training in areas where consent is needed. Minimization measures employed during training activities

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a <i>de minimis</i> usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 <i>Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA</i>. Pursuant to the 2009 <i>de minimis</i> activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed <i>de minimis</i> activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions. • On January 23, 2019 the Navy submitted a Negative Determination for proposed training activities at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area. The Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii. • On March 25, 2021 the Navy submitted an addendum to the January 23, 2019 Negative Determination to address U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS. The Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training on U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii. 	<p>would limit encounters with the public during training events. No public properties would be closed to the public during proposed training activities. Therefore, no significant impacts on land use or recreation would occur with implementation of Alternative 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the CZMA, the Navy completed the Federal CCD process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020 and February 17, 2021, the State of Hawaii Office of Planning conditionally concurred with the Navy’s determinations that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program. • The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a <i>de minimis</i> usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 <i>Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities under CZMA</i>. Pursuant to the 2009 <i>de minimis</i> activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed <i>de minimis</i> activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions. • On January 23, 2019 the Navy submitted a Negative Determination for proposed training activities at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area. The Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii. • On March 25, 2021 the Navy submitted an addendum to the January 23, 2019 Negative Determination to address U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS. The Navy determined that the

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
		<p>proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. Therefore, implementation of the proposed NSO training on U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii.</p>
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in the state of Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impacts on biological resources would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Impacts on terrestrial and marine biological resources with implementation of Alternative 1 are expected to be minimal, short term, and temporary due to the following: relatively low intensity of the impacts, localized nature of the impacts, infrequent nature of the impacts, brief duration of the activities, and implementation of SOPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on biological resources.</p> <p>Terrestrial Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the non-invasive nature of the proposed training activities (e.g., no live-fire, no construction, no digging, no fires, no human waste) would have minimal effects on terrestrial vegetation and wildlife because of the short duration, infrequency of occurrence, and low intensity of the proposed training activities. Because the goal of training is for the trainees to be in the field undetected, the environment would be minimally disturbed and materials (e.g., gear and trash) would not be left behind. In addition, identical travel routes would rarely be used; the level of foot traffic associated with each group would not wear paths in the training study area. Species would likely respond to the physical presence of trainees by temporarily stopping normal activities (e.g., feeding, resting) and moving away from the training activity. This type of impact is anticipated to be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (where behavioral changes would be insignificant). • Overall, potential impacts to populations of vegetation and wildlife would be insignificant, as effects on individuals would be temporary and effects to habitat discountable because of the non-invasive nature and intent to leave no trace during or 	<p>Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional impacts on terrestrial and marine biological resources are expected. Impacts on biological resources with implementation of Alternative 2 are expected to be similar to Alternative 1 and would be minimal, short term, and temporary due to the following: relatively low intensity of the impacts, localized nature of the impacts, infrequent nature of the impacts, brief duration of the activities, and implementation of SOPs designed to minimize or avoid impacts on biological resources.</p> <p>Terrestrial Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the non-invasive nature of the proposed training activities (e.g., no live-fire, no construction, no digging, no fires, no human waste) would have minimal effects on terrestrial vegetation and wildlife because of the short duration, infrequency of occurrence, and low intensity of the proposed training activities. Because the goal of training is for the trainees to be in the field undetected, the environment would be minimally disturbed and materials (e.g., gear and trash) would not be left behind. In addition, identical travel routes would rarely be used; the level of foot traffic associated with each group would not wear paths in the training study area. Species would likely respond to the physical presence of trainees by temporarily stopping normal activities (e.g., feeding, resting) and moving away from the activity. The proposed training activities under Alternative 2 would likely induce a slight increase in the number of individual animals that would potentially experience

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>after a training event. Long-term consequences to terrestrial wildlife and vegetation are not expected under Alternative 1. Therefore, no significant impacts on terrestrial biological resources would occur with implementation of Alternative 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBTA Conclusion: A variety of bird species would be encountered in the training study area, including those listed under the MBTA. Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), with implementation of aircraft flight restrictions, impacts from proposed training activities under Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect on migratory bird populations. • ESA Conclusion (Terrestrial Species). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat. As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the USFWS regarding potential impacts on ESA-listed terrestrial species and critical habitat within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, proposed training activities in the terrestrial environment under Alternative 1 may affect, but would not adversely affect, the same ESA-listed terrestrial species and critical habitat as under Alternative 2. <p>Marine Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed training activities in the marine environment would have minimal impacts on marine vegetation and invertebrates because of the minimally invasive training activities and avoidance measures (e.g., timing of activities to avoid low tides and geographic restrictions on sensitive coral reef areas). Any disturbances from activities under Alternative 1 would not be expected to cause long-term or permanent impairment to the surrounding benthic habitats because any damage would likely be very small and localized. 	<p>temporary behavioral effects; however, these animals would quickly resume normal activities after the disturbance ceases or trainees move through an area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be no detectable increases in overall impacts compared to those discussed under Alternative 1. Potential effects to terrestrial species overall would be insignificant, as effects on individuals would be temporary and effects to habitat discountable because of the non-invasive nature and intent to leave no trace during or after a training event. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts on terrestrial biological resources with implementation of Alternative 2. • MBTA Conclusion. A variety of bird species would be encountered in the training study area, including those listed under the MBTA. Under the MBTA regulations applicable to military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21), with implementation of aircraft flight restrictions, impacts from proposed training activities under Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect on migratory bird populations. • ESA Conclusion (Terrestrial Species). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with the USFWS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat. Based on the analysis in the BE, proposed training activities in the terrestrial environment under Alternative 2 may affect, but would not adversely affect, the following ESA-listed terrestrial species and associated critical habitat: six plant species and associated critical habitat for two of the species, orangeblack damselfly, two yellow-faced bee species, Hawaiian coot, Hawaiian common gallinule, Hawaiian duck, Hawaiian stilt, Hawaiian goose, Hawaiian hawk, band-rumped storm petrel, Hawaiian petrel, Newell’s Townsend’s shearwater, Hawaiian hoary bat, green turtle, hawksbill turtle, and olive ridley turtle. In March 2019 and March 2021, the USFWS issued letters concurring with the Navy’s findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect,

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential impact on marine fish from the physical presence of trainees, physical disturbance or strike from vessels, and acoustic energy (noise) generated during training activities under Alternative 1 would be extremely low because (1) most fish can detect and avoid vessel (surface and submersible) and human movements, and (2) activities occur at infrequent intervals and for a brief duration of time. Potential impacts of exposure to vessels and noise generated by vessels are not expected to result in substantial changes to an individual’s behavior, fitness, or species recruitment and are not expected to result in population-level impacts. Since impacts from these stressors would be unlikely, impacts on individual fish or fish populations would be negligible. • Therefore, no significant impacts on marine biological resources would occur with implementation of Alternative 1. • <u>EFH Conclusion.</u> Pursuant to the EFH requirements of the MSA and implementing regulations, activities proposed under Alternative 1 that involve vessels and personnel in the water could potentially impact EFH and associated species in the training study area. As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and conducted consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the NMFS regarding potential impacts on EFH within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, proposed training activities in the marine environment under Alternative 1 would not adversely affect EFH with the implementation of the following conservation measures under Alternative 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct surveillance and site-specific training reconnaissance as described in the proposed BMPs. - Training exercises within areas designated as MLCs on Oahu and Lanai will be modified to avoid impacts to marine resources. No motorized vessels (e.g., 	<p>ESA-listed species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction (see Appendix A, <i>Agency Correspondence</i>).</p> <p>Marine Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed training activities would have minimal impacts on marine vegetation and invertebrates because of the minimally invasive training activities and avoidance measures (e.g., timing of activities to avoid low tides and geographic restrictions on sensitive coral reef areas). Any disturbances from activities under Alternative 2 would not be expected to cause long-term or permanent impairment to the surrounding benthic habitats because any damage would likely be very small and localized. • The potential impact on marine fish from the physical presence of trainees, physical disturbance or strike from vessels, and acoustic energy (noise) generated during training activities under Alternative 2 would be extremely low because (1) most fish can detect and avoid vessel (surface and submersible) and human movements, and (2) activities occur at infrequent intervals and for a brief duration of time. Potential impacts of exposure to vessels and noise generated by vessels are not expected to result in substantial changes to an individual’s behavior, fitness, or species recruitment and are not expected to result in population-level impacts. Since impacts from these stressors would be unlikely, impacts on individual fish or fish populations would be negligible. • Therefore, no significant impacts on marine biological resources would occur with implementation of Alternative 2. • <u>EFH Conclusion.</u> Pursuant to the EFH requirements of the MSA and implementing regulations, activities proposed under Alternative 2 that involve vessels and personnel in the water could potentially impact EFH species and habitats present in the training study area. As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and conducted consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. The Navy has determined that under Alternative 2 there would be no adverse effect on

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>submarine, zodiacs, or jet-skis) will be utilized in either MLCD. All vessels/crafts will be left at the outer boundary of the MLCDs. Scuba diving, an approved activity within the MLCDs, will be conducted within both MLCDs. Over-the-beach training is allowed at the Pupukea MLCD, Oahu; however, over-the-beach training will not be conducted at the Hulopo’e Bay MLCD, Lanai.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure no anchors, equipment, tools, and personnel are in contact with any organism, especially coral; instead place anchors in soft sediment in unconsolidated bottom habitats only. - All vessels should operate at “no wake/idle” speeds at all times while in water depths where the draft of the vessel provides less than a 6-ft clearance. - When conducting activities in shallow water, all vessels should employ a dedicated and qualified “lookout” to assist the pilot with avoiding large coral colonies and other benthic organisms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESA Conclusion (Marine Species). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat. As the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from NMFS regarding potential impacts on ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat within the action area under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, proposed training activities in the marine environment under Alternative 1 may affect, but would not adversely affect, the same ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat as under Alternative 2. • MMPA Conclusion. Pursuant to the MMPA, the Navy has determined that under Alternative 1, Level A or Level B harassment of marine mammals is not expected to occur. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume 	<p>EFH within the training study area. In June 2018, as part of the EFH consultation process for the proposed action, NMFS issued a number of conservation recommendations to avoid and minimize impacts to EFH. The Navy responded in November 2019 and agreed to implement the following conservation recommendations, and consultation for EFH under the MSA was completed in December 2019 with receipt of a letter of concurrence from NMFS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct surveillance and site-specific training reconnaissance as described in the proposed BMPs. - Training exercises within areas designated as MLCDs on Oahu and Lanai will be modified to avoid impacts to marine resources. No motorized vessels (e.g., submarine, zodiacs, or jet-skis) will be utilized in either MLCD. All vessels/crafts will be left at the outer boundary of the MLCDs. Scuba diving, an approved activity within the MLCDs, will be conducted within both MLCDs. Over-the-beach training is allowed at the Pupukea MLCD, Oahu; however, over-the-beach training will not be conducted at the Hulopo’e Bay MLCD, Lanai. - Ensure no anchors, equipment, tools, and personnel are in contact with any organism, especially coral; instead place anchors in soft sediment in unconsolidated bottom habitats only. - All vessels should operate at “no wake/idle” speeds at all times while in water depths where the draft of the vessel provides less than a 6-ft clearance. - When conducting activities in shallow water, all vessels should employ a dedicated and qualified “lookout” to assist the pilot with avoiding large coral colonies and other benthic organisms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESA Conclusion (Marine Species). As required by section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy prepared a BE and conducted informal consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat. Based on the analysis in the BE, proposed training activities in the marine environment under Alternative 2 may affect, but

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes) and would not be considered Level A or Level B harassment. Therefore, consultation under MMPA is not required.</p>	<p>would not adversely affect, the following ESA-listed marine species and associated critical habitat: oceanic whitetip shark, giant manta ray, green turtle, hawksbill turtle, olive ridley turtle, Hawaiian monk seal and associated critical habitat, blue whale (Central North Pacific Stock), Main Hawaiian Islands Insular false killer whale and associated critical habitat, fin whale, sei whale, and sperm whale.</p> <p>On April 30, 2020, NMFS issued a letter concurring with the Navy’s findings that implementation of Alternative 2 may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed marine species and critical habitat within the action area under their jurisdiction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MMPA Conclusion.</u> Pursuant to the MMPA, the Navy has determined that under Alternative 2, Level A or Level B harassment of marine mammals are not expected to occur. The types of impacts anticipated from in-water activities would be short term (where normal activities would resume after training events cease or move through the area) and minor (minor behavioral changes) and would not be considered Level A or Level B harassment. Therefore, consultation under MMPA is not required.
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HST EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impacts on cultural resources would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed training activities would be non-invasive in nature. Training would also follow the protocols established under existing Programmatic Agreements, Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plans, and requirements in land use agreements and/or rights of entry, where applicable, to further avoid and minimize the potential for impacts on archeological resources, historic architecture, and traditional cultural properties. The Navy has determined that no historic properties would be affected with implementation of Alternative 1 based on the following: (1) the goal of small-unit training is to be undetected (silent and unseen) during training and leave no trace of their presence during or after the training activity; (2) the undertaking does not include construction or ground-disturbing activities; (3) the training will avoid historic properties; and (4) proposed training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional impacts on cultural resources are expected and impacts to cultural resources with implementation of Alternative 2 are expected to be similar to Alternative 1. • The proposed training activities would be non-invasive in nature. While tempo would increase under Alternative 2, training would follow the protocols established under existing Programmatic Agreements, Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plans, and requirements in land use agreements and/or rights of entry, where applicable, to further avoid and minimize the potential for impacts on archeological resources, historic architecture, and traditional cultural properties. The Navy has determined that no historic properties would be

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>activities at or in the vicinity of historic properties will not alter the characteristics of the historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the NRHP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>NHPA Section 106 Consultation</u>. As required by NHPA Section 106, the Navy consulted with the Hawaii SHPO, Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic partners, and the public to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on historic properties. As the APE is the same for Alternatives 1 and 2 and the maximum number of training events under Alternative 2 is greater than under Alternative 1, the concurrence from the Hawaii SHPO regarding potential impacts historic properties within the APE under Alternative 2 is also applicable under Alternative 1. Therefore, the proposed undertaking under Alternative 1 would result in no historic properties affected in accordance with NHPA Section 106 Implementing Regulations at 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1). 	<p>affected with implementation of Alternative 1 based on the following: (1) the goal of small-unit training is to be undetected (silent and unseen) during training and leave no trace of their presence during or after the training activity; (2) the undertaking does not include construction or ground-disturbing activities; (3) the training will avoid historic properties; and (4) proposed training activities at or in the vicinity of historic properties will not alter the characteristics of the historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the NRHP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>NHPA Section 106 Consultation</u>. The Navy initiated the NHPA Section 106 process August 22, 2018. The Navy consulted with the Hawaii SHPO, Native Hawaiian Organizations, historic partners, and the public. The Navy determined that the proposed undertaking under Alternative 2 would result in no historic properties affected in accordance with NHPA Section 106 Implementing Regulations at 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1). Since the proposed training activities will be ongoing, the Navy has agreed to brief SHPO annually regarding effects to historic properties, if any, as well as locations of training in accordance to Operational Security requirements. In addition, the Navy shall review the Section 106 consultation with the SHPO 7 years following receipt of SHPO’s concurrence letter. Prior to the 7 year review, reinitiation of the Section 106 process would be warranted if there is a change in the undertaking or the APE. On May 29, 2020, the Hawaii SHPO concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect and the Navy's Section 106 requirements have been completed (see Appendix A, <i>Agency Correspondence</i>).
Noise		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training activities would generally occur away from residentially zoned areas and the goal of land-based activities is to remain undetected and leave no trace of presence during or after the training. • Aviation training activities and associated noise would only occur over or within DoD and USCG properties or over open water adjacent to a DoD installation. In addition, the 	<p>Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities. Despite the increase in tempo, no additional noise impacts on noise-sensitive receptors or points of interest are expected and noise impacts with implementation of Alternative 2 are expected to be similar to Alternative 1.</p>

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
<p>CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impact on the noise environment would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>operational conditions of aviation activities to maintain elevations above 2,000 ft except for short periods (below 500 ft for approximately 10 minutes) associated with proposed training under Alternative 1 avoids and minimizes noise and potential noise impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Alternative 1, proposed training would not include use of live-fire weapons; however, in three locations live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges. • Disturbances are expected to be short term and infrequent and any impacts on noise-sensitive receptors or points of interest would be minimal and short term based on the (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts, and (4) brief duration of the activities. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in significant impacts to the regional noise environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training activities would generally occur away from residentially zoned areas and the operational conditions of land-based activities is to remain undetected and leave no trace of presence during or after the training. • Aviation training activities and associated noise would only occur over or within DoD and USCG properties or over open water adjacent to a DoD installation. In addition, the operational conditions of aviation activities to maintain elevations above 2,000 ft except for short periods (below 500 ft for approximately 10 minutes) associated with proposed training under Alternative 2 avoids and minimizes noise and potential noise impacts. • Under Alternative 2, proposed training would not include use of live-fire weapons; however, in three locations live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges. • Disturbances are expected to be short term and infrequent and any impacts on noise-sensitive receptors or points of interest would be minimal and short term based on the (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts, and (4) brief duration of the activities. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts to the regional noise environment.
<p>PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY</p>		
<p>NSO training activities conducted in Hawaii over the past 30 years would continue at the same level and locations in the nearshore waters of and selected shoreline and inland locations on Oahu and the Island of Hawaii and currently approved under event-based Records of CATEX and the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS, as applicable. Therefore, no significant impacts on public health and safety would occur with implementation of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Navy policy requires that training activities ensure the safety and health of personnel and the public. Under Alternative 1, proposed training would not include use of live-fire weapons. However, live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land at three locations to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges with limited and restricted public access; therefore, public health and safety would not be affected. For other training activities, personnel would use existing roads and waterways in compliance with applicable safety regulations. • Air-based activities, including the use of aircraft and sUAS, would comply with FAA safety regulation and the DoD's memorandum of agreement with the FAA and the NATOPS 	<p>Alternative 2 includes the same training study area and training activities as under Alternative 1, but with an increase in tempo of training activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Navy policy requires that training activities ensure the safety and health of personnel and the public. Under Alternative 2, proposed training would not include use of live-fire weapons. However, live-fire weapons would be carried over DoD land at three locations to reach existing DoD live-fire ranges with limited and restricted public access; therefore, public health and safety would not be affected. For other training activities, personnel would travel using existing roads and waterways in compliance with applicable safety regulations.

Table 3-11: Summary of Potential Impacts by Resource Area

No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	<p>program. sUAS would only be operated above DoD and USCG installations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All training events on state, county, city, or private lands and harbors would be conducted in accordance with rights-of-entry and real estate agreements and approvals, as applicable. A safety buffer would be established around water- and land-based training areas, and a vehicle would be dedicated for emergency response during training events. Size and type of safety buffer would vary by training site. NSWC would coordinate with the USCG to issue NOTMARs and will also coordinate with local police departments and law enforcement prior to conducting training activities. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts to public health and safety with implementation of Alternative 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air-based activities, including the use of aircraft and sUAS, would comply with FAA safety regulation and the DOD's memorandum of agreement with the FAA and the NATOPS program. sUAS would only be operated above DoD and USCG installations. All training events on state, county, city, or private lands and harbors would be conducted in accordance with rights-of-entry and real estate agreements and approvals. A safety buffer would be established around water- and land-based training areas, and a vehicle would be dedicated for emergency response during training events. NSWC would coordinate with the USCG to issue NOTMARs and will also coordinate with local police departments and law enforcement prior to conducting training activities. The increase in tempo under Alternative 2 would not have a substantially greater impact on public health and safety when compared to Alternative 1. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts to public health and safety with implementation of Alternative 2.

Notes: APE = area of potential effect; BE = Biological Evaluation; BMP = Best Management Practice; CATEX = Categorical Exclusion; CCD = Coastal Consistency Determination; CFR = Code of Federal Regulations; CZM = Coastal Zone Management; CZMA = Coast Zone Management Act; DoD = Department of Defense; DPS = Distinct Population Segment; EFH = Essential Fish Habitat, ESA = Endangered Species Act; FAA = Federal Aviation Administration; ft = feet; HSTT EIS/OEIS = Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement; KPSTS = Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station; MBTA= Migratory Bird Treaty Act; MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; MMPA = Marine Mammal Protection Act; MSA = Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; NAAQS = National Ambient Air Quality Standards; NATOPS = Naval Air Training and Operating Procedures Standardization; NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act; NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service; NOTMARs = Notice to Mariners; NRHP = National Register of Historic Places; NSO = Naval Special Operations; NSWC = Naval Special Warfare Command; SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer; SOP = Special Operating Procedure; sUAS = small unmanned aircraft system; USCG = U.S. Coast Guard; USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

4 Cumulative Impacts

This section (1) defines cumulative impacts, (2) describes past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions relevant to cumulative impacts, (3) analyzes the incremental interaction the proposed action may have with other actions, and (4) evaluates cumulative impacts potentially resulting from these interactions.

4.1 Definition of Cumulative Impacts

The approach taken in the analysis of cumulative impacts follows the objectives of NEPA and CEQ regulations and guidance. Cumulative impacts are defined in 40 CFR 1508.7 as “the impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action when added to the other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (DoD or non-DoD) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.”

To determine the scope of environmental impact analyses, agencies shall consider cumulative actions, which when viewed with other proposed actions have cumulatively significant impacts and should therefore be discussed in the same impact analysis document.

In addition, CEQ and USEPA have published guidance addressing implementation of cumulative impact analyses—*Guidance on the Consideration of Past Actions in Cumulative Effects Analysis* (Council on Environmental Quality, 2005) and *Consideration of Cumulative Impacts in EPA Review of NEPA Documents* (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1999). CEQ guidance entitled *Considering Cumulative Impacts Under NEPA* (1997) states that cumulative impact analyses should:

“...determine the magnitude and significance of the environmental consequences of the proposed action in the context of the cumulative impacts of other past, present, and future actions...identify significant cumulative impacts...[and]...focus on truly meaningful impacts.”

Cumulative impacts are most likely to arise when a relationship or synergism exists between a proposed action and other actions expected to occur in a similar location or during a similar time period. Actions overlapping with or in close proximity to the proposed action would be expected to have more potential for a relationship than those more geographically separated. Similarly, relatively concurrent actions would tend to offer a higher potential for cumulative impacts. To identify cumulative impacts, the analysis needs to address the following three fundamental questions.

- Does a relationship exist such that affected resource areas of the proposed action might interact with the affected resource areas of past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions?
- If one or more of the affected resource areas of the proposed action and another action could be expected to interact, would the proposed action affect or be affected by impacts of the other action?
- If such a relationship exists, then does an assessment reveal any potentially significant impacts not identified when the proposed action is considered alone?

4.2 Scope of Cumulative Impacts Analysis

The scope of the cumulative impacts analysis involves both the geographic extent of the effects and the time frame in which the effects could be expected to occur. For this EA, the study area delimits the geographic extent of the cumulative impacts analysis. In general, the study area will include those areas

previously identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) for the respective resource areas. The time frame for cumulative impacts centers on the timing of the proposed action. For the purposes of this analysis, past and reasonably foreseeable projects are those within 5 years of the preparation of the Draft EA for proposed NSO training in the state of Hawaii (i.e., the time period 2014-2024).

Another factor influencing the scope of cumulative impacts analysis involves identifying other actions to consider. Beyond determining that the geographic scope and time frame for the actions interrelate to the proposed action, the analysis employs the measure of “reasonably foreseeable” to include or exclude other actions. For the purposes of this analysis, public documents prepared by federal, state, and local government agencies form the primary sources of information regarding reasonably foreseeable actions. Documents used to identify other actions include notices of intent for EISs and EAs, management plans, land use plans, and other planning related studies.

4.3 Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions

This section will focus on past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects at and near the proposed action locale. In determining which projects to include in the cumulative impacts analysis, a preliminary determination was made regarding the past, present, or reasonably foreseeable action. Specifically, using the first fundamental question included in Section 4.1 (Definition of Cumulative Impacts), it was determined if a relationship exists such that the affected resource areas of the proposed action (included in this EA) might interact with the affected resource area of a past, present, or reasonably foreseeable action. If no such potential relationship exists, the project was not carried forward into the cumulative impacts analysis. In accordance with CEQ guidance (Council on Environmental Quality, 2005), these actions considered but excluded from further cumulative effects analysis are not catalogued here as the intent is to focus the analysis on the meaningful actions relevant to informed decision-making. Projects included in this cumulative impacts analysis are listed in Table 4-1 and briefly described in the following subsections.

4.3.1 Past DoD Actions

4.3.1.1 MCBH Wave Energy Test Site

The MCBH Wave Energy Test Site has constructed two wave energy test sites and is testing offshore wave energy conversion devices. Construction included installation and operation of moorings, trunk power and communications transmission cables, in-water scientific data gathering equipment, and associated shoreside electrical transmission and monitoring equipment. Ongoing environmental considerations for operation and maintenance include noise, entanglement and collision hazard, electrical leakage, heat, and electric and magnetic fields. It was determined that construction and operations are not likely to adversely affect any ESA-listed species or their critical habitat (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2014).

Table 4-1: Cumulative Action Evaluation

Action	NEPA Analysis (Year)
Past DoD Actions	
MCBH Wave Energy Test Site	EA (2014)
Fixed Surface Ship Radiated Noise Measurement System, Barbers Point, Oahu	EA (2015)
MCBH Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion	EA (2016)
Long Range Strike Weapon Systems Evaluation Program	EA (2016)
Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future DoD Actions	
T-Pier Demolition at MCBH	EA (2017)
PMRF Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems	EA (2017)
Hawaii and Southern California Training and Testing (HSTT)	EIS/OEIS (2018)
Shoreline Stabilization at Puuloa Range Training Facility	EA (2019)
Submarine Dry Dock and Waterfront Production Facility at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility, JBPHH	EIS (2020)
Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Non-DoD Actions	
Commercial Wind Energy Development	N/A
Recreational Fishing	N/A
Commercial Fishing	N/A
Maritime Traffic	N/A
Coastal Land Development and Tourism	N/A
Undersea Communications Cables	Multiple EAs
Aquaculture	N/A
Academic Research	N/A

Notes: N/A = not applicable.

4.3.1.2 Installation and Operation of a Fixed Surface Ship Radiated Noise Measurement System at the Fleet Test and Evaluation Center, Barbers Point, Oahu and Surrounding Ocean

This project includes the installation and operation of a hydrophone array, undersea data transmission cable, and a shore station cable landing to measure underwater vessel noise (propulsion, ship machinery, and flow noise). Temporary impacts associated with sediment suspension during drilling operations for undersea cable installation were identified, along with anticipated negligible impacts on marine wildlife, including avoidance by individuals, during construction. No long-term impacts are anticipated (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015b).

4.3.1.3 MCBH Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion

Existing services include 12 single and duplex recreational cottages. Expansion would occur on a previously developed 0.44-acre site used to store emergency generators and other portable equipment and would construct 19 new cottages (49 total new lodging units) adjacent to the shoreline. Construction would be implemented through 2026. Cottage construction does not involve in-water work; however, construction activities and recreation by cottage tenants during operation may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed sea turtles or the Hawaiian monk seal. Other future impacts on nearshore environments and EFH are possible from increased recreational activity (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2016b).

4.3.1.4 Long Range Strike Weapon Systems Evaluation Program

The long-range evaluation tests include live and inert weapon systems deployed from aircraft for detonation in the air as well as at and below the water surface. Missions in 2017–2020 would occur once a year over five consecutive days. Detonations associated with this program would produce

underwater noise and explosions; however, due to shallow detonations, it is not anticipated that cratering would occur at the seafloor. Metals would sink, disperse, or bind to sediments. Individual fish in the area may be killed by the strike or the associated pressure bubble. Incidental Take Authorizations for marine mammals and sea turtles (hawksbill, loggerhead, olive Ridley, leatherback, and Central North Pacific DPS of green sea turtle) were issued for the tests (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 2016).

4.3.2 Present and Reasonably Foreseeable DoD Actions

4.3.2.1 T-Pier Demolition at MCBH

This project includes demolition of Facility 1662, the former Naval Ocean Systems Command Pier, to include removal of concrete decking, support pilings, and existing utility lines associated with the pier. No long-term environmental impacts are anticipated; short-term noise and turbidity in the nearshore marine environment during demolition activities expected (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b).

4.3.2.2 PMRF Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems

The Navy has proposed a renewable energy project consisting of a combined utility-scale photovoltaic array on an 87-acre site and a 94-acre site. The project would improve power quality and energy resiliency in support of the PMRF by supplementing the more vulnerable and lower quality power from the local power plant. The solar array system could generate up to 44 megawatts of direct current electrical power and would feed this electricity into the Kauai Island Utility Cooperative electrical grid for all users, public, and military. New electrical transmission lines would be installed either overhead or underground. The anticipated environmental impacts are primarily terrestrial. The project would expand the energy portfolio available to the PMRF and the Kauai Island Utility Cooperative electrical grid, reducing the need for development of offshore energy resources (i.e., fuel tanker traffic, wind energy development) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017c).

4.3.2.3 Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing (HSTT) EIS/OEIS

The Navy prepared the 2018 HSTT EIS/OEIS to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with water-based military readiness training and testing activities off the coasts of Hawaii and Southern California, on the high seas during vessel transit between these areas, in the Temporary Operating Area north and west of the Hawaii Range Complex, and at select Navy pierside and harbor locations (i.e., HSTT Study Area) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018). The water-based NSO training covered in the HSTT EIS/OEIS is considered at-sea training and does not include land-based components. Collectively, the at-sea areas in the EIS/OEIS are referred to as the HSTT Study Area. In the EIS/OEIS, the Navy assessed military readiness activities that could potentially impact human and natural resources, especially marine mammals, sea turtles, and other marine resources, and consultations were conducted under the ESA and MMPA. The range of alternatives included a No Action Alternative and two action alternatives. The military readiness activities proposed in the EIS/OEIS included the use of active sonar and explosives within the HSTT Study Area. These military readiness activities are generally consistent with and representative of training and testing that the Navy has been conducting in the HSTT Study Area for decades.

While the HSTT EIS/OEIS addressed several resource areas, potential impacts on resource areas under HSTT EIS/OEIS that are the same as those analyzed in this EA would be considered for the cumulative impacts analysis. These resource areas include air quality, marine biological resources, and public health and safety. The emission of criteria pollutants resulting from activities in the HSTT Study Area would not cause a violation or contribute to an ongoing violation of the NAAQS. Navy training and testing activities

have the potential to expose marine species to multiple acoustic, energy, physical disturbance and strike, entanglement, ingestion, and secondary stressors. However, based on ESA and MMPA consultations, long-term consequences to marine species in the Study Area would not occur. Because of the Navy's SOPs, impacts on public health and safety would be unlikely.

4.3.2.4 Shoreline Stabilization at the Puuloa Range Training Facility (PRTF)

The proposed action is to initiate measures to mitigate coastal erosion at PRTF, Puuloa, Ewa Beach, on the southcentral shore of Oahu. The proposed action is needed to ensure the long-term sustainability of the range to support mandated U.S. Armed Forces training requirements. The Preferred Alternative would consist of the installation of sheet pile along the fast land boundary of Ranges A and B; a maximum-feasible retreat/setback from the shoreline of Ranges C-F; and revegetation of available fast land areas fronting all ranges as feasible. The sheet pile would be installed on the ocean side of the ranges to mitigate erosion to the toe of the impact berms. The sheet pile is would wrap-around the eastern and western edges of the range impact berms in order to provide erosion protection at the ends of the berms. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would result in no significant impacts to air quality, water resources, geological resources, biological resources, visual resources, noise-sensitive receptors, and hazardous materials and wastes, and no impacts to cultural resources, recreational impacts, land use, infrastructure, and public health and safety (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019).

4.3.2.5 Submarine Dry Dock and Waterfront Production Facility at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility, JBPHH

In September 2020, the Navy announced its intent to prepare an EIS to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of a submarine dry dock replacement and waterfront production facility at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility at JBPHH. The dry dock and waterfront production facility will provide required capability to perform depot-level maintenance on current and future classes of fast-attack submarines and improve operational readiness. The proposed action includes the demolition of existing facilities and construction of new facilities, utilities, and infrastructure at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility (85 Federal Register 57194).

4.3.3 Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Non-DoD Actions

4.3.3.1 Commercial Wind Energy Development

Three offshore wind projects have been proposed for federal waters around Oahu. Commercial-scale offshore wind facilities are similar to onshore wind facilities, and, depending on rotor size and spacing requirements, can include from 14 (110-m rotor diameter) to 40 (150-m rotor diameter) turbines in one Outer Continental Shelf block. Average leaseholds are eight blocks, and current technology limits development to waters no deeper than 100 m. Development includes installing the substructure, which is typically a large steel tube (up to 20 ft in diameter) driven 80–100 ft below the mudline in 15 – 100-ft water depths, with the pole and turbine mounted on top. Each turbine is connected by power cable to an electric service platform/substation, typically located somewhere within the turbine array, from which buried high voltage cables transmit the power to an onshore substation for integration into the onshore grid.

Site characterization activities include geophysical surveys, sub-bottom sampling, and biological surveys. Site assessment activities include installation of meteorological towers and meteorological buoys, data collection, and decommissioning of the towers and buoys.

Most impacts would occur during the construction phase, which involves the highest amount of vessel traffic, noise generation, seafloor disturbance (especially from transmission cabling), and air emissions; however, ongoing impacts would occur from vessel and turbine strikes; moderate operational noise; disturbance of nesting areas; alteration of key habitat; or potential fuel, oil, or dielectric fluid spills. Potential population-level impacts on marine mammals, fish, birds, and sea turtles would be mitigated in site-specific environmental review and permitting processes. In particular, impacts on sea turtles could be minor to moderate because of the technologies' potential to impede sea turtle movement and the potential of trapping sea turtles in overtopping devices. Additionally, if related onshore facilities are located in nesting areas, operation could cause minor to moderate adverse impacts on sea turtles due to hatchling disorientation from lighting, with possible major impacts if turtle nests or aggregates of hatchlings are destroyed. During operation there is a risk of increased turbine strike of seabirds. Proper siting and design and other mitigation measures would minimize potential impacts on coastal sediment transport processes, marine navigation, commercial shipping, fishing activities, seafloor habitats, marine mammals, sea turtles, areas of special concern, archaeological sites, and U.S. DoD training and exercise activities.

4.3.3.2 Recreational Fishing

From 2010 through 2014, recreational fishers caught over 19 million fish in marine and estuarine waters in Hawaii. Recreational fishing includes impacts from vessel traffic (strike, noise, water pollution, marine debris) and can compound impacts on fish stocks already experiencing exploitation. Recreational fishing and boat traffic usually occur nearshore rather than in the deeper open ocean, and recreational traffic typically frequents popular locations, which can concentrate damage in these areas from anchors or other bottom-disturbing equipment.

4.3.3.3 Commercial Fishing

Twenty major fisheries in Hawaiian waters include tuna, billfish, bottom fish, other species of pelagic fish, and a smaller invertebrate fishery. These fisheries all have gear, seasonal, and geographical prohibitions depending on the ecological conditions of the area and the target species. The NMFS issues fishing vessel, dealer, and commercial operator permits and fishing authorizations as required under the various Federal Fishery Regulations.

Commercial fishing can adversely affect fish populations, non-target species, and habitats. Bycatch includes the unintentional capture of fish, marine mammals, sea turtles, seabirds, and other non-targeted species that occur incidental to normal fishing operations. Fisheries bycatch has been identified as a primary driver of population declines in several groups of marine species, including sharks, mammals, seabirds, and sea turtles (Wallace et al., 2010). Commercial fishing often includes the use of mobile fishing gear, such as bottom trawls, which increases turbidity, alters surface sediment and bottom habitats, removes prey (leading to declines in predator abundance), removes predators, and generates marine debris. Ghost fishing occurs when lost and abandoned fishing gear, such as gill nets, purse seines, and long-lines, continue to ensnare fish and other marine animals without human oversight and removal. Lost gear fouls and disrupts bottom habitats and has the potential to entangle, or be ingested by, marine animals.

4.3.3.4 Maritime Traffic

The Hawaii coasts are heavily traveled by commercial, recreational, and government marine vessels with commercial ports near Navy OPAREAs. The United States has grown increasingly dependent on international trade over the past 50 years. Primary environmental concerns regarding increased

maritime traffic include vessels striking marine mammals and sea turtles, introduction of non-native species through ballast water, and underwater sound from ships and other vessels. Additionally, air and water quality in busy ports can be diminished due to engine emissions and fuel leaks. Secondary impacts include maintenance of port infrastructure, which often include dredging requirements to maintain channel depths and habitat loss and degradation in coastal habitats.

4.3.3.5 Coastal Land Development and Tourism

Coastal land development adjacent to the training study area is both intensive and extensive, including development of homes, businesses, recreation, vacation, and ship traffic at port facilities and marinas. The training study area coastline also includes extensive coastal tourism (hotels, resorts, restaurants, food industry, and vacation homes) and its supporting infrastructure (retail businesses, marinas, fishing tackle stores, dive shops, fishing piers, recreational boating harbors, beaches, and recreational fishing and whale watching). New development in the coastal zone requires a permit from the state or local government per the CZMA.

Tourism is the single biggest industry in Hawaii, and on any given day in a typical year, over 200,000 visitors are in Hawaii. Significant activities include scuba diving, snorkeling, and whale watching.

Coastal development intensifies use of coastal resources through dune and nearshore habitat loss and disturbance, point and nonpoint source water pollution, entrainment in outflows and other structures, and air quality degradation. Scuba diving and snorkeling has the potential to degrade reef systems through disturbance and collecting, and collisions between whale watching ships and whales are common.

4.3.3.6 Undersea Communications Cables

Submarine cables provide the primary means of voice, data, and Internet connectivity between the United States and the rest of the world. The Federal Communications Commission grants licenses authorizing cable applicants to install, own, and operate submarine cables and associated landing stations in the United States. Cables are installed by specialized boats across flat ocean surfaces and dug into the seabed in shallow areas. Over 550,000 miles of cables currently exist in the world's oceans.

Potential impacts of installation and maintenance activities would include noise and vessel strikes from boat traffic and increased seafloor disturbance and sedimentation in localized areas where the cable is installed. Likewise, electromagnetic fields are generated by some cables that may be sensed by and affect the migration behavior of some fish, sharks, rays, and eels.

4.3.3.7 Aquaculture

Aquaculture is the farming of aquatic organisms such as fish, shellfish, and plants. Globally, 29 percent of stocks are fished at biologically unsustainable levels, and aquaculture helps meet demand and offsets stress to wild populations. Aquaculture production reached an all-time high of 97 million metric tons in 2013 and is the fastest growing form of food production, at 6 percent per year globally; 47 percent of aquaculture operations occur in the Pacific Ocean.

The threats of aquaculture operations on wild fish populations include reduced water quality, competition for food, predation by escaped or released farmed fishes, spread of disease and parasites, and reduced genetic diversity. These threats become apparent when farmed fish escape and enter the natural ecosystem. The Marine Aquaculture Policy provides direction to enable the development of sustainable marine aquaculture.

4.3.3.8 Academic Research

Wide-scale academic research is conducted in the training study area by federal entities, such as both the Navy and NMFS, and State and private entities and other partnerships. Although academic research aims to capture data without disturbing the ambient conditions of the ocean environment, vessels contribute traffic, noise, and strike hazard; seismic activity contributes noise; and various other collection methods, such as trawling, could be disruptive to the ecosystems under observation. Impacts from academic research operations can be similar to the impacts expected from oil and gas air gun survey activities.

4.4 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Where feasible, the cumulative impacts were assessed using quantifiable data; however, for many of the resources included for analysis, quantifiable data is not available and a qualitative analysis was undertaken. In addition, where an analysis of potential environmental effects for future actions has not been completed, assumptions were made regarding cumulative impacts related to this EA where possible. The analytical methodology presented in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences), which was used to determine potential impacts on the various resources analyzed in this document, was also used to determine cumulative impacts.

4.4.1 Air Quality

4.4.1.1 Description of Geographic Study Area

The area of analysis refers to the region around the Study Area for which cumulative air quality impacts must be accounted for. For this project, the area of analysis is considered to be the air basin encompassing the state of Hawaii, which is designated as being in attainment for all criteria pollutants.

4.4.1.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions

Actions that are relevant to cumulative impacts on air quality in the area of analysis include Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion, T-Pier Demolition at MCBH, Long Range Strike Weapon Systems Evaluation Program, HSTT EIS/OEIS, PMRF Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems, Shoreline Stabilization at PRTF, Commercial Wind Energy Development, Recreational Fishing, Commercial Fishing, Maritime Traffic, Coastal Land Development and Tourism, Undersea Communications Cables, Aquaculture, and Academic Research.

4.4.1.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The ambient air quality is the result of all the processes, both natural and anthropogenic, that pollute or clean the air. The PSD thresholds consider these processes and determine whether an action would have an appreciable impact on the ambient air quality in addition to other activities, meaning a cumulative analysis is inherently performed. Generally, PSD thresholds are only applicable to stationary sources of emissions, which there are none of in the proposed action. Although this means that the PSD program does not apply to this action, the significance thresholds that it establishes are still useful as a reference point to demonstrate whether an action will have an impact on the ambient air quality. In this case, the PSD thresholds are used as a reference to illustrate how cumulative impacts from the proposed action would be less than significant. Although criteria pollutant emissions under the proposed action exceed PSD Significant Emission Rates for VOCs and CO, training activities would be distributed and dispersed across the state of Hawaii and would not cause pollutants to accumulate over localized areas. Therefore, implementation of proposed training activities under Alternative 1 or

Alternative 2, combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts to air quality within the area of analysis.

4.4.2 Land Use/Recreation

4.4.2.1 Description of Geographic Study Area

The land use/recreation area of analysis contains the training study area, which includes geographic regions including five Oahu regions (JBPHH, South, Windward, North, and West), the Island of Hawaii, Kauai, Maui, Lanai, and Molokai.

4.4.2.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions

Actions that are relevant to the cumulative impacts on land use and recreational resources in the area of analysis include MCBH Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion, PMRF Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems, Shoreline Stabilization at PRTF, Recreational Fishing, and Coastal Land Development and Tourism.

4.4.2.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Cumulative land use impacts from past, present, and future actions within the area of analysis would be less than significant because implementation of Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would not restrict the ability of individuals to use or access recreational areas for purposes of hiking, hunting, fishing and boating/beach recreation on non-DoD or DoD lands. Training would be localized, infrequent, and brief in duration. Training would be consistent with the existing land use of the area for DoD and non-DoD lands, with trainees swimming in the water, moving across the beach, and walking on trails. Training would only occur on non-DoD property if proper consent was given. Proposed air-based training activities would have no effect on recreational activities as they would be conducted on DoD and USCG property in designated areas consistent with other military activities. Drop zone and landing zone training activities are not co-located with public recreational activities. Therefore, implementation of proposed training activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in cumulative impacts within the area of analysis.

4.4.3 Biological Resources

4.4.3.1 Description of Geographic Study Area

The area of analysis for biological resources includes both the terrestrial and marine portions of the training study area, which includes geographic regions of five Oahu regions (JBPHH, South, Windward, North, and West), the Island of Hawaii, Kauai, Maui, Lanai, and Molokai.

4.4.3.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions

Actions that are relevant to the cumulative impacts on biological resources in the area of analysis include:

- MCBH Wave Energy Test Site
- MCBH Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion
- Long Range Strike Weapon Systems Evaluation Program
- T-Pier Demolition at MCBH
- PMRF Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems
- HSTT EIS/OEIS
- Shoreline Stabilization, PRTF

- Submarine Dry Dock and Waterfront Production Facility, JBPHH
- Commercial Wind Energy Development
- Recreational and Commercial Fishing
- Maritime Traffic
- Coastal Land Development and Tourism
- Undersea Communications Cables
- Aquaculture
- Academic Research

4.4.3.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The ongoing actions and actions that may reasonably occur in the foreseeable future listed above introduce similar stressors analyzed in this EA on biological resources (i.e., physical presence, physical disturbance and strike, and acoustic stressors), as well as additional stressors not part of this proposed action. These additional stressors include potential habitat degradation associated with coastal development and construction projects, recreational and commercial fishing activities, and construction of infrastructure in nearshore environments associated with industrial-grade energy production (planned wind energy projects in nearshore waters of Hawaii) and communication infrastructure (e.g., undersea cables). The proposed training activities discussed in this EA would have minor and temporary impacts, without long-term consequences for terrestrial and marine wildlife resources. Any effects associated with proposed training activities are anticipated to be insignificant and discountable, and therefore would not adversely affect ESA-listed species or habitats. Because potential impacts from the proposed training activities would be minor and temporary, the proposed action is not expected to contribute to any cumulative impacts on terrestrial and marine biological resources.

Cumulative biological resource impacts from past, present, and future actions within the training study area would be less than significant because of the reasons stated above. Therefore, implementation of the proposed training activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in cumulative impacts on terrestrial and marine biological resources within the area of analysis.

4.4.4 Cultural Resources

4.4.4.1 Description of Geographic Study Area

The area of analysis for cultural resources consists of the training study area, which includes geographic regions including five Oahu regions (JBPHH, South, Windward, North, and West), Kauai, Maui, Lanai, Molokai, and the Island of Hawaii. This training study area is considered the APE.

4.4.4.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions

Actions that are relevant to the cumulative impacts on cultural resources in the area of analysis include MCBH Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion, HSTT EIS/OEIS, PMRF Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems, Commercial Wind Energy Development, Coastal Land Development and Tourism, Undersea Communications Cables, Aquaculture, and Academic Research.

4.4.4.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Cumulative impacts on cultural resources from past, present, and future actions within the area of analysis would be less than significant because training activities would be low impact as trainees operate with the goal to leave no trace during or after a training event throughout the area of analysis.

Proposed training would follow the appropriate protocols established under existing approved SOPs, and protective measures that are in place to avoid and minimize the potential for impact on archaeological resources. Therefore, implementation of proposed training activities under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in cumulative impacts within the area of analysis.

4.4.5 Noise

4.4.5.1 Description of Geographic Study Area

The noise area of analysis contains the training study area, which includes geographic regions including five Oahu regions (JBPHH, South, Windward, North, and West), Kauai, Maui, Lanai, Molokai, and the Island of Hawaii.

4.4.5.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions

Actions that include noise-producing activities that may interact with the affected areas of the training study area include activities such as the MCBH Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion, T-Pier Demolition at MCBH, Long Range Strike Weapon Systems Evaluation Program, HSTT Training and Testing, PMRF Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems, Shoreline Stabilization at PRTF, Commercial Wind Energy Development, Maritime Traffic, and Coastal Land Development and Tourism. These construction activities would add noise to the environment on a short-term, intermittent basis. Other training activities and maritime traffic would add noise to the ocean environment, however that noise would be short term and intermittent and spread out over a wide area that only intersects with the area of analysis for short-term events.

4.4.5.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

There are points of interest throughout the training study area. While the Lehua Elementary School is present within the JBPHH Region of the training study area, training is not proposed to occur during school activities or hours of operation. The measures described in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) to minimize NSO training interaction with the public would further avoid potential impacts on the public's use of points of interest, including schools. Training activities would occur away from residential zoned areas in nearshore areas and on public or DoD lands. In cases where points of interest are proximate to training activities, operational conditions (such as aircraft typically operating above 2,000 ft) minimize received noise levels at residences or other points of interest. Cumulative noise impacts from past, present, and future actions within the area of analysis would be less than significant because the primary purpose of training activities would be to remain undetected and not make noise. Therefore, implementation of proposed training activities under Alternatives 1 or 2, combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in cumulative noise impacts within the area of analysis.

4.4.6 Public Health and Safety

4.4.6.1 Description of Geographic Study Area

The public health and safety area of analysis contains the training study area, which includes geographic regions including five Oahu regions (JBPHH, South, Windward, North, and West), Kauai, Maui, Lanai, Molokai, and the Island of Hawaii.

4.4.6.2 Relevant Past, Present, and Future Actions

Past, present, and future actions that could add to impacts on public health and safety are those actions that contribute further to maritime traffic such as the HSTT EIS/OEIS, recreational and commercial fishing, and maritime traffic. Recreational and commercial fishing activities increase the number of vessels in the water, which increases the chance of hazardous spills or discharges. No current or foreseeable projects would require the use of local police for traffic control and therefore would not impact public health and safety.

4.4.6.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Cumulative public health and safety impacts from past, present, and future actions within the area of analysis would be less than significant because increases in vessel traffic associated with proposed training activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 are negligible and any spills or discharges that take place during training events would be cleaned up in accordance with Navy protocols. Proposed training activities would not require assistance from local law enforcement for traffic or pedestrian control. NSWC would also coordinate with local police departments and law enforcement prior to conducting training activities. Given local law enforcement is not typically needed to support NSO training, first responders would not be affected by proposed training. All training events would be conducted in accordance with military training procedures, approved SOPs, and protective measures, including OPNAVINST 5100.23G, *Navy Safety and Occupational Health Program Manual* (2011) and FAA safety regulations when sUAS or NSO training activities are conducted in conjunction with other DoD service aircraft assets. In addition, the Navy would coordinate with USCG to inform mariners on safety of navigation. Therefore, implementation of proposed training activities under Alternatives 1 or 2, combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in cumulative impacts within the area of analysis.

5 Other Considerations Required by NEPA

5.1 Consistency with Other Federal, State, and Local Laws, Plans, Policies and Regulations

In accordance with 40 CFR section 1502.16(c), analysis of environmental consequences shall include discussion of possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of federal, regional, State, and local land use plans, policies, and controls. Table 5-1 identifies the principal federal and State laws and regulations that are applicable to the proposed action and describes briefly how compliance with these laws and regulations would be accomplished.

Table 5-1: Principal Federal and State Laws Applicable to the Proposed Action

Federal, State, Local, and Regional Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
Antiquities Act (16 USC §§431–433)	In accordance with Navy procedures, the proposed action is consistent with the Act’s objectives for protection of archaeological and historical sites and objects, preservation of cultural resources, and the public's access to them. On 26 April 2017, Executive Order (EO) 13792, <i>Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act</i> , was issued and directed the Secretary of the Interior to review designations of national monuments made since 1996. See Section 3.4 (Cultural Resources) for the assessment.
Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 USC §7401 et seq.)	The proposed action is within an attainment area for NAAQS, thus a Conformity Determination is not required. In addition, PSD thresholds are not applicable to training activities since there are no stationary sources associated with the proposed action. Criteria pollutant emissions would not be generated in significant enough quantities to affect the attainment status of the region and would be sufficiently dispersed to not appreciably impact local air quality.
Clean Water Act (33 USC §1251 et seq.)	The proposed action does not require a permit pursuant to sections 401, 402, or 404 of the Clean Water Act, as the proposed action does not include construction or demolition activities.
Comprehensive Environmental Response and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 USC §9601 et seq.)	One CERCLA site is present within the training study area, Pearl Harbor Naval Complex. The Navy is not disturbing the contaminated site and the personnel are allowed to walk across the site. The Navy would report any spill or release of hazardous substance of a quantity equal to or greater than the reportable quantity.
ESA (16 USC §1531 et seq.)	In accordance with section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Navy has prepared Biological Evaluations that assesses the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative on ESA-listed terrestrial and marine species and designated critical habitat. The analysis in the Biological Evaluations indicates that the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect ESA listed species and critical habitat (see Section 3.3, Biological Resources). The USFWS and NMFS issued letters of concurrence regarding the Navy’s findings that the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed species and designated critical habitat. Correspondence regarding consultations with the USFWS and NMFS is presented in Appendix A, <i>Agency Correspondence</i> .

Table 5-1: Principal Federal and State Laws Applicable to the Proposed Action

Federal, State, Local, and Regional Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act (MSA) (16 USC §1801 et seq.)	As required by the MSA, the Navy prepared an EFH Assessment and conducted consultation with NMFS to assess the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on EFH. The Navy concluded the proposed action would not adversely affect EFH and the NMFS concurred with that determination (see Section 3.3, Biological Resources). See Appendix A (<i>Agency Correspondence</i>) for correspondence between the Navy and NMFS.
Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) (16 USC §1361 et seq.)	The proposed action is not expected to result in Level A or Level B harassment of any marine mammal as defined by the MMPA. Therefore, consultation under the MMPA is not required.
Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431 et seq.)	All of the military activities the Navy proposes to be conducted in the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary fall into classes of activities covered in the 1997 Final EIS/Management Plan for the Sanctuary, which under the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary regulations do not require permits or further consultation under section 304(d) unless the military activity is modified in a manner significantly greater than was considered in a previous consultation. The activities proposed in the EA have not been modified in a manner significantly greater than those considered in the 2013 and 2018 HSTT Final EISs/OEISs and, therefore, consultation is not required.
Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 USC §703–712)	The proposed action is not anticipated to result in adverse effects on migratory bird populations and would be in compliance with the MBTA.
NEPA (42 USC §4321 et seq.); CEQ NEPA implementing regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508); Navy procedures for Implementing NEPA (32 CFR Part 775)	This EA has been prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ regulations implementing NEPA, and Navy NEPA procedures. Public participation and review were conducted in compliance with NEPA.
NHPA (54 USC § 306108 et seq.)	The proposed action is consistent with the national policy for the preservation of historic sites, buildings, archaeological sites, and objects of national significance. The Navy conducted Section 106 consultations with the Hawaii SHPO and key stakeholders, including Native Hawaiian Organizations. The Navy determined that the proposed undertaking for NSWC to conduct land-, water-, and air-based training activities in the State of Hawaii would result in no historic properties affected in accordance with NHPA Section 106. The Hawaii SHPO concurred with a Finding of No Adverse Effect and the Navy's Section 106 requirements have been completed. See Appendix A (<i>Agency Correspondence</i>) for correspondence between the Navy, SHPO, and key stakeholders.
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001 et seq.)	In the event human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony are discovered, the Navy would consult with Native Hawaiian organizations.
Rivers and Harbors Act (33 USC §407)	No permit is required under the Rivers and Harbors Act as no construction in navigable waterways is proposed.
Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (43 USC §§1301–1315)	The proposed action is consistent with regulations concerning the Submerged Lands Act.
Sunken Military Craft Act (Public Law 108–375, 10 USC section 113 Note and 118 Stat. 2094–2098)	The Sunken Military Craft Act does not apply to actions taken by, or at the direction of, the United States. See Section 3.4 (Cultural Resources) for the assessment.

Table 5-1: Principal Federal and State Laws Applicable to the Proposed Action

Federal, State, Local, and Regional Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
HRS Chapter 343, <i>Environmental Impact Statements (or HEPA)</i>	The Navy prepared this EA in accordance with HRS Chapter 343 requirements. A separate determination under HEPA will be made by the Hawaii DLNR.
HRS Chapter 6E, <i>Historic Preservation</i>	The Navy will coordinate with the responsible state or county agencies to address HRS Chapter 6E compliance prior to conducting any training events on state, city, county, or private lands, where applicable.
HAR Chapter 11-200, <i>Environmental Impact Statement Rules</i>	The Navy prepared this EA in accordance with HAR Chapter 11-200 requirements. A separate determination will be made by the Hawaii DLNR.
HAR Title 11 Chapter 59, <i>Ambient Air Quality Standards</i>	The proposed action would not cause an exceedance of the State's ambient air quality standards since criteria pollutant emissions would be distributed across the entire state and would not include point sources releasing large amounts of emissions in a localized area. Therefore, the proposed action is in compliance with HAR Title 11 Chapter 59.
HAR Chapter 13-107, <i>Threatened and Endangered Plants</i>	The proposed action is consistent with Chapter 13-107 to the maximum extent practicable. In accordance with section 7 of the ESA, the Navy has prepared a Biological Evaluation, and the Navy has completed informal consultation with USFWS regarding potential effects of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed plant species and associated critical habitat. As this consultation occurs on a federal level it also will apply to the state (see Section 3.3, Biological Resources). Correspondence regarding consultations with the USFWS is presented in Appendix A (<i>Agency Correspondence</i>).
HAR Chapter 13-124, <i>Indigenous Wildlife, Endangered and Threatened Wildlife, Injurious Wildlife, Introduced Wild Birds, and Introduced Wildlife</i> and HRS Chapter 195D, <i>Conservation of Aquatic Life, Wildlife, and Land Plants</i>	The proposed action is consistent with HAR Chapter 13-124 and HRS Chapter 195D to the maximum extent practicable. In accordance with section 7 of the ESA, the Navy has prepared two Biological Evaluations and is conducting informal consultation with USFWS and NMFS regarding potential effects of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) on ESA-listed terrestrial and marine species. As this consultation occurred on the federal level it would also apply at the state level (see Section 3.3, Biological Resources). Correspondence regarding consultations with the USFWS and NMFS is presented in Appendix A (<i>Agency Correspondence</i>).
EO 11988, <i>Floodplain Management</i>	The proposed action would not impact any 100-year floodplain.
EO 12088, <i>Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards</i>	All necessary actions would be taken for the prevention, control, and abatement of environmental pollution.
EO 12898, <i>Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-income Populations</i>	The proposed action would not result in any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations.
EO 13045, <i>Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks</i>	The proposed action would not result in environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children.
EO 13089, <i>Coral Reef Protection</i>	The Navy concluded the proposed action would not adversely affect coral reefs. See Section 3.3 (Biological Resources).
EO 13783, <i>On Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth</i>	The proposed action is consistent with the policy and immediate review of all agency actions that potentially burden the safe, efficient development of domestic energy resources.

5.1.1 Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)

Through the CZMA, Congress established national policy to preserve, protect, develop, restore, or enhance resources in the coastal zone. This Act encourages coastal states to properly manage use of their coasts and coastal resources, prepare and implement coastal management programs, and provide for public and governmental participation in decisions affecting the coastal zone. To this end, CZMA imparts an obligation upon federal agencies whose actions or activities affect any land or water use or natural resource of the coastal zone to be carried out in a manner consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of federally approved state coastal management programs. However, federal lands, which are “lands the use of which is by law subject solely to the discretion of the Federal Government, its officers, or agents,” are statutorily excluded from the State's “coastal uses or resources.” If, however, the proposed federal activity affects coastal uses or resources beyond the boundaries of the federal property (i.e., has spillover effects), the CZMA Section 307 federal consistency requirement applies. As portions of the training study area are located within the coastal zone of the state of Hawaii. The State of Hawaii Office of Planning is the lead agency for coastal management and is responsible for enforcing the State's federally approved CZM program (State of Hawaii, 2017).

In accordance with the CZMA, The Navy completed the Federal CCD process in coordination with the Hawaii CZM Program for activities that would occur on non-DoD lands. On July 1, 2020 and February 17, 2021, the Hawaii Office of Planning conditionally concurred with the Navy's determination that the proposed activities are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program based on the following four conditions that the Navy will implement (refer to Section 3.2.3.2, Alternative 1 and Appendix A, *Agency Correspondence*):

1. The proposed activity shall be carried out as represented in the CCD and all supporting materials and information provided to the Hawaii CZM Program. Any changes to the proposed activity shall be submitted to the Hawaii CZM Program for review and approval. Changes to the proposed activity may require a full CZM federal consistency review, including publication of a public notice and provision for public review and comment. This condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed activity is implemented as reviewed for consistency with the enforceable policies of the Hawaii CZM Program. HRS Chapter 205A (Coastal Zone Management), is the federally approved enforceable policy of the Hawaii CZM Program that applies to this condition.
2. The proposed activity shall be conducted in compliance with the requirements of the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Division (SHPO) concurrence of “no adverse effect to historic properties,” issued May 29, 2020, for the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation. In addition, SHPO requirements resulting from the HRS Chapter 6E Historic Preservation review shall be complied with. HRS Chapter 6E is the federally approved enforceable policy of the Hawaii CZM Program that applies to this condition.
3. The proposed activity shall not obstruct or preclude public engagement in or access to ocean recreation in/on non-DoD areas. This condition is necessary to ensure consistency with the recreational resource policies contained in HRS Chapter 205A (Coastal Zone Management), which is the federally approved enforceable policy that applies to this condition.
4. The proposed activity shall be conducted in compliance with the Hawaii DLNR, Division of Aquatic Resources recommendations of October 11, 2020 that were agreed to by the Navy as transmitted and indicated in the June 18, 2020 letter and October 19, 2020 email to the Office of Planning.

The Navy also provided the Hawaii CZM Program a *de minimis* usage notification for proposed activities on DoD lands in accordance with the approved July 9, 2009 *Navy/Marine Corps de Minimis Activities*

under CZMA. Pursuant to the 2009 *de minimis* activities list, the Office of Planning concurred that the listed *de minimis* activities are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect (cumulative and secondary) coastal effects, and should not be subject to further review by the Hawaii CZM Program on the basis and condition that the listed activities are subject to and bound by full compliance with the Project Mitigation/General Conditions.

On January 23, 2019 the Navy submitted a Negative Determination for proposed training activities at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area. After an assessment was conducted, the Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. The Navy has determined that the implementation of the proposed NSO training at USCG Station Barbers Point and the Kanes Drop Zone at the Kahuku Training Area would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii.

In addition, on March 25, 2021 the Navy submitted an addendum to the January 23, 2019 Negative Determination to address U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS. After an assessment was conducted, the Navy determined that the proposed action would not conflict with CZM Program policies and would be compatible with the objectives, policies and guidance of other state and local land use plans. The Navy has determined that the implementation of the proposed NSO training on U.S. Air Force-leased lands at KPSTS would have no effect on coastal uses or resources of Hawaii.

5.2 Irreversible or Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources

Resources that are irreversibly or irretrievably committed to a project are those that are used on a long-term or permanent basis. This includes the use of non-renewable resources such as metal and fuel, and natural or cultural resources. These resources are irretrievable in that they would be used for this project when they could have been used for other purposes. Human labor is also considered an irretrievable resource. Another impact that falls under this category is the unavoidable destruction of natural resources that could limit the range of potential uses of that particular environment.

For the proposed action, most resource commitments would be neither irreversible nor irretrievable. Most impacts are short term and temporary, or long lasting but negligible. Since there would be no building or facility construction, the consumption of materials typically associated with construction (e.g., concrete, metal, sand) would not occur. Energy usage typically associated with construction activities would not be expended and irreversibly lost. Fuel expended by vehicles, vessels, and aircraft during training activities would be irreversibly lost.

The proposed action would not result in loss of habitat for plants or animals. The proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, threatened or endangered species. As part of the rigorous training, the trainees learn skills needed to avoid detection along with the goal of leaving no trace of their presence during or after training activities, which diminishes the likelihood of any physical disturbance to cultural resources. There would be no changes in land use within the training study area.

The amount of materials required for any training-related activities and energy used during the proposed action would be small. Although the proposed activities would result in some irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources such as various metallic materials, minerals, and labor, this commitment of resources is not significantly different from that necessary for many other Navy training activities carried out over the past several years. Proposed activities would not commit natural resources in significant quantities.

5.3 Relationship between Short-Term Use of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity

The NEPA requires an analysis of the relationship between a project's short-term impacts on the environment and the effects that these impacts may have on the maintenance and enhancement of the long-term productivity of the affected environment. Impacts that narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment are of particular concern. This refers to the possibility that choosing one development site reduces future flexibility in pursuing other options, or that using a parcel of land or other resources often eliminates the possibility of other uses at that site.

In the short term, effects to the human environment with implementation of proposed training activities under the proposed action would be minimal. NSO training activities under the proposed action would be consistent with the existing land use of the area for DoD and non-DoD lands, with trainees swimming in the water, moving across the beach, and walking on and off trails. The proposed action does not include construction on undeveloped lands or permanent ground-disturbing activities over an undisturbed area. In addition, part of the rigorous training is for the trainees to learn skills needed to avoid detection along with the goal of leaving no trace of their presence during or after training activities. Implementation of the proposed action would result in less than significant impacts on sensitive resources. Thus, the proposed action would not significantly impact the long-term natural resource productivity of the area. The proposed action would not result in any impacts that would significantly reduce environmental productivity or permanently narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment.

6 List of Preparers

This EA was prepared collaboratively between the Navy and ManTech International Corporation.

6.1 U.S. Department of the Navy

- John Bigay (Naval Facilities Engineering Command [NAVFAC] Pacific)
M.S., Urban and Regional Planning
Years of Experience: 34
Role: Project Management
- Norma Creps (NAVFAC Pacific)
B.S., Zoology w/Marine Option Program Certificate
Years of Experience: 16
Role: Terrestrial Biological Resources
- Jeff Fong (NAVFAC Pacific)
M.A., Anthropology
Years of Experience: 18
Role: Cultural Resources
- Jean Pan (NAVFAC Pacific)
Ph.D., Plant Sciences/Ecology, Evolution, & Behavior
Years of Experience: 16
Role: Marine Biological Resources
- Margherita Parrent (Naval Special Warfare Group THREE)
B.S., Public Administration
Years of Experience: 23
Role: Project Management
- Barbara Prine (NAVFAC Pacific)
M.S., Environmental-Agricultural Education
Years of Experience: 13
Role: Chapters 1 & 2, Public Health and Safety, Land Use/Recreation
- Coral Rasmussen (NAVFAC Pacific)
M.A., Maritime History and Underwater Archaeology
Years of Experience: 29
Role: Cultural Resources
- Adrienne Saboya (Commander, U.S. Naval Special Warfare Command)
B.S., Geology
Years of Experience: 15
Role: Project Management
- Julie Zimmerman (NAVFAC Pacific)
B.A., Environmental Studies and English
Years of Experience: 13
Role: Project Management

6.2 Contractor

- Christine Burris (ManTech International Corporation)
B.A. Geography
Years of Experience: 5
Role: GIS/Graphics
- Lucas Griswold (ManTech International Corporation)
B.S., Environmental Engineering
Years of Experience: 1
Role: Air Quality
- Kelsey Kaehler (ManTech International Corporation)
B.S., Environmental Science
Years of Experience: 2
Role: Land Use/Recreation
- Danny Heilprin (ManTech International Corporation)
M.S., Marine Sciences
Years of Experience: 30
Role: Marine Biological Resources
- Meagan Ostrem (ManTech International Corporation)
B.S., Environmental Science/Environmental Law and Policy
Years of Experience: 15
Role: Project Management, Land Use/Recreation, and Public Health & Safety
- Marya Samuelson (ManTech International Corporation)
M.B.A., Project Management
Years of Experience: 7
Role: Cultural Resources
- Rick Spaulding (ManTech International Corporation)
M.S., Wildlife and Fisheries Science
Years of Experience: 34
Role: Project Management and Terrestrial Biological Resources
- Karen Waller (ManTech International Corporation)
M.B.A., Environmental Management
Years of Experience: 29
Role: Program Management and Chapters 1 & 2
- Larry Wolski (ManTech International Corporation)
M.S. Marine Sciences
Years of Experience: 21
Role: Noise and Air Quality

7 Coordination List

The following agencies/people were coordinated with during the NEPA and HEPA processes and associated consultations. In addition, copies of the Draft and Final EAs were available in the libraries listed below.

7.1 Federal Agencies

- U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Dr. Mary Abrams, Field Supervisor
Katherine Mullett, Acting Field Supervisor
Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office
Honolulu, HI
- NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Gerry Davis, Assistant Regional Administrator, Habitat Conservation Division
Ann Garrett, Assistant Regional Administrator, Protected Resources Division
Anne Chung, Marine Resource Specialist
Pacific Islands Regional Office
Honolulu, HI
- ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
Kate Kerr, Program Analyst, Office of Federal Agency Programs
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
John Broward, Acting Superintendent, Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historic Park, Kailua-Kona, HI
Daniel Kawaiaea, Superintendent, Pu'ukohola Heiau National Historic Site, Kawaihae, HI

7.2 State of Hawaii Agencies

- OFFICE OF HAWAII STATE GOVERNOR
Michael McCarthy, Chief of Staff
Cindy McMillan, Director of Communications
Moses Kaiwi, Director of Chief of Staff
Honolulu, HI
- DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
Samuel Lemmo, Administrator, Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands
Suzanne Case, Chairperson, Board of Land and Natural Resources
Catherine Gewecke, Aquatic Biologist – Special Activity Permits/Technical Review, Division of Aquatic Resources
Honolulu, HI

Dr. Alan Downer, Administrator, State Historic Preservation Division
Dr. Susan Lebo, Archaeology Branch Chief, State Historic Preservation Division
Ka'ahiki Solis, Cultural Historian (Oahu, Kauai, & Niihau), State Historic Preservation Division
Stephanie Hacker, Archaeologist, State Historic Preservation Division
Kapolei, HI

- OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL
Scott Glenn, Director
Tom Eisen, Planner
Honolulu, HI
- OFFICE OF PLANNING
Robert Miyaskai, Planning Program Administrator
Mary Alice Evans, Director, Coastal Zone Management Program
John Nakagawa, Coastal Zone Management Program
Honolulu, HI
- DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
Joe Logan, Adjutant General for the State of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI
- DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AIRPORTS DIVISION
Robert Lee, Special Assistant Deputy Director
Honolulu, HI
- DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, HARBORS DIVISION
Darrell Young, Deputy Director
Honolulu, HI
- DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES, LAND DIVISION
Robert Matsuda, 1st Deputy Director
Honolulu, HI
- DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES, DIVISION OF STATE PARKS
Curt Cottrell, Administrator
Honolulu, HI

7.3 Federal and State Elected Officials

- OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN ED CASE
Tim Nelson, Chief of Staff
Honolulu, HI
- OFFICE OF CONGRESSWOMAN TULSI GABBARD
Kainoa Penarozza, Chief of Staff
Guido Weiss, Military Legislative Assistant
Kirsten Turner, Constituent Outreach Rep
Honolulu, HI
- OFFICE OF STATE SENATOR MAIZE HIRONO
Carlos Santana, Community Liaison
Alan Yamamoto, Office Manager
Honolulu, HI
- OFFICE OF STATE SENATOR BRIAN SCHATZ
Chuck Freedman, Special Advisor
Dale Hahn, Senior Policy Advisor
Honolulu, HI

- State Representative Lynn Decoite
- State Representative Nicole Lowen
- State Representative David Tarnas

7.4 City and County of Honolulu

- OFFICE OF CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU MAYOR
Ray Amemiya, Managing Director
Honolulu, HI
- DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
Michele K. Nekota, Director
Jeanne Ishikawa, Deputy Director
Craig Maeda, Maintenance Director
Kapolei, HI
- DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Lori Kahikina, Director
Tim Houghton, Deputy Director
Kapolei, HI

7.5 County of Hawaii

- OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
Harry Kim, Mayor
Roy Takemoto, Managing Director
- PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Michael Yee, Director
Duane Kanuha, Deputy Director
Theresa Donham, Chair, Cultural Resources Commission
- CIVIL DEFENSE AGENCY
Talmadge Magno, Administrator
Josh Black, Staff Officer
Barry Periatt, Administrative Officer
- DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
David Yamamoto, Director
Allan Simeon, Deputy Director
- FIRE DEPARTMENT
Garrett Kim, Special Operations Chief
- POLICE DEPARTMENT
Jason Grows, Administrative Sergeant
- PARKS AND RECREATION
Roxcie Waltjen, Director
Maurice Messina, Deputy Director

7.6 County of Maui

- MAYOR' OFFICE
Michael Victorino, Mayor
Don Couch, Community Liaison
- OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Kay Fukumoto, Director
Makale'a Ane, Environmental Coordinator
- MAUI COUNTY COUNCIL
Kelly King, Chair
Alice Lee, Councilmember
Tamara Paltin, Councilmember & Chair of Planning and Sustainable Land Use Committee
- Jerrie Sheppard, Corporate Counsel
- Moana Lutey, Corporate Counsel
- Kate Griffiths, Affirmative Action Advisory Council

7.7 Libraries

- Oahu: Hawaii State Library, 478 S. King Street, Honolulu
- Kauai: Waimea Public Library, 9750 Kaumualii Hwy, Waimea
- Hawaii Island: Kailua-Kona Public Library, 75-138 Hualalai Rd, Kailua-Kona
- Maui: Kahului Public Library, 90 School St, Kahului
- Molokai: Molokai Public Library, 15 Ala Malama Ave, Kaunakakai

8 REFERENCES

- Allen, B. M., and R. P. Angliss. (2013). *Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2012*. Seattle, WA: U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum.
- Allen, L. G., and J. N. Cross. (2006). Surface waters. In L. G. Allen, D. J. Pondella, II, & M. H. Horn (Eds.), *The Ecology of Marine Fishes: California and Adjacent Waters* (pp. 320–341). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Assured Bio Labs. (2020). Survey and Genetic Analysis of *Bidens amplexans* and Possible *Bidens amplexans x torta* Hybrids at Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station (KPSTS) Waianae, Hawaii. Oak Ridge, TN. February.
- Badino, A., D. Borelli, T. Gaggero, E. Rizzuto, and C. Schenone. (2012). *Modeling the outdoor noise propagation for different ship types*. Paper presented at the 17th International Conference on Ships and Shipping Research. Naples, Italy.
- Baird, R. (2013). Odontocete Cetaceans Around the Main Hawaiian Islands: Habitat Use and Relative Abundance from Small-Boat Sighting Surveys. *Aquatic Mammals*, 39(3), 253–269.
- Baird, R. W., D. J. McSweeney, D. L. Webster, A. M. Gorgone, and A. D. Ligon. (2003). *Studies of Odontocete Population Structure in Hawaiian Waters: Results of a Survey Through the Main Hawaiian Islands in May and June 2003*. Seattle, WA: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
- Barlow, J., S. Rankin, E. Zele, and J. Appler. (2004). *Marine Mammal Data Collected During the Hawaiian Islands Cetacean and Ecosystem Assessment Survey (HICEAS) Conducted Aboard the NOAA Ships McArthur and David Starr Jordan, July–December 2002*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
- Barlow, J. (2006). Cetacean abundance in Hawaiian waters estimated from a Summer–Fall survey in 2002. *Marine Mammal Science*, 22(2), 446–464.
- Barlow, J., M. C. Ferguson, W. F. Perrin, L. Ballance, T. Gerrodette, G. Joyce, C. D. MacLeod, K. Mullin, D. L. Palka, and G. Waring. (2006). Abundance and densities of beaked and bottlenose whales (family Ziphiidae). *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, 7(3), 263–270.
- Barlow, J., S. Rankin, A. Jackson, and A. Henry. (2008). *Marine Mammal Data Collected During the Pacific Islands Cetacean and Ecosystem Assessment Survey Conducted Aboard the NOAA Ship McArthur II, July–November 2005*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
- Bartol, S. M., and D. R. Ketten. (2006). *Turtle and Tuna Hearing* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-7). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.
- Bauer, L., M. Poti, B. M. Costa, D. Wagner, F. Parrish, M. Donovan, and B. Kinlan. (2016). Chapter 3: Benthic Habitats and Corals. In B. M. Costa & M. S. Kendall (Eds.), *Marine Biogeographic Assessment of the Main Hawaiian Islands* (pp. 57–136). Sterling, VA: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. OCS Study BOEM 2016-035 and NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 214.
- Big Island Invasive Species Committee. (2018). *Welcome to BIISC!* , Retrieved from <http://www.biisc.org/>.

- Bonaccorso, F. J., and C. Pinzari. (2011). *Hawaiian Hoary Bat Occupancy at the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) and Satellite Facilities*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Island Ecosystems Research Center and Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawaii at Hilo.
- Bonaccorso, F. J., C. M. Todd, A. C. Miles, and P. M. Gorresen. (2015). Foraging range movements of the endangered Hawaiian hoary bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus* (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae). *Journal of Mammalogy*, 96(1), 64–71.
- Bowles, A. E. (1995). Chapter 8: Responses of Wildlife to Noise. In R. L. Knight & K. J. Gutzwiller (Eds.), *Wildlife and Recreationists: Coexistence Through Management and Research*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Bowles, A. E., J. Francine, S. Wisely, J. S. Yaeger, and L. McClenaghan. (1995). *Effects of Low-Altitude Aircraft Overflights on the Desert Kit Fox (Vulpes macrotis arsipus) and its Small Mammal Prey on the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range, Arizona, 1991–1994* (AFRL-HE-WP-TR-2000-0101). San Diego, CA: United States Air Force Research Laboratory.
- Bradford, A. L., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, and J. Barlow. (2012). *Line-transect Abundance Estimates of False Killer Whales (Pseudorca crassidens) in the Pelagic Region of the Hawaiian Exclusive Economic Zone and in the Insular Waters of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.
- Bradford, A. L., K. A. Forney, E. A. Oleson, and J. Barlow. (2013). *Line-transect abundance estimates of cetaceans in the Hawaiian EEZ* (PIFSC Working Paper WP-13-004, PSRG-2013-18). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.
- Bradford, A. L., E. A. Oleson, R. W. Baird, C. H. Boggs, K. A. Forney, and N. C. Young. (2015). *Revised Stock Boundaries for False Killer Whales (Pseudorca crassidens) in Hawaiian Waters* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-47). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.
- Bradford, A. L., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, and J. Barlow. (2017). Abundance estimates of cetaceans from a line-transect survey within the U.S. Hawaiian Islands Exclusive Economic Zone. *Fishery Bulletin*, 115(2), 129–142.
- Carretta, J. V., K. A. Forney, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. Baker, D. Johnston, B. Hanson, R. L. Brownell, Jr., J. Robbins, D. Mattila, K. Ralls, M. M. Muto, D. Lynch, and L. Carswell. (2010). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2009*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.
- Carretta, J. V., E. Oleson, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, K. A. Forney, J. Baker, B. Hanson, K. Martien, M. M. Muto, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, R. L. B. Jr., and D. K. Mattila. (2014). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2013*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.
- Carretta, J. V., E. Oleson, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, K. A. Forney, J. Baker, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell. (2015). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2014* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-549). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.
- Carretta, J. V., E. M. Oleson, J. Baker, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, K. A. Forney, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. E. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2017a). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2016* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-561). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

- Carretta, J. V., E. M. Oleson, K. A. Forney, J. Baker, J. E. Moore, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, M. M. Muto, B. Hanson, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell, Jr. (2017b). *U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2017* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-602). La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.
- Cavanaugh, W. J., and G. C. Tocci. (1998). Environmental Noise. *E.S.C., USC. Journal of Public Affairs*, 1(1), 11.
- Chu, J. (2015). *Can rain clean the atmosphere? Study explains how rain droplets attract aerosols out of the atmosphere*. MIT News. Retrieved from <http://news.mit.edu/2015/rain-drops-attract-aerosols-clean-air-0828>.
- Conn, P. B., and G. K. Silber. (2013). Vessel speed restrictions reduce risk of collision-related mortality for North Atlantic right whales. *Ecosphere*, 4(4), 1–16.
- Correia, A. W., J. L. Peters, J. I. Levy, S. Melly, and F. Dominici. (2013). Residential Exposure to Aircraft Noise and Hospital Admissions for Cardiovascular Diseases; Multi-Airport Retrospective Study. *BMJ*, 347, f5561.
- Costa, B. M., and M. S. Kendall. (2016). *Marine Biogeographic Assessment of the Main Hawaiian Islands*. Sterling, VA: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.
- Council on Environmental Quality. (1997). *Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act*. Washington, DC: The Council on Environmental Quality.
- Council on Environmental Quality. (2005). *Guidance on the Consideration of Past Actions in Cumulative Effects Analysis*. Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President.
- Cowan, J. P. (1994). *Handbook of Environmental Acoustics*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Defenders of Wildlife. (2015). *A Petition to List the Giant Manta Ray (Manta birostris), Reef Manta Ray (Manta alfredi), and Caribbean Manta Ray (Manta c.f. birostris) as Endangered, or Alternatively as Threatened, Species Pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and for the Concurrent Designation of Critical Habitat*. Denver, CO: Defenders of Wildlife.
- Department of Business Economic Development and Tourism. (2009). *Hawaii Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program Federal Consistency Concurrence with Modifications to the Department of the Navy De Minimis Activities in Hawaii under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)*. Pearl Harbor, HI: State of Hawaii.
- Dollar, S., and R. Brock. (2007). *Survey of Marine and Fishery Resources for an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) for the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Barking Sands (BS), Kauai, Hawaii, Phase II - 2006*. Honolulu, HI: Navy Regional Environmental Department, Pacific Missile Range Facility.
- Ellis, D. H., C. H. Ellis, and D. P. Mindell. (1991). Raptor responses to low-level jet aircraft and sonic booms. *Environmental Pollution*, 74, 53–83.
- Falcone, E. A., B. Diehl, A. Douglas, and J. Calambokidis. (2011). *Photo-Identification of Fin Whales (Balaenoptera physalus) along the US West Coast, Baja California, and Canada*. Olympia, WA: Cascadia Research Collective.
- Federal Aviation Administration. (2002). *Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments Policy Memorandum 15-002, "Guidance for the Domestic Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems."* Washington, DC: Deputy Secretary of Defense.

- Federal Aviation Administration. (2017). *FAA Order 7400.2L Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters*. Washington, DC: Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization Policy.
- Federal Interagency Committee on Noise. (1992). *Federal Review of Selected Airport Noise Analysis Issues*. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise. (1980). *Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land Use Planning and Control*. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, U.S. Department of Defense, and Veterans Administration.
- Ferguson, M. C. (2005). *Cetacean Population Density in the Eastern Pacific Ocean: Analyzing Patterns With Predictive Spatial Models*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA. Retrieved from <http://daytonlab.ucsd.edu>.
- Flaspohler, D. J., C. P. Giardina, G. P. Asner, P. Hart, J. Price, C. K. Lyons, and X. Castaneda. (2010). Long-term effects of fragmentation and fragment properties on bird species richness in Hawaiian forests. *Biological Conservation*, 143(2), 280–288.
- Forney, K. A., R. W. Baird, and E. M. Oleson. (2010). *Rationale for the 2010 Revision of Stock Boundaries for the Hawaii Insular and Pelagic Stocks of False Killer Whales, Pseudorca crassidens*. La Jolla, CA: Southwest Fisheries Science Center.
- Forney, K. A., E. A. Becker, D. G. Foley, J. Barlow, and E. M. Oleson. (2015). Habitat-based models of cetacean density and distribution in the central North Pacific. *Endangered Species Research*, 27, 1–20.
- Fuentes, M. M. P. B., D. A. Pike, A. Dimatteo, and B. P. Wallace. (2013). Resilience of marine turtle regional management units to climate change. *Global Change Biology*, 19(5), 1399–1406.
- Gende, S. M., A. N. Hendrix, K. R. Harris, B. Eichenlaub, J. Nielsen, and S. Pyare. (2011). A Bayesian approach for understanding the role of ship speed in whale-ship encounters. *Ecological Applications*, 21(6), 2232–2240.
- Giambelluca, T. W., Q. Chen, A. G. Frazier, J. P. Price, Y.-L. Chen, P.-S. Chu, J. K. Eischeid, and D. M. Delparte. (2013). Online Rainfall Atlas of Hawaii. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 94, 313–316.
- Goldstein, M. I., A. J. Poe, E. Cooper, D. Youkey, B. A. Brown, and T. L. McDonald. (2005). Mountain goat response to helicopter overflights in Alaska. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 33(2), 688–699.
- Gorresen, P. M., P. M. Cryan, M. M. Huso, C. D. Hein, M. R. Schirmacher, J. A. Johnson, K. M. Montoya-Aiona, K. W. Brinck, and F. J. Bonaccorso. (2015). *Behavior of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat (Lasiurus cinereus semotus) at Wind Turbines and its Distribution Across the North Koolau Mountains, Oahu*. Hilo, HI: Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawaii at Hilo.
- Grubb, T. G., and W. W. Bowerman. (1997). Variations in breeding bald eagle responses to jets, light planes and helicopters. *Journal of Raptor Research*, 31(3), 213–222.
- Hawaii Department of Health. (2015). *Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards. Air Monitoring and Data*. Retrieved from http://health.hawaii.gov/cab/files/2013/05/naaqs_nov_2015.pdf.
- Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources. (2015a). *Endangered Species Recovery Committee Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance Document*. Honolulu, HI: Division of Forestry and Wildlife.

- Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources. (2015b). *Hawaii State Wildlife Action Plan*. Honolulu, HI: Department of Land and Natural Resources.
- Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources. (2017). *Marine Mammals: Whales and Dolphins*. Retrieved from <http://dlnr.hawaii.gov/dar/species/marine-mammals/>.
- Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources. (2016). *Hawaii Fishing Regulations*. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources.
- Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources. (2017). *Commercial Fishing*. Retrieved from <http://dlnr.hawaii.gov/dar/fishing/commercial-fishing/>.
- Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources. (2019a). *Haena Community-Based Subsistence Fishing Area*. Retrieved from <http://dlnr.hawaii.gov/dar/regulated-areas/haena-community-based-subsistence-fishing-area/>.
- Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources. (2019b). *Hawaii Marine Recreational Fishing Survey (HMRFS)*. Retrieved from <https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/dar/fishing/hmrfs/>.
- Hawaii Division of Boating and Ocean Recreation. (2015). *Personal Water Craft*. Retrieved from <http://dlnr.hawaii.gov/dobor/personal-water-craft/>.
- Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife. (2017a). *Hunting*. Retrieved from <http://dlnr.hawaii.gov/recreation/hunting/>.
- Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife. (2017b). *Game Bird Hunting*. Retrieved from <http://dlnr.hawaii.gov/recreation/hunting/bird/>.
- Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife. (2017c). *Game Mammal Hunting*. Retrieved from <http://dlnr.hawaii.gov/recreation/hunting/mammal/>.
- Hawaii Division of State Parks. (2015). *Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan 2015*. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources.
- Hawaii Office of Planning. (2019). *Hawaii State Planning Act*. Retrieved from <http://planning.hawaii.gov/hawaii-state-planning-act/>.
- Holloway-Adkins, K. G. (2006). Juvenile green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) forage on high-energy, shallow reef on the east coast of Florida. In M. Frick, A. Panagopoulou, A. F. Rees, & K. Williams (Eds.), *Twenty-sixth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation: Book of Abstracts*. Athens, Greece: National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science Center, International Sea Turtle Society.
- Hoover, J. P. (2008). *The Ultimate Guide to Hawaiian Reef Fishes, Sea Turtles, Dolphins, Whales, and Seals*. Honolulu, HI: Mutual Publishing.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2007). *Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report, IPCC Fourth Assessment*. Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC.
- Jacobs, D. S. (1994). Distribution and Abundance of the Endangered Hawaiian Hoary Bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*, on the Island of Hawaii. *Pacific Science*, 48(2), 193–200.
- Jefferson, T. A. (2009). Rough-toothed dolphin, *Steno bredanensis*. In W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig, & J. G. M. Thewissen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals* (2nd ed., pp. 990–992). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

- Jefferson, T. A., M. A. Webber, and R. L. Pitman. (2015). *Marine Mammals of the World: A Comprehensive Guide to Their Identification* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.
- Johanos, T. C., A. L. Harting, T. L. Wurth, and J. D. Baker. (2015). *Range-wide Patterns in Hawaiian Monk Seal Movements Among Islands and Atolls*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam. (2016). *JBPHH Green Waste Disposal Direction*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Department of the Navy.
- Jørgensen, R., N. O. Handegard, H. Gjørseter, and A. Slotte. (2004). Possible vessel avoidance behaviour of capelin in a feeding area and on a spawning ground. *Fisheries Research*, 69(2), 251–261.
- Kahuku Wind Power LLC. (2010). *Kahuku Wind Power Habitat Conservation Plan*. Honolulu, HI: SWCA Environmental Consultants.
- Kahuku Wind Power LLC. (2017). *Kahuku Wind Power Habitat Conservation Plan Annual Report: FY 2017*. Haleiwa, HI: Tetra Tech, Inc.
- Kauai Invasive Species Committee. (2018). *Welcome to KISC!*, Retrieved from <http://www.kauaiisc.org/>.
- Klinck, H., S. L. Nieuwirth, S. Fregosi, D. K. Mellinger, S. Lastuka, G. B. Shilling, and J. C. Luby. (2015). *Cetacean Studies on the Hawaii Range Complex in December 2014–January 2015: Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Marine Mammals using Gliders. Final Report*. Honolulu, HI: HDR Inc.
- Krausman, P. R., M. C. Wallace, M. J. Zine, L. R. Berner, C. L. Hayes, and D. W. DeYoung. (1993). *The Effects of Low-Altitude Aircraft on Mountain Sheep Heart Rate and Behavior* (AL/OE-TR-1993-0184). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.
- Krausman, P. R., M. C. Wallace, C. L. Hayes, and D. W. DeYoung. (1998). Effects of jet aircraft on mountain sheep. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 62(4), 1246–1254.
- Lamp, R. E. (1989). *Monitoring the Effects of Military Air Operations at Naval Air Station Fallon on the Biota of Nevada*. Reno, NV: Nevada Department of Wildlife.
- Larkin, R. P., L. L. Pater, and D. J. Tazlk. (1996). *Effects of Military Noise on Wildlife: A Literature Review* (USACERL Technical Report 96/21). Champaign, IL: Department of the Army, Construction Engineering Research Lab.
- Ludlow, B., and K. Sixsmith. (1999). Long-term Effects of Military Jet Aircraft Noise Exposure during Childhood on Hearing Threshold Levels. *Noise and Health*, 2(5), 33–39.
- Magalhães, S., R. Prieto, M. A. Silva, J. Gonçalves, M. Afonso-Dias, and R. S. Santos. (2002). Short-term reactions of sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) to whale-watching vessels in the Azores. *Aquatic Mammals*, 28(3), 267–274.
- Magnacca, K. N., and C. B. K. King. (2013). *Assessing the Presence and Distribution of 23 Hawaiian Yellow-Faced Bee Species on Lands Adjacent to Military Installations on Oahu and Hawaii Island*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawaii at Mānoa.
- ManTech International Corporation. (2010). *Sea-Based X-Band Radar Vessel Noise Assessment*. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command Missile Defense Agency.
- Martinez, J. A., C. M. Smith, and R. H. Richmond. (2012). Invasive algal mats degrade coral reef physical habitat quality. *Estuarine and Coastal Shelf Science*, 99(2012), 42–49.

- Mate, B. R., D. M. Palacios, L. M. Irvine, B. A. Lagerquist, T. Follett, M. H. Winsor, and C. Hayslip. (2015). *Baleen (Blue & Fin) Whale Tagging in Southern California in Support of Marine Mammal Monitoring Across Multiple Navy Training Areas (SOCAL, NWTRC, GOA); Final Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: U.S. Pacific Fleet.
- Mate, B. R., D. M. Palacios, C. S. Baker, B. A. Lagerquist, L. M. Irvine, T. Follett, D. Steel, C. Hayslip, and M. H. Winsor. (2016). *Baleen (Blue and Fin) Whale Tagging in Southern California in Support of Marine Mammal Monitoring Across Multiple Navy Training Areas. Final Report*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.
- Mazzacano, C. (2008). *Species Profile for Megalagrion xanthomelas (Séllys-Longchamps, 1876) Orangeblack Hawaiian damselfly Odonata: Zygoptera: Coenagrionidae*. Portland, OR: The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.
- Miller, M. H., and C. Klimovich. (2016). *Endangered Species Act Status Review Report: Giant Manta Ray (Manta birostris) and Reef Manta Ray (Manta alfredi)*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources.
- Mobley, J. R., M. Smultea, T. Norris, and D. Weller. (1996). Fin whale sighting north of Kauai, Hawaii. *Pacific Science*, 50(2), 230–233.
- Mobley, J. R., S. S. Spitz, K. A. Forney, R. Grotefendt, and P. H. Forestell. (2000). *Distribution and Abundance of Odontocete Species in Hawaiian Waters: Preliminary Results of 1993–98 Aerial Surveys*. Pearl City, HI; Colorado Springs, CO; La Jolla, CA; North Bend, WA; and Southampton, NY: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.
- Murakawa, S. K. K. (2014). *Summary of Sea Turtle Strandings in the Main Hawaiian Islands, 1975–July 2014*. Retrieved from https://pifsc-www.irc.noaa.gov/marine_turtle/.
- Na Pua Makani Power Partners, L. (2016). *Final Na Pua Makani Wind Energy Project - Habitat Conservation Plan*. Oahu, HI: Tetra Tech.
- National Guard Bureau, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2008). *Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Army National Guard Transformation Equipment Fielding*. Fairfax, VA: Tetra Tech, Inc.
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (1998). *Criteria for a Recommended Standard: Occupational Noise Exposure*. Cincinnati, OH: United States Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2007). *Recovery Plan for the Hawaiian Monk Seal (Monachus schauinslandi)*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2009). *Sperm Whale (Physeter macrocephalus): 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2011a). *Final Recovery Plan for the Sei Whale (Balaenoptera borealis)*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2011b). *Hawaiian Monk Seal Recovery; 2009–2010 Program Update and Accomplishments Report*. Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Pacific Islands Region.

- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2013). *2013 Annual Report of a Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean*. Woods Hole, MA and Miami, FL: Northeast Fisheries Science Center and Southeast Fisheries Science Center.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2014). Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation: *Biological Opinion and Conference Opinion on the U.S. Navys' Training and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area*. Silver Spring, MD: Office of Protected Resources, Permits and Conservation Division.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015). *Reinitiated Biological Opinion on U.S. Navy Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing*. Consultation #FPR-2015-9111. Silver Spring, MD: Office of Protected Resources' Permits and Conservation Division.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016a). *Main Hawaiian Islands Monk Seal Management Plan*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Region.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016b). *Status of Stocks 2015 (Annual Report to Congress on the Status of U.S. Fisheries)*. Retrieved from <https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/15619>.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2018). Biological Opinion on U.S. Navy Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing and the National Marine Fisheries Service's Promulgation of Regulations Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act for the Navy to "Take" Marine Mammals Incidental to Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing. Consultation #FPR-2018-9275. Silver Spring, MD: Office of Protected Resources' Permits and Conservation Division.
- National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2013). *Hawksbill Sea Turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation*. Silver Spring, MD: Office of Protected Resources.
- National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2014). *Olive Ridley Sea Turtle (Lepidochelys olivacea) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation*. Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Southeast Region.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2016). *Oceanic Whitetip Shark (Carcharhinus longimanus)*. Retrieved from <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/oceanic-whitetip-shark>.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2020a). *Hawaiian Monk Seal*. Retrieved from <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/hawaiian-monk-seal>.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2020b). *Giant Manta Ray*. Retrieved from <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/giant-manta-ray>.
- National Park Service. (1994). *Report on Effects of Aircraft Overflights on the National Park System* (Report to Congress prepared pursuant to Public Law 100-191, the National Parks Overflights Act of 1987). Washington, DC: National Park Service.
- Newton, I. (2010). *The Migration Ecology of Birds*. Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.
- Nowacek, D. P., F. Christiansen, L. Bejder, J. A. Goldbogen, and A. S. Friedlaender. (2016). Studying cetacean behaviour: New technological approaches and conservation applications. *Animal Behaviour*, 120, 235–244.
- Oahu Invasive Species Committee. (2018). *Welcome to OISC!* , Retrieved from <http://www.oahuisc.org/>.

- Oleson, E. M., C. H. Boggs, K. A. Forney, M. B. Hanson, D. R. Kobayashi, B. L. Taylor, P. R. Wade, and G. M. Ylitalo. (2010). *Status Review of Hawaiian Insular False Killer Whales (Pseudorca crassidens) under the Endangered Species Act* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-22). Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center.
- Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center. (2014). *Reefs for the future: Resilience of coral reefs in the main Hawaiian Islands*. (SP-15-001). Honolulu, HI: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Pacific Science Center, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Special Publication.
- Pacific Islands Ocean Observing System. (2018). *Estimated Coral Cover in Hawaii*. Retrieved from <http://www.pacios.hawaii.edu/projects/coral/>.
- Parker, D. M., G. H. Balazs, C. S. King, L. Katahira, and W. Gilmartin. (2009). Short-range movements of Hawksbill turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) from nesting to foraging areas within the Hawaiian Islands. *Pacific Science*, 63(3), 371–382.
- Parker, D. M., G. H. Balazs, M. Rice, W. Seitz, Kaho'olawe Island Reserve Commission, J. Pettigrew, Maui Coastal Land Trust, National Botanical Tropical Gardens, K. Maison, I. Kelly, J. Burger, J. Pawloski, D. Heacock, S. Hau, M. Coelho, B. Puleloa, C. King, The Nature Conservancy Moloka'i Turtle Trackers, P. Bennett, U. Keuper-Bennett, G. Nakai, J. Klavitter, J. Hiromasa, and D. Brown. (2015). *Map Guide to Marine Turtle Nesting and Basking in the Hawaiian Islands*. Retrieved from https://pifsc-www.irc.noaa.gov/marine_turtle/.
- Pepper, C. B., M. A. Nascarella, and R. J. Kendall. (2003). A review of the effects of aircraft noise on wildlife and humans, current control mechanisms, and the need for further study. *Environmental Management*, 32(4), 418–432.
- Popper, A. N., A. D. Hawkins, R. R. Fay, D. A. Mann, S. M. Bartol, T. J. Carlson, S. Coombs, W. T. Ellison, R. L. Gentry, M. B. Halvorsen, S. Løkkeborg, P. H. Rogers, B. L. Southall, D. G. Zeddies, and W. N. Tavolga. (2014). *ASA S3/SC1.4 TR-2014 Sound Exposure Guidelines for Fishes and Sea Turtles: A Technical Report prepared by ANSI-Accredited Standards Committee S3/SC1 and registered with ANSI*. New York, NY and London, United Kingdom: Acoustical Society of America Press and Springer Briefs in Oceanography.
- Popper, A. N., and A. Hawkins. (2016). *The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II*. New York, NY: Spring Science+Business Media.
- Pyle, R., and P. Pyle. (2017). Short-Eared Owl - *Asio flammeus*. *The Birds of the Hawaiian Islands: Occurrence, History, Distribution, and Status* (Vol. 2017). Honolulu, HI: Hawaii Biological Survey.
- Rice, D. W. (1998). *Marine Mammals of the World: Systematics and Distribution* (Society for Marine Mammalogy Special Publication). Lawrence, KS: Society for Marine Mammalogy.
- Richie, M. W., R. K. Uyeyama, J. M. Aschettino, and M. A. Fagan. (2016). *Marine Species Surveys of Pearl Harbor, Nov 2013–Nov 2015, and Historical Occurrence of Marine Species in Pearl Harbor*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.
- Ritchie, E. I. (2016). False killer whales spotted in feeding frenzy off Dana Point Coast—rare for this area. *The Orange County Register*. Retrieved from <https://www.ocregister.com/2016/04/18/false-killer-whales-spotted-in-feeding-frenzy-off-dana-point-coast-rare-for-this-area/>.

- Roberson, K., M. S. Kendall, D. Parker, and S. Murakawa. (2016). Chapter 5: Sea Turtles. In B. M. Costa & M. S. Kendall (Eds.), *Marine Biogeographic Assessment of the Main Hawaiian Islands* (pp. 196–226). Sterling, VA: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. OCS Study BOEM 2016-035 and NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 214.
- Rocha, R. C., P. J. J. Clapham, and Y. V. Ivashchenko. (2014). Emptying the Oceans: A Summary of Industrial Whaling Catches in the 20th Century. *Marine Fisheries Review*, 76(4), 37–48.
- Rodgers, K. S., P. L. Jokiel, E. K. Brown, S. Hau, and R. Sparks. (2015). Over a Decade of Change in Spatial and Temporal Dynamics of Hawaiian Coral Reef Communities. *Pacific Science*, 69(1), 1–13.
- Sax, D. F., S. D. Gaines, and J. H. Brown. (2002). Species invasions exceed extinctions on islands worldwide: A comparative study of plants and birds. *The American Naturalist*, 160(6), 766–783.
- Schonberg, L., S. Jepsen, and S. H. Black. (2009a). *Petition to List Two Species of Hawaiian Yellow-Faced Bees, Hylaeus mana and Hylaeus kuakea, as Endangered Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act*. Portland, OR: The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.
- Schonberg, L., S. Jepsen, and S. H. Black. (2009b). *Petition to List One Species of Hawaiian Yellow-Faced Bee, Hylaeus assimulans, as Endangered Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act*. Portland, OR: The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.
- Schonberg, L., S. Jepsen, and S. H. Black. (2009c). *Petition to List Two Species of Hawaiian Yellow-Faced Bees, Hylaeus anthracinus and Hylaeus longiceps, as Endangered Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act*. Portland, OR: The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.
- Schonberg, L., S. Jepsen, and S. H. Black. (2009d). *Petition to List One Species of Hawaiian Yellow-Faced Bee, Hylaeus facilis, as Endangered Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act*. Portland, OR: The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.
- Schonberg, L., S. Jepsen, and S. H. Black. (2009e). *Petition to List One Species of Hawaiian Yellow-Faced Bee, Hylaeus hiliaris, as Endangered Under the U.S. Endangered Species Act*. Portland, OR: The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.
- Seminoff, J. A., A. Resendiz, and W. J. Nichols. (2002). Home range of green turtles, *Chelonia mydas*, at a coastal foraging area in the Gulf of California, Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 242, 253–265.
- Senigaglia, V., F. Christiansen, L. Bejder, D. Gendron, D. Lundquist, D. P. Noren, A. Schaffar, J. C. Smith, R. Williams, E. Martinez, K. Stockin, and D. Lusseau. (2016). Meta-analyses of whale-watching impact studies: Comparisons of cetacean responses to disturbance. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 542, 251–263.
- Shallenberger, E. W. (1981). *The Status of Hawaiian Cetaceans*. Kailua, HI: Manta Corporation.
- Shankar, K., J. Ramadevi, B. C. Choudhary, L. Singh, and R. K. Aggarwal. (2004). Phylogeography of olive ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) on the east coast of India: Implications for conservation theory. *Molecular Ecology*, 13, 1899–1909.
- Silber, G., J. Slutsky, and S. Bettridge. (2010). Hydrodynamics of a ship/whale collision. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 391, 10–19.
- Smith, D. G., D. H. Ellis, and T. H. Johnson. (1988). *Raptors and Aircraft*. Paper presented at the Southwest Raptor Management Symposium and Workshop. Washington, DC.

- Smith, J. E., C. L. Hunter, E. J. Conklin, R. Most, T. Sauvage, C. Squair, and C. M. Smith. (2004). Ecology of the invasive red alga *Gracilaria salicornia* (Rhodophyta) on O'ahu, Hawai'i. *Pacific Science*, 58(2), 325–343.
- Spalding, M. D., H. E. Fox, G. R. Allen, N. Davidson, Z. A. Ferdaña, M. Finlayson, B. S. Halpern, M. A. Jorge, A. Lombana, S. A. Lourie, K. D. Martin, E. McManus, J. Molnar, C. A. Recchia, and J. Roberston. (2007). Marine ecoregions of the world: A bioregionalisation of coastal and shelf areas. *Bioscience*, 57(7), 573–583.
- Stafford, K. M., S. L. Nieuwkerk, and C. G. Fox. (2001). Geographic and seasonal variation of blue whale calls in the North Pacific. *Journal of Cetacean Research Management*, 3(1), 65–76.
- Stafford, K. M., D. R. Bohnenstiehl, M. Tolstoy, E. Chapp, D. K. Mellinger, and S. E. Moore. (2004). Antarctic-type blue whale calls recorded at low latitudes in the Indian and eastern Pacific Oceans. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 51(10), 1337–1346.
- Stalmaster, M. V., and J. L. Kaiser. (1997). Flushing responses of wintering bald eagles to military activity. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 61(4), 1307–1313.
- Star Advertiser Staff. (2011). Facility to demagnetize subs completed. <https://www.staradvertiser.com/2011/01/18/hawaii-news/facility-to-demagnetize-subs-completed/>. Last updated January 18, 2011; accessed July 29, 2020.
- State of Hawaii. (2017). *State Coastal Zone Management Program*. Retrieved from <http://planning.hawaii.gov/czm/>.
- SWCA. 2019. Kuaokala Ridge Biological Resource Survey. Prepared for KFS LLC, Huntsville, AL by SWCA Environmental Consultants, Honolulu, HI. June.
- The Nature Conservancy. (2015). *The Nature Conservancy Hawaii Marine Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/northamerica/unitedstates/hawaii/index.htm>.
- The Pueo Project. (2018). *Pueo - the Hawaiian Short-eared Owl Distribution Map*. Retrieved from <https://www.pueoproject.com/distribution-map>.
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2013). *Revision of the UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on Annual Inventories for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (Following Incorporation of the Provisions of Decision 24/CP.19)*. (FCCC/CP/2013/10/Add.3). New York, NY: The United Nations.
- University of Hawaii at Manoa. (2015a). *Compilation of reef fish data*. Retrieved from <https://fisheriesecologyresearchlab.wordpress.com>.
- University of Hawaii at Manoa. (2015b). *Coral Reef Assessment and Monitoring Program*. Retrieved from http://cramp.wcc.hawaii.edu/CRAMP_Information/overview.htm.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2015). Kaena Point Satellite Tracking Station, Hawaii Natural Resource Assessment Report. Prepared for MWH Americas, Inc. by SWCA Environmental Consultants, Honolulu, HI.
- U.S. Army Garrison Hawaii. (2010). *Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan 2010–2014 Island of Oahu: Schofield Barracks Military Reservation, Schofield Barracks East Range, Kawaihoa Training Area, Kahuku Training Area, Dillingham Military Reservation, Makua Military Reservation, Tripler Army Medical Center*. Fort Collins, CO: Cooperative Research Agreement with the USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station (07-CR-11221611-038), Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University.

- U.S. Army Garrison Hawaii. (2017). *2017 Status Report for the Makua and Oahu Implementation Plan*. Schofield Barracks, HI: Oahu Army Natural Resources Program.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2016). *American Community Survey Selected Economic 2011-2015*. Retrieved from <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- U.S. Department of Defense. (2009). *Improving Aviation Noise Planning, Analysis and Public Communication with Supplemental Metrics - Guide to Using Supplemental Metrics*. Washington, DC: Noise Working Group.
- U.S. Department of Defense. (2013). *Technical Bulletin: An Overview of Blast Noise: Characteristics, Assessment and Mitigation*. Washington, DC: Department of Defense Noise Working Group.
- U.S. Department of Defense. (2014). *2014 Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap*. Alexandria, VA: Department of Defense.
- U.S. Department of the Air Force. (2016). *Final Environmental Assessment/Overseas Environmental Assessment for the Long Range Strike Weapon Systems Evaluation Program at the Pacific Missile Range Facility at Kauai, Hawaii*. Air Force Civil Engineer Center, NEPA Division, AFCEC/CZN.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, and U. S. C. Bureau. (2011). *2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation Hawaii 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2008a). *Hawaii Range Complex, Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2008b). *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Introduction of the P-8A Multi-Mission Maritime Aircraft into the U.S. Navy Fleet*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2009). *West Coast Basing of the MV-22 Final Environmental Impact Statement*. San Diego, CA: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2010a). *Bird/Animal Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) Manual*. Washington, DC: CNIC Air Operations Program Director.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2010b). *Final Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan Pacific Missile Range Facility, Islands of Kaua'i, O'ahu, and Ka'ula, State of Hawai'i (2010-2014)*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2011a). *Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, September 2011 (2011-2015)*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2011b). *U.S. Navy Diving Manual*. Volume 1. Washington, DC: Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2012). *Marine Corps Base Hawaii Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan Update*. Honolulu, HI: Environmental Compliance and Protection Department Marine Corps Base Hawaii.

- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2013). *Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing EIS/OEIS*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2014). Wave Energy Test Site Final Environmental Assessment, Marine Corps Base Hawaii. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific and Naval Facilities Engineering and Expeditionary Warfare Center.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015a). *Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii, Volumes I-IV*. Mangilao, GU: University of Guam and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2015b). *Installation and Operation of a Fixed Surface Ship Radiated Noise Measurement System at the Fleet Test and Evaluation Center, Barbers Point, O'ahu, Hawai'i and Surrounding Ocean*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2016a). *Studying Nocturnal Seabird Activity at PMRF, Kauai*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Hawaii.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2016b). *MCB Hawaii Kaneohe Bay Pali Kilo Beach Cottages Expansion Environmental Assessment*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017a). *U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area* (Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific Technical Report). Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017b). *Final Environmental Assessment Demolish Abandoned Pier Marine Corps Base Hawaii, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2017c). *Final Environmental Assessment for Photovoltaic and Battery Energy Storage Systems at Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2018). *Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. (2019). *Environmental Assessment for Shoreline Stabilization at Puuloa Range Training Facility, Oahu, Hawaii*. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific.
- U.S. Department of Transportation. (2006). *Construction Noise Handbook: 9.0 Construction Equipment Noise Levels and Ranges*. FHWA-HEP-06-015. Prepared for Federal Highway Administration, Office of Natural and Human Environment, Washington, DC by Research and Innovative Technology Administration, John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Environmental Measurement and Modeling Division, Acoustics Facility, Cambridge, MA.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (1974). *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*. (EPA 550/9-74-004). Washington, DC: Office of Noise Abatement and Control.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (1982). *Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis*. Washington, DC: Office of Noise Abatement and Control.

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (1992). *Procedures for Emission Inventory Preparation. Volume IV: Mobile Sources*. EPA420-R-92-009. Office of Mobile Sources and Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (1999). *Consideration of Cumulative Impacts in EPA Review of NEPA Documents*. Washington, DC: Office of Federal Activities.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2007). *The Plain English Guide to the Clean Air Act*. (EPA-456/K-07-001). Research Triangle Park, NC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2008). *Ordnance detonation, Section 15.7: Mines and smoke pots* (AP 42, 5th ed., Volume I. Chapter 15). Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2009a). *Technical Support Document for Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act*. Washington, DC: Council on Foreign Relations.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2009b). *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2009c). *AP-42, Compilation of Air Pollutant Emissions Factors, Volume 1: Stationary Point and Area Sources*. Retrieved from <https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-factors-and-quantification/ap-42-compilation-air-emission-factors#5thed>.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2015). *Technology Transfer Network - Air Toxics Website: Pollutants and Sources*. Retrieved from <https://www3.epa.gov/airtoxics/pollsour.html>.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2016a). *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2014*. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2016b). *Hazardous Air Pollutants*. Retrieved from <https://www.epa.gov/haps>.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2017). *Basic Information About the General Conformity Rule*. Retrieved from <https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/basic-information-about-general-conformity-rule>.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1984). *Hawaiian Hawk Recovery Plan*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1996). *Marsilea villosa Recovery Plan*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1998). *Recovery Plan for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat (Lasiurus cinereus semotus)*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1999). *Recovery Plan for Multi-Island Plants*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2004). *Draft Revised Recovery Plan for the Nene or Hawaiian Goose (Branta sandvicensis)*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2005). *Regional Seabird Conservation Plan, Pacific Region*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Migratory Birds and Habitat Programs, Pacific Region.

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2008). *Draft Post-Delisting Monitoring Plan for the Hawaiian Hawk, or IO (Buteo solitarius)*. Honolulu, HI: Endangered Species Division, Pacific Island Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2010a). *Sesbania tomentosa (Ohai) 5-Year Review Summary and Evaluation*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2010b). *Hawaiian Stilt or Ae`o (Himantopus mexicanus knudseni) 5-Year Review Summary and Evaluation*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2011a). *Ōpe`ape`a or Hawaiian Hoary Bat (Lasiurus cinereus semotus): 5-Year Review Summary and Evaluation*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2011b). *Nēnē or Hawaiian Goose (Branta sandvicensis): 5-Year Review Summary and Evaluation*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2011c). *Marsilea villosa (ihi`ihi) 5-Year Review: Short Form Summary*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2011d). *Recovery Plan for Hawaiian Waterbirds, Second Revision*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2011e). *Abutilon menziesii (ko`oloa`ula): 5-Year Review Summary and Evaluation*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2013). *Cyperus trachysanthos (puukaa): 5-Year Review Short Form Summary*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2014). *Orangeblack Hawaiian damselfly (Megalagrion xanthomelas) Species Assessment and Listing Priority Assignment Form*. Portland, OR: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015a). *Hawaiian Coot (Fulica alai) 5-Year Review: Short Form Summary*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015b). *Hawaiian Duck (Anas wyvilliana) 5-Year Review: Short Form Summary*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015c). *Hawaiian Common Gallinule (Gallinula chloropus sandvicensis) 5-Year Review: Short Form Summary*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015d). *Sesbania tomentosa (‘ohai) 5-Year Review: Short Form Summary*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2017a). *Hawaiian Petrel (Pterodroma sandwichensis) 5-Year Review: Short Form Summary*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2017b). *Newell’s Shearwater (Puffinus auricularis newelli) 5-year Review Short Form*. Washington, DC: Pacific Regional Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2017c). *Panicum niihauense (Lauehu) 5-Year Review: Short Form Summary*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2019). *Bidens amplexans (ko’oko’olau): 5-Year Review Summary and Evaluation*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Geological Survey (Cartographer). (2003). *Federal Lands and Indian Reservations: Hawaii (Figure)*.

- U.S. Marine Corps. (2011). *Final Marine Corps Base Hawaii Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan Update (Marine Corps Base Hawaii INRMP) (2012–2016)*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Marine Corps Environmental Compliance and Protection Department.
- U.S. Marine Corps. (2012). *Environmental Review for Basing MV-22 Aircraft at MCAS Futenma and Operating in Japan - Final*. Kaneohe, HI: Marine Corps Installations Pacific.
- U.S. Marine Corps. (2017). *Final Marine Corps Base Hawaii Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan Update (Marine Corps Base Hawaii INRMP) (2017-2021)*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Marine Corps Environmental Compliance and Protection Department.
- Uyehara, K., and K. Misajon. (2007). *Nene Habitat Enhancement and Management*. Honolulu, HI: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Pacific Islands Area.
- Vanderlaan, M. S. A., and T. C. Taggart. (2007). Vessel collisions with whales: The probability of lethal injury based on vessel speed. *Marine Mammal Science*, 23(1), 144–156.
- Wallace, B. P., R. L. Lewison, S. L. McDonald, R. K. McDonald, C. Y. Kot, S. Kelez, R. K. Bjorkland, E. M. Finkbeiner, S. Helmbrecht, and L. B. Crowder. (2010). Global patterns of marine turtle bycatch. *Conservation Letters*, 3(3), 131–142.
- Warshauer, F. R., J. D. Jacobi, and J. Price. (2009). *Native coastal flora and plant communities in Hawaii: Their composition, distribution, and status* (Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit Technical Report HCSU-014). Hilo, HI: University of Hawaii at Hilo.
- Weisenberger, M. E., P. R. Krausman, M. C. Wallace, D. W. De Young, and O. E. Maughan. (1996). Effects of simulated jet aircraft noise on heart rate and behavior of desert ungulates. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 60(1), 52–61.
- Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2009). *Fishery Ecosystem Plan for Pacific Pelagic Fisheries of the Western Pacific Region*. Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.
- Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2016a). *Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the Hawaii Archipelago - Working Draft*. Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.
- Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. (2016b). *Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the Pacific Pelagic Fisheries - Working Draft*. Honolulu, HI: Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.
- Whitaker, J. O., Jr., and P. Q. Tomich. (1983). Food habits of the hoary bat, *Lasiurus cinereus*, from Hawaii. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 64, 151–152.
- Whiteterms.org. (2018). *Complete manu-o-Kū Breeding Range Map - Hui manu-o-kū*. Retrieved from <https://www.whiteterms.org/complete-manu-o-k363-breeding-range-map.html>.
- Wiley, D. N., C. A. Mayo, E. M. Maloney, and M. J. Moore. (2016). Vessel strike mitigation lessons from direct observations involving two collisions between noncommercial vessels and North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*). *Marine Mammal Science*, 32(4), 1501–1509.
- Witzell, W. N. (1983). *Synopsis of biological data on the hawksbill turtle, Eretmochelys imbricata (Linnaeus, 1766)*. Rome, Italy: United Nations Environment Programme, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

- Wright, A. J., N. A. Soto, A. L. Baldwin, M. Bateson, C. M. Beale, C. Clark, T. Deak, E. F. Edwards, A. Fernandez, A. Godinho, L. T. Hatch, A. Kakuschke, D. Lusseau, D. Martineau, M. L. Romero, L. S. Weilgart, B. A. Wintle, G. Notarbartolo-di-Sciara, and V. Martin. (2007). Anthropogenic noise as a stressor in animals: A multidisciplinary perspective. *International Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 20, 250–273.
- Xerces Society. (2018). *Hawaiian Yellow-Faced Bees*. Retrieved from <https://xerces.org/hawaiian-yellow-faced-bees/>.
- Young, C. N., J. Carlson, C. Hutt, D. Kobayashi, C. T. McCandless, and J. Wraith. (2016). *Status review report: Oceanic whitetip shark (Carcharhinus longimanus)* (Final Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources). Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service & National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
- Zanre, E. (2014). *Community-based Subsistence Fishing Area Designation Procedures Guide*. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources.