

Monday, March 31, 2008

Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic Division
Attention: Code EV22 (Atlantic Fleet Sonar Project Manager)
6506 Hampton Blvd
Norfolk, VA 23508-1278

Subject: Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS)

To Atlantic Fleet Sonar Project Manager

- 565 [1. Why is the Navy doing piecemeal environmental studies on Sonar on the East Coast instead of a comprehensive environmental study on all Navy Sonar Training on the East Coast?]
- 797/566 [2. How can there be no cumulative impacts involving the Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) and the Navy Undersea Warfare Training Range (USWTR)?]
- 567 [3. Why isn't the AFAST and the USWTR in the same environmental study?]
- ✓ [4. Why does the AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS make conclusions that are not supported by facts?]
- ✓ [5. Why isn't there the proper scientific research in the AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS?]
- 569 [6. Why is the Navy pursuing a special permit from the National Marine Fisheries Service to "harass" endangered species and sea turtles rather than protecting endangered species and sea turtles?]

Sincerely,

Frances T. Armstrong

Frances T. Armstrong

Bath, NC [REDACTED]

I - 007

Monday, March 24, 2008

Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic Division
Attention: Code EV22 (Atlantic Fleet Sonar Project Manager)
6506 Hampton Blvd
Norfolk, VA 23508-1278

Subject: Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS)

To: Atlantic Fleet Sonar Project Manager

I am writing to express my concern with the AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS. I think the Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) and the Undersea Warfare Training Range (USWTR) need to be studied together.

The AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS states that there will not be cumulative impacts involving the AFAST and the USWTR, although at this time the USWTR is under study and the location is unknown, but the preferred location is off the coast of North Carolina. I was surprised at the lack of information on the USWTR in the AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS.

The AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS is not a comprehensive study and is therefore flawed and inaccurate. A comprehensive study of the Navy's Sonar Training on the east coast must be made which would necessarily include the AFAST and the USWTR being studied together.

Also, I don't think the AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS has given facts to support the No-Action Alternative. In fact I don't think the study has facts to support the conclusions given in the study.

The preferred No-Action Alternative for the AFAST which is to keep doing what has been done causes adverse impacts and takes of endangered species and will require a special permit from the National Marine Fisheries Service to "harass" endangered species and sea turtles. I am greatly concerned with the cumulative harm to the ocean and marine life from all the Navy's active sonar activities.

It is a known fact that after Navy Sonar Training off the North Carolina coast, strandings and deaths have occurred of many marine mammals with bleeding ears which indicates ruptured eardrums. The main cause of ruptured eardrums is sonar.

The AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS is not comprehensive and does not have the evidence to support the study's conclusions and therefore the study needs to be scratched and a new study of Navy Sonar Training on the East Coast needs to be done. This study must include both the AFAST and the USWTR and more scientific research on the effects of sonar use.

Sincerely,

Frances T Armstrong

Frances T. Armstrong

Bath, NC

Date	Comment	First Name	Last Name	Street	City	State	Zip Code
3/31/2008 13:43	<p>Monday, March 31, 2008 Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic Division Attention: Code EV22 (Atlantic Fleet Sonar Project Manager) 6506 Hampton Blvd Norfolk, VA 23508-1278 Subject: Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS) To: Atlantic Fleet Sonar Project Manager 1. Why is the Navy doing piecemeal environmental studies on Sonar on the East Coast instead of a comprehensive environmental study on all Navy Sonar Training on the East Coast? 2. How can there be no cumulative impacts involving the Atlantic Fleet Active Sonar Training (AFAST) and the Navy Undersea Warfare Training Range (USWTR)? 3. Why isn't the AFAST and the USWTR in the same environmental study? 4. Why does the AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS make conclusions that are not supported by facts? 5. Why isn't there the proper scientific research in the AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS? 6. Why is the Navy pursuing a special permit from the National Marine Fisheries Service to harass endangered species and sea turtles rather than protecting endangered species and sea turtles? Sincerely, Frances T. Armstrong 264 Teach's Cove Bath, NC 27808</p>	Frances	Armstrong				

I-007

2-18-2008



I would like a CD with the
AFAST Draft EIS/OEIS
and
a paper copy of the Executive
Summary.

Thank you,

Frances Armstrong

[REDACTED]
Bath NC [REDACTED]