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INTRODUCTION

This Volume of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) includes comments and responses on the Draft EIS for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at F.E. Warren Air Force Base (AFB), Wyoming and ten candidate deployment installations; all original written comment documents; and public hearing transcripts (comments sections only) as recorded by court reporters for each of the 11 public hearings held on the Draft EIS.

During the public comment and review period (28 June 1988 through 31 August 1988), written comments on the Draft EIS were received from federal, state, and local agencies; organizations; and individuals in addition to oral testimony received at the 11 public hearings. Each of the written comments received as memoranda, letters, and reports are referred to as documents. The issues raised within each document were individually coded and responses prepared for each. A total of 497 written documents were received and are shown in Section 2. Public hearing transcripts for the 11 hearings are provided in Section 3 and are numbered 500 through 510. Eleven documents were postmarked after the comment period deadline of 31 August 1988 and were assigned document numbers 511 through 521. These documents and responses prepared for the comments in each are provided in Section 4. Relevant information contained in these documents has been incorporated, where appropriate, into the Final EIS text.

1.1 Summary of Respondents and Issues

Table 1 contains a listing of all respondents by location who submitted written comments during the public review and comment period. It identifies the author's name, city, state, and affiliation, if any, and the document number assigned to each respondent's document. All documents received during the comment period are presented sequentially from 1 through 497 in Section 2 and from 511 through 521 in Section 4. An individual looking for a response to his/her written comments can look at Table 1, locate his/her name, identify the document number, and go to the document number in Section 1.2.1 to read the issues and responses or the responses in Section 4.1. Those who spoke at the public hearings can look at Table 2, find their name, public hearing transcript number, and the page on which their name first appears in the transcripts. They can then go to Section 1.2.2 to read the comments and responses.

From the 508 written documents received (497 prior to and 11 after the 31 August 1988 deadline) and the 11 public hearings transcripts, a total of 2,670 comments were identified. Table 3 provides a summary of the number of documents and comments by location. Table 4 categorizes the comments by location and issue category. The largest number of comments (867) pertained to Air Force policy, followed by 404 on system requirements, 398 on the Environmental Impact Analysis Process, and 341 on system safety. Among the resource categories, the largest number of comments pertained to socioeconomics (236 comments). Biological resources and water resources were other major resource categories eliciting 93 and 74 comments, respectively. All other resources received 40 comments or less each. Eighty-four comments could not be clearly classified and were categorized as general comments.
## Table 1
### List of Respondents Submitting Written Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Federal Agencies/Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U.S. Bureau of the Census (Roger A. Herriot)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Washington, DC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>State Agencies/Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Honorable Mike Sullivan, Governor (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Randolph Wood) (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>Wyoming Office of the Governor (Alan Edwards)</td>
<td>15, 488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wyoming House of Representatives</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Lynn Dickey) (Sheridan, Wyoming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local Agencies/Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Honorable Don Erickson, Mayor (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Laramie County Clerk (Janet C. Whitehead)</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Laramie, Wyoming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Laramie County School District Number One</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Dennis L. Peterson) (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dan's County Market (Marlin Martin) (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dray, Madison, and Thomson</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(William J. Thomson) (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>League of Women Voters (Linda L. Kirkbride)</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alvin Aldrich (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annette Aldrich (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enja Borgmann (Tie Siding, Wyoming)</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sharon Breitweiser (Laramie, Wyoming)</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Daniel D. Brown (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Andrea L. Cook (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sister Rosella Hehn (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lorraine Holcomb (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dean B. Holmer (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Beth Howard (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individuals (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mae Kirkbride (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eileen Lappe (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prudy Marshall (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,15</td>
<td>Darryl Miller (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>417, 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Robert Nisbet (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Adora Lindsley Palma (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sally Palmer (Laramie, Wyoming)</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bernard Phelan (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Anne Radford (Scottsbluff, Nebraska)</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Janet S. Rider (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sydney Spiegel (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Eileen F. Starr (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Edward Warsaw (Cheyenne, Wyoming)</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Barksdale AFB, Louisiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>State Agencies/Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, and Tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Leslie P. Tassin) (Baton Rouge, Louisiana)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local Agencies/Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bossier City-Parish Metropolitan Planning Commission</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A. Dean Holt) (Bossier City, Louisiana)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eddy E. Arnold (Minden, Louisiana)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christine Barberousse (Shreveport, Louisiana)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ginny Homza (Shreveport, Louisiana)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beal Locue (Shreveport, Louisiana)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ronald A. Martin (Shreveport, Louisiana)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jody Miller Shearer (New Orleans, Louisiana)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thomas Neale (Shreveport, Louisiana)</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jan Nelson (Shreveport, Louisiana)</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eileen Oldag (Shreveport, Louisiana)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alta Ruark (Springhill, Louisiana)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Renee Simar (Shreveport, Louisiana)</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Continued, Page 3 of 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Honorable William P. Clements, Jr., Governor (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Honorable Jim Mattox, Attorney General (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Railroad Commission of Texas (James Nugent) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Texas Historical Commission (James E. Bruseth) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Bill Arnold) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Erwin Barton) (Pasadena, Texas)</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Jerry J. Beauchamp) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Hugo Berlanga) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Weldon Betts) (Houston, Texas)</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Dick Burnett) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Frank Collazo, Jr.) (Port Arthur, Texas)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Robert Earley) (Beeville, Texas)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Robert Eckels) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Orlando L. Garcia) (San Antonio, Texas)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (John J. Gavin) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Gerald Geistweidt) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Ron D. Givens) (Lubbock, Texas)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Kent Grusendorf) (Arlington, Texas)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Lena Guerrero) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Jack Harris) (Pearland, Texas)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Dudley Harrison) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Jim Horn) (Lewisville, Texas)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Bob Hunter) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Gibson Lewis) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Ron Lewis) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Jim McWilliams) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Bob Melton) (Gatesville, Texas)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Mike Millsap) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Alejandro Moreno, Jr.) (Edinburg, Texas)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Anna Mowery) (Fort Worth, Texas)</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (A.R. Ovard) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Jim Parker) (Comanche, Texas)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (L.P. Patterson) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Glenn Repp) (Duncanville, Texas)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Jim D. Rudd) (Brownfield, Texas)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Sam W. Russell) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Robert M. Saunders) (L. Grange, Texas)</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Alan Schoolcraft) (Universal City, Texas)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Curtis L. Seidlits, Jr.) (Big Springs, Texas)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Larry Don Shaw) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Hugh D. Shine) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Richard A. Smith) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (John Smithee) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Monte Stewart) (Bedford, Texas)</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Mark W. Stiles) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Jim Tallas) (Sugar Land, Texas)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (M.A. Taylor) (Waco, Texas)</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Barry B. Telford) (Texarkana, Texas)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Keith Valigura) (Conroe, Texas)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Richard A. Waterfield) (Canadien, Texas)</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Foster Whaley) (Pampa, Texas)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Steven D. Wolens) (Dallas, Texas)</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Texas House of Representatives (Jerry Yost) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Roy Blake) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Chet Brooks) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Kent A. Caperton) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Chet Edwards) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Bob Glasgow) (Fort Worth, Texas)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Don Henderson) (Houston, Texas)</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Grant Jones) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (John N. Leedom) (Dallas, Texas)</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Bob McFarland) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Document Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Hugh Parmer) (Fort Worth, Texas)</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Hector Uribe) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Texas State Senate (Judith Zaffirini) (Austin, Texas)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Agencies/Officials**

1. Honorable Bobbye Allen, Comanche County Judge (Comanche, Texas) 202
2. Honorable P.C. Carr, Mayor (Aspermont, Texas) 204
3. Honorable William F. Goetz, Mayor (Ballinger, Texas) 213
4. Honorable Garth Gregory, Kent County Judge (Kent, Texas) 192
5. Walter M. Hertel, City Administrator (Munday, Texas) 191
6. Honorable Terry Julian, Nolan County Judge (Sweetwater, Texas) 30, 190
7. Honorable Mack Kniffen, Callahan County Judge (Baird, Texas) 195
8. Honorable Robert Knott, Mayor (Tuscola, Texas) 216
9. Honorable Weldon Leonard, Mayor (Breckenridge, Texas) 217
10. Honorable Johnny Livingston, Mayor (Comanche, Texas) 203
11. Honorable Catarino Martinez, Mayor (Loraine, Texas) 207
12. Honorable Bert V. Massey II, Mayor (Brownwood, Texas) 214
13. Roy McCorkle, City Manager (Coleman, Texas) 211
14. Honorable Michael B. Murchison, Runnels County Judge (Breckenridge, Texas) 196
15. Honorable David N. Perdue, Knox County Judge (Benjamin, Texas) 199
16. Honorable Gene Rodgers, Mayor (Anson, Texas) 198
17. Honorable David Rogers, Mayor (Ranger, Texas) 201
18. Honorable Marie Smith, Shackelford County Judge (Albany, Texas) 14, 205
19.20. Honorable J. Hugh Stempel, Mayor (Coleman, Texas) 212, 218
21.22. Honorable Roy Thorn, Jones County Judge (Jones County, Texas) 200
23. Honorable Miller Tuttle, Stephens County Judge (Breckenridge, Texas) 206
24. Honorable Joe Wheatley, Mayor (Cisco, Texas) 210
25. Honorable Ed Wolsch, Stonewall County Judge (Aspermont, Texas) 197

**Native American Groups**

1. Fort Sill Apache Tribe (Mildred J. Cleghorn) (Apache, Oklahoma) 368
### Dyess AFB, Texas (continued)

#### Organizations

1. International Association of Lions Club  
   (William King) Abilene, Texas  
   **Serial Number:** 185

2. West Central Texas Municipal Water District  
   (David Bell) (Abilene, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 486

#### Individuals

1. T.C. Adams (Austin, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 109

2. Bruce R. Condit (Abilene, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 182

3. Beckie Cox (Abilene, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 286

4. Mrs. A.W. Crawford (Lubbock, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 479

5. Lara Lynn Creech (Abilene, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 12

6. Dick Dickenson (Abilene, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 189

7. Werner Harsch (Miles, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 209

8, 9. Jack S. Herndan (Abilene, Texas)  
   **Serial Number:** 349, 465

10. Barbara Hurt (Blackwell, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 208

11. Richmond E. Kissko, Jr. (Lubbock, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 358

12. Samuel B. Matta (Abilene, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 187

13. Garry Mauro (Austin, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 186

14. Greg Melton (Haskell, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 193

15. Lila Senter (Abilene, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 23

16. Scott Senter (Abilene, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 22

17. Murray Simmons (Roby, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 194

18. Mary M. Vines (Lubbock, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 345

19. William Westney (Lubbock, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 484

20. Troy Williamson (Snyder, Texas)  
    **Serial Number:** 215

### Eaker AFB, Arkansas

#### Organizations

1. Northeast Arkansas Citizens Committee  
   (James R. Deal) (Blytheville, Arkansas)  
   **Serial Number:** 431

#### Individuals

1. Jim Brown (Blytheville, Arkansas)  
   **Serial Number:** 88

2. Hildred G. Bunch (Blytheville, Arkansas)  
   **Serial Number:** 223

3. Dennis Clardy (Blytheville, Arkansas)  
   **Serial Number:** 263

4. Robert Gilliham (Mountain View, Arkansas)  
   **Serial Number:** 460

5. Douglas M. Mason (Springfield, Missouri)  
   **Serial Number:** 409

6. Jenny Russell (Jonesboro, Arkansas)  
   **Serial Number:** 416
Table 1 Continued, Page 7 of 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fairchild AFB, Washington**

**Local Agencies/Officials**

1. Honorable Vicki S. McNeill, Mayor (Spokane, Washington) 439
2. Honorable Al Ogdon, Mayor (Cheney, Washington) 62

**Individuals**

1. Larry Anderson (Spokane, Washington) 472
2. Keith Aubrey (Spokane, Washington) 104
3. Michael G. Blackburn (Spokane, Washington) 359
4. Russ Brown (Medical Lake, Washington) 47
5. David F. Carroll (Spokane, Washington) 364
6. Janice M. Doherty (Spokane, Washington) 476
7. Marilyn J. Geiger (Medical Lake, Washington) 269
8. David J. Hunt (Coeur d'Alene, Idaho) 477
9. Richard Juzix (Spokane, Washington) 46
10. Sue R. Krause (Spokane, Washington) 46
11. Judith Lacerti (Spokane, Washington) 236
12. Tom Lande (Spokane, Washington) 377
13. Al Mangan (Spokane, Washington) 482
14. Gene Sargeant (Spokane, Washington) 233
15. Helen M. Sargeant (Spokane, Washington) 412
16. Robert and Pearl Singer (Spokane, Washington) 224
17. Larry and Mary Stuckart (Spokane, Washington) 277

**Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota**

**State Agencies/Officials**

1. Honorable George A. Sinner, Governor 424
   (Bismarck, North Dakota)
2. North Dakota State Historical Society (James E. Sperry) 480
   (Bismarck, North Dakota)

**Local Agencies/Officials**

1. Grand Forks County Board of Commissioners 96
   (James A. Earl) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)
2. Polk County Board of Commissioners 102
   (Earl Radi) (Crookston, Minnesota)
3. Honorable Raymond Trosen, Mayor (Larimore, North Dakota) 314
Table 1 Continued, Page 8 of 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Associated General Contractors of North Dakota (Curtis L. Peterson) (Bismarck, North Dakota)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Exchange Club of Grand Forks, North Dakota (George McKinley Bowman) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce (Frank W. Coe) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce (Marlan Helgeson) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grand Forks Kiwanis Club (Floyd K. Christianson) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>International Union of Operating Engineers (Arden Grundvig) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>North Dakota State Building and Construction Trades Council (David A. Funston) (Bismarck, North Dakota)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizations**

- Associated General Contractors of North Dakota (Curtis L. Peterson) (Bismarck, North Dakota)
- The Exchange Club of Grand Forks, North Dakota (George McKinley Bowman) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)
- Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce (Frank W. Coe) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)
- Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce (Marlan Helgeson) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)
- Grand Forks Kiwanis Club (Floyd K. Christianson) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)
- International Union of Operating Engineers (Arden Grundvig) (Grand Forks, North Dakota)
- North Dakota State Building and Construction Trades Council (David A. Funston) (Bismarck, North Dakota)

**Individuals**

- James R. Antes (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 312
- Scott Bichler (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 93
- DaLonna Bjorge (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 370
- Jon Bonzer (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 97
- Gerald Breyer (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 448
- David Britton (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 92
- Emma Browning (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 348
- Sandra Donaldson (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 280
- Don Fischer (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 110
- Richard E. Frank (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 319
- Bob Gustafson (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 284
- Al Hackenberg (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 101
- Al Hermodson (Crookston, Minnesota) 337
- Gaile Kady (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 261
- Donald F. Larsen (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 380
- Don Linderen (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 235
- Edwina D. Luevanos (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 489
- M. F. Luevanos (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 490
- D.E. Mack (East Grand Forks, Minnesota) 320
- Pat McFarren (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 408
- Virginia Miller (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 311
- Glenn Moen (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 441
- Abraham Muscari (Grand Forks, North Dakota) 231

1-9
### Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dagne Olsen (Manvel, North Dakota)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gloria Porter (Grandin, North Dakota)</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bruce Rampelburg (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ronnie Diane Rosenberg (Crookston, Minnesota)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>John R. Salter, Jr. (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Don Schneider (East Grand Forks, Minnesota)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>William A. Schwalb (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Francis and Edith Sears (Petersburg, North Dakota)</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dan Sheridan (East Grand Forks, Minnesota)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Richard Sinner (Fargo, North Dakota)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kristen Sorenson (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dr. Curtis W. Stofferahn (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>James D. Stolee (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Curt Walen (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Lonny B. Winrich (Grand Forks, North Dakota)</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Martin Zeilig (Winnipeg, Canada)</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Little Rock AFB, Arkansas

#### State Agencies/Officials

1. Arkansas Department of Finance & Administration (Joe Gillespie) (Little Rock, Arkansas) 272
2. Arkansas House of Representatives (Doug Woods) (North Little Rock, Arkansas) 219
3. Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission (J. Randy Young) (Little Rock, Arkansas) 7

#### Local Agencies/Officials

1. Lula M. Leonard, City Clerk-Treasurer (Jacksonville, Arkansas) 399

#### Organizations

1. ACORN (Gloria Wilson) (Little Rock, Arkansas) 402
2. Arkansas for Peace (Jacksonville, Arkansas) 438
3. Jacksonville Commerce Corporation (Jerry Halsey) (Jacksonville, Arkansas) 397
4. League of Women Voters of Pulaski County (Little Rock, Arkansas) 450
5. League of Women Voters of Pulaski County (Ruth Bell) (Little Rock, Arkansas) 401
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent Name and Address</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sandy Baker (Sherwood, Arkansas)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John Agee Ball (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lisa J. Bamberg (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vera Begeman (North Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T.R. Bond (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E. J. Borough (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Art Brannen (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kathy Carkbridge (Tahlequah, Oklahoma)</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mary Carpenter (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Steve Coop (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wainwright Copass, Jr. (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dale Dabbs (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>James C. Davis (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ralph Desmarais (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Conrad F. DeVeau (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lawrence Dupree (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Shannon Dupree (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Thomas W. Dupree (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Eugene M. Farrell III (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Joel L. Faulkner (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gerry Getty (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wayne Govar (North Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jim Green (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Diana Gunlock (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bill Gwatney (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Robert Haney (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alton Hardy (Sherwood, Arkansas)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hans Heaney (Morrilton, Arkansas)</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Trusten Holder (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Heida Hyme (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Violet Jaynes (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>John A. Jones (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kathern Kappus - Beattie (Leslie, Arkansas)</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Emma Knight (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Harold Kohnest (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Madeleine Korfmacher (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Walter Korfmacher (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Edith Lake (Jerusalem, Arkansas)</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kenneth Lake (Jerusalem, Arkansas)</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>John O. Lewis (Cabot, Arkansas)</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Catherine Markey (Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mark McAllister (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Document Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Little Rock AFB, Arkansas (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Bob McCrary (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Maggie Nehitten (North Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Dana Daniels Nixon (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46,47</td>
<td>James Prentess (Memphis, Tennessee)</td>
<td>369,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ken Proctor (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Barbara Rifkin (Jerusalem, Arkansas)</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Roland H. Roy (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Carl S. Runyon (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Hilbert Dal Santo (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Sue Sharp (Jerusalem, Arkansas)</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>George Shaw (Sherwood, Arkansas)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>John and Sue Simmons (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Joe and Kim Stacey (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>David Swanson (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Thomas Tackett (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Patricia Taylor (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Gordon and Clara Tubbs (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sid Vicious (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Dan Von Bose (Tecumseh, Missouri)</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Jeanette Warren (North Little Rock, Arkansas)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Kenneth N. Wilson (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Larry Wilson (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Moly G. Zumwalt (Jacksonville, Arkansas)</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Malmstrom AFB, Montana**

**Federal Agencies/Officials**

1 | Honorable John Melcher, U.S. Senate (Washington, DC) | 355 |

**State Agencies/Officials**

1 | Montana State Historic Preservation Office (Mark F. Baumler) (Helena, Montana) | 18 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malmstrom AFB, Montana (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roy H. Ball (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sue Dickenson (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gretchen Grayum (Helena, Montana)</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allan Hahn (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charles M. Heber (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zarina Jackson (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ray Jergeson (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ira M. Kaufman, Jr. (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Donald R. Marble (Chester, Montana)</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cheryl M. Reichert (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arlo Skari (Chester, Montana)</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Paul Stephens (Great Falls, Montana)</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Joan Stockton (Grass Range, Montana)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minot AFB, North Dakota**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Agencies/Officials</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Dakota State Senate (Jim Maxson) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Agencies/Officials**

| 1              | Honorable Tony Alef, Mayor (Glenburn, North Dakota) | 240       |
| 2              | Honorable George Christensen, Mayor (Minot, North Dakota) | 353       |
| 3              | Honorable Gary A. Holum, Ward County Judge (Minot, North Dakota) | 374       |
| 4              | Minot Park District (Robert Petry) (Minot, North Dakota) | 376       |
| 5              | Ward County Sheriff's Department (Arthur T. Anderson) (Minot, North Dakota) | 244       |

**Organizations**

| 1              | Air Force Association (Michael Fedorchak) (Minot, North Dakota) | 253       |
| 2              | Allen Realty Company (Earl Allen) (Minot, North Dakota) | 411       |
| 3              | Associated General Contractors of North Dakota (Curtis L. Peterson) (Bismarck, North Dakota) | 254       |
| 4              | Brady, Martz and Associates (Gary Hovdestad) (Minot, North Dakota) | 324       |
| 5              | Building and Construction Trades Council (Dick Bergstad) (Minot, North Dakota) | 256       |
| 6              | Knowles Jewelry (Bruce Peterson) (Minot, North Dakota) | 362       |
### Table 1 Continued, Page 13 of 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>Lutheran Campus Ministry, Minot State University (Neal Ruedisili) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>391, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mackley Construction Co., Inc. (Fred Abelseth) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Minot Area Chamber of Commerce (Art Eklad) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Minot Area Development Corporation (Gary Wickre) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Minot Association of Builders (Ronald Huber) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Minot Association of Builders (Brenda Mattson) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Minot Chamber of Commerce (James M. Crawford) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Minot Jaycees (Daniel Christen) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>North Dakota State Building and Construction Trades Council (David A. Funston) (Bismarck, North Dakota)</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Signal Management (Bruce Christianson) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Souris River Telephone (Lowell D. Swart) (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organizations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Earl Beck (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ruby G. Crites (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gordon Dubovoy (Max, North Dakota)</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chuck Duke (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Daniel Feist (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Al Hermodson (Crookston, Minnesota)</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charles A. Hoffman (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lloyd Huesers (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dorothy Klungtvedt (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Karen Krebsbach (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michelle Lange (Devil's Lake, North Dakota)</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Anne Lian (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Christine Olson (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nancy Rakness (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kenneth K. Robertson (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Anne Ruedisili (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lorraine Smith (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Document Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>John D. Stewart (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Steve Sydness (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Larry Thompson (Minot, North Dakota)</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minot AFB, North Dakota (continued)**

**Individuals (continued)**

18  John D. Stewart (Minot, North Dakota) 375
19  Steve Sydness (Minot, North Dakota) 241
20  Larry Thompson (Minot, North Dakota) 251

**Whiteman AFB, Missouri**

**State Agencies/Officials**

1  Missouri Office of Administration (Lois Pohl) 321
   (Jefferson City, Missouri)

**Local Agencies/Officials**

1  Honorable Edwin J. Denman, Mayor (Clinton, Missouri) 66
2  Honorable Larry G. Foster, Mayor (Sedalia, Missouri) 20
3  Honorable Woodrow Kurth, Mayor (Concordia, Missouri) 55
4  Honorable Ben J. Mangina, Mayor (Windsor Missouri) 71
5  Johnson County Commission (Ray Maring) (Warrensburg, Missouri) 70

**Organizations**

1  Action Realty Company (Elvin Maloney) 78
   (Warrensburg, Missouri)
2  American Friends Service Committee (Gail Smith) 67
   (Kansas City, Missouri)
3  Citizens Bank (Lynn A. Harmon) (Warrensburg, Missouri) 53
4  Eberting Chiropractic Center (Arthur Eberting) 73
   (Clinton, Missouri)
5  Henry County Economic Development Council (Lyle Cummings) 64
   (Clinton, Missouri)
6  Key Realty, Inc. (Vance A. DeLozier) (Warrensburg, Missouri) 274
7  Mid-Missouri Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign 264
   (Mark Haim) (Columbia, Missouri)
8  Sedalia Area Chamber of Commerce 387
   (Steven J. Dust) (Sedalia, Missouri)
9  Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth (Frances Russell) 407
   (Leavenworth, Kansas)
10  Truman Area Audit Bureau (Robert J. Wilkins II) 74
    (Clinton, Missouri)
11  Whiteman Area Steering Council (Delores Hudson) 86
    (Warrensburg, Missouri)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Whiteman Committee (Jerry E. Brown) (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Windsor Chamber of Commerce (Mark Moser) (Windsor, Missouri)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizations** (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raymond Bass, Sr. (Knob Noster, Missouri)</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ervin C. Beard (Knob Noster, Missouri)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mary E. Beckman (Columbia, Missouri)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grant Brooks (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jerry E. Brown (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Helen Burnham (Columbia, Missouri)</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Judy Carman (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mark Carr (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Helena Chudomelka (Aurora, Missouri)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jim Coleman (Lohman, Missouri)</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Garrett R. Crouch (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Garrett R. Crouch II (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Janice M. Dover (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Marti Gilbert (Springfield, Missouri)</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Margaret Hilermicec (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Randall Howes (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mary Christine Huber (Columbia, Missouri)</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Betty Hutson (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>James T. Jones (Strafford, Missouri)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>John Melvin Klotz (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Robert A. Landewe (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Martin Levit (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Gregg Lombardi (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Catherine Hodge McCoid (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,26</td>
<td>Betty McElwee (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>220, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Judson R. McElwee (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. William McGonigle (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nora McMullen (Jefferson City, Missouri)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Phillip J. McNally (Springfield, Missouri)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,32</td>
<td>Patricia Nelson (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>298, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Diana Nomad (Columbia, Missouri)</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Karen A. Prins (Columbia, Missouri)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Patty Purves (Columbia, Missouri)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Claude Schiratti (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Harold Smith (Henry County, Missouri)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Henry M. Stoever (Kansas City, Missouri)</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1  Continued, Page 16 of 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Whiteman AFB, Missouri (continued)**

**Individuals (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name and Location</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Dotte Troxell (Lexington, Missouri)</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Jerry Winsor (Warrensburg, Missouri)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan**

**Federal Agencies/Officials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name and Location</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service (Jerry McCormick) (East Tawas, Michigan)</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Agencies/Officials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name and Location</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Michigan Bureau of History (Martha Bigelow) (Lansing, Michigan)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Agencies/Officials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name and Location</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>James Balten, Iosco County Administrator (Tawas City, Michigan)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Charter Township of Oscoda (Robert Foster) (Oscoda, Michigan)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Honorable James Lansky, Mayor (Tawas City, Michigan)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name and Location</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Covenant for Peace (C. Peter Dougherty) (East Lansing, Michigan)</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>First of America Bank - Oscoda (Ralph Ferber) (Oscoda, Michigan)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Home for Peace and Justice (Barbara Jackson) (Birch Run, Michigan)</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oscoda-AuSable Chamber of Commerce (Oscoda, Michigan)</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oscoda-AuSable Chamber of Commerce (Bruce Myles) (Oscoda, Michigan)</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oscoda Baptist Church (A. Royce Wolden) (Oscoda, Michigan)</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Physicians for Social Responsibility (Lawrence M. Probes) (Grand Rapids, Michigan)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament (Kathleen Mooney) (Southfield, Michigan)</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Document Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>James R. Anderson (East Lansing, Michigan)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eugene Barrette (Millersburg, Michigan)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shirley Berkrow (Bay City, Michigan)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vicki Brown (East Lansing, Michigan)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Theresa Burkey (Saginaw, Michigan)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Patsy Coffman (St. Johns, Michigan)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ron and Sigrid Dale (Michigan)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gayle Faba (Grand Haven, Michigan)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Carol Gilbert (Saginaw, Michigan)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rita Goedken (Palms, Michigan)</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Willard B. Hunter (Midland, Michigan)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jeff Lange (Saginaw, Michigan)</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Doug Lent (Lent, Michigan)</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Joan McCoy (Saginaw, Michigan)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Terry R. Miller (Bay City, Michigan)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Doug Mowery (Bay City, Michigan)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Robert Pilaichi (Saginaw, Michigan)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Edward Plotrowski (Standish, Michigan)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>George and JoAnn Prescott (Michigan)</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jean S. Prokopow (Bloomfield, Michigan)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Leona Riebling (Northville, Michigan)</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rosalie Riegle (Saginaw, Michigan)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Robert L. Schust (Greenbush, Michigan)</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mary Sinclair (Midland, Michigan)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,26</td>
<td>Richard E. Skochdopole (Midland, Michigan)</td>
<td>32,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Glenna L. Snider (Midland, Michigan)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bernard Sorensen (Harrisville, Michigan)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dorothy B. Suttles (Birmingham, Michigan)</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Arlene Victor (Birmingham, Michigan)</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A. Vernon Williams (Traverse City, Michigan)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dorothy L. Yates (Midland, Michigan)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Agencies/Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (David Clapp) (Atlanta, Georgia)</td>
<td>262, 487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1 Contended, Page 18 of 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Franciscan Friars Province of Saint Barbara (Joe Chinnici) (Oakland, California)</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physicians for Social Responsibility (Christine Cassel) (Washington, DC)</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional's Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control, Inc. (Robert K. Musil) (Washington, DC)</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rural Coalition (Jeff Tracy) (Washington, DC)</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SANE/FREEZE (Duane Shank) (Washington, DC)</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Union of Concerned Scientists (Robert Zirkie) (Washington, DC)</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Julia Bozar (Berkeley, California)</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carol A. Day (Mapleton, Utah)</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Randal J. Divinski (Syracuse, New York)</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mary Ann Flese (La Grande, Oregon)</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lisa Hubbell (Oakland, California)</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ellen Tamm Sweeney (Brookline, Massachusetts)</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Joe Tempel (Denver, Colorado)</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lauren Unger (Berkeley, California)</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stephen Wheeler (Berkeley, California)</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documents Postmarked and Received After 31 August 1988**

| **Federal Agencies/Officials** | | |
| 1 | U.S. Department of Interior (Bruce Blanchard) (Washington, DC) | 516 |
| 2 | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Richard E. Sanderson) (Washington, DC) | 513 |

| **State Agencies/Officials** | | |
| 1 | Honorable Ted Schwindent, Governor (Helena, Montana) | 512 |
| 2 | Honorable George A. Sinner, Governor (Bismarck, North Dakota) | 518 |
| 3, 4 | Texas Office of the Governor (T.C. Adams) (Austin, Texas) | 514, 519 |
| 5 | Washington Department of Ecology (M.F. Palko) (Olympia, Washington) | 511 |

| **Individuals** | | |
| 1 | D. L. Blank (Whitefish, Montana) | 521 |
| 2 | Sandra and Fred Garcia (Marshall, Arkansas) | 520 |
| 3 | Victor Skorapa, Jr. (Gardiner, Maine) | 515 |
| 4 | Peter J. Stauffacher (Kansas City, Missouri) | 517 |
Table 2  
Speakers at Public Hearings for Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  

| F.E. Warren AFB, Cheyenne, Wyoming  
| (Document 500)  
| Aldrich, Alvin  
| Aldrich, Annette  
| Applegate, Jim  
| Atchison, Phyllis  
| Atwell, Larry  
| Baggs, Fred  
| Breitweiser, Sharon  
| Brown, Bruce  
| Clay, John  
| Cohen, Haskell  
| Cook, Peter  
| Edwards, Al  
| Erickson, Don  
| Hehn, Rosella  
| Hines, Thomas  
| Holcomb, Peter  
| Ililloway, Pete  
| Kirkbride, Linda  
| | Lappe, Eileen  
| Lindsey, Tom  
| Martin, Carl  
| Meeker, E.L.  
| Miller, Darryl  
| Mitchell, Robert  
| Moore, Richard  
| Oberg, Brad  
| Olson, Brian  
| Raford, Anne  
| Scott, Robert  
| Schlacter, Fred  
| Spiegel, Sidney  
| Starr, Eileen  
| Warsaw, Ed  
| Warsaw, Sylvia  
| Whitehead, Janet  
| | (Document 501)  
| Arceneaux, Thomas "Tom"  
| Barberousse, Christine  
| Bennett, Wanda  
| Bourland, Tom  
| Bruce, James  
| Brun, Roy  
| Burchett, Dewey  
| Burford, Bob  
| Carpenter, Ed  
| Cassagno, Francois.  
| Clayton, Murray  
| Crumpton, Tom  
| Dolphin, LaVerne  
| Fayard, Ron  
| Homza, Ginny  
| Hussey, John  
| | Jones, Don  
| Justice, Claire  
| Larkin, Timothy  
| McCaffrey, Margaret  
| McElroy, Tim  
| Neale, Tom  
| Oldag, Eileen  
| Prestridge, Roger M.  
| Roberts, Deborah  
| Roberts, Mark  
| Scott, Leroy  
| Sibley, Dale  
| Taylor, Robert  
| Waggoner, Joe D.  
| Wojeci, C.A.  
| | (Document 502)  
| Aneff, James  
| Barr, Grady  
| Blagg, Jim  
| | Bolls, Downing  
| Burnam, Lon  
| Calcote, Lynda  

1-20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canon, Joe</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Law, Violet</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheves, Brad</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>McClarity, Tim</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conner, John E.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Matta, Samuel</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson, Temple</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Morton, Walter P., Jr.</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressen, Russell</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Nixon, Harold</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Don</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Palmer, George</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estes, Kathy</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Rhodes, Rick</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, Dale</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Russell, John</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders, Hal</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Senter, Scott</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gee, Louis</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Shradar, Greg</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harendt, Tommie</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Stone, Roger</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrell, Ronna</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Tiffany, Robert J.</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaney, Jim</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Turley, Mack</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helbert, Brad</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Turner, John E.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway, Jess</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Velasquez, Kristina</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Fred Lee</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Velasquez, Maria</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst, Boyd</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Weeks, David</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Lance E.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Wells, Keith</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungmeyer, Paul</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Wheat, Walter</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karrenbrock, Karl</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Wright, Bill</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Dale</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eaker AFB, Blytheville, Arkansas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin, Bill</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Steve</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohannon, Jerry</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, LaJean</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darnell, Phil</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal, James</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielson, Terry</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Mike</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gildewell, Carol</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Shirley</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gude, Joe</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurley, Joe</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammett, Willy</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks, Jim</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffman, Bo</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inman, Bill</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledbetter, Carl</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddox, Lew</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason, Douglas</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebrook, Lonnie</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neely, Dewey</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prewitt, Dick</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury, Harold</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullins, John</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Wayne</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Joyce</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Michael</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fairchild AFB, Medical Lake, Washington**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aubrey, Keith</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber, William</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakely, Steven</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll, David</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofer, Randy</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doherty, Janice</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahoe, Kathleen</td>
<td>p95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleser, Mary Ann</td>
<td>p90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaylord, Lauren</td>
<td>p49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaylord, Randall</td>
<td>p68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, William</td>
<td>p51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggin, Lindell</td>
<td>p55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggin, Margaret</td>
<td>p56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hines, Jerry</td>
<td>p67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaroneski, Matthew</td>
<td>p64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juzix, Richard</td>
<td>p50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavanagh, John</td>
<td>p66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerwin, Peter</td>
<td>p103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangan, Al</td>
<td>p86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moos, Marion</td>
<td>p53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Jeff</td>
<td>p74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach, David</td>
<td>p40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning, Mark</td>
<td>p76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordenkircher, Carole</td>
<td>p60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushfield, Bob</td>
<td>p53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Matthew</td>
<td>p80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, Richard</td>
<td>p37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayburgh, Rich</td>
<td>p89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coe, Frank</td>
<td>p38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiglish, James</td>
<td>p81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl, James</td>
<td>p35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finney, Maury</td>
<td>p102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finney, Steve</td>
<td>p45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Richard</td>
<td>p77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froemcie, Mark</td>
<td>p89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjovig, Bruce</td>
<td>p56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagness, Tom</td>
<td>p42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Mark</td>
<td>p62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermodson, Al</td>
<td>p92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmberg, Ray</td>
<td>p31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudak, Kathleen</td>
<td>p96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jardine, Kevin</td>
<td>p99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuchera, Tom</td>
<td>p33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lander, Tom</td>
<td>p89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfoot, C.L. &quot;Bud&quot;</td>
<td>p65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Little Rock AFB, Jacksonville, Arkansas  
(Document 506)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ball, John</td>
<td>(p51)</td>
<td>Knight, Emma</td>
<td>(p85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass, Eliz</td>
<td>(p35)</td>
<td>Kohut, Nick</td>
<td>(p24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belden, Ted</td>
<td>(p14)</td>
<td>Leonard, Lula</td>
<td>(p13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Ruth</td>
<td>(p65)</td>
<td>Markey, Catherine</td>
<td>(p79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bland, Bob</td>
<td>(p82)</td>
<td>Meddress, James</td>
<td>(p26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannen, Art</td>
<td>(p59)</td>
<td>Meyers, Dub</td>
<td>(p44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Tom</td>
<td>(p19)</td>
<td>Moore, Randy</td>
<td>(p56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Veau, Elizabeth</td>
<td>(p58)</td>
<td>Mourot, Jon</td>
<td>(p28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Veau, Fred</td>
<td>(p47)</td>
<td>Norton, Elizabeth</td>
<td>(p75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmarais, Ralph</td>
<td>(p62)</td>
<td>Norton, Wendel</td>
<td>(p68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell, Gene</td>
<td>(p15)</td>
<td>Quinn, Roberta</td>
<td>(p84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, Gary</td>
<td>(p86)</td>
<td>Smith, Marshall</td>
<td>(p12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getty, Gerry</td>
<td>(p77)</td>
<td>Stead, William</td>
<td>(p21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golgan, Sharon</td>
<td>(p72)</td>
<td>Stewart, Jo</td>
<td>(p70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwatney, Bill</td>
<td>(p41)</td>
<td>Swaim, Tommy</td>
<td>(p9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halsell, Jerry</td>
<td>(p27)</td>
<td>Williams, Jeannie</td>
<td>(p89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder, Trusten</td>
<td>(p64)</td>
<td>Wilson, Mike</td>
<td>(p8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Ray</td>
<td>(p41)</td>
<td>Wood, Doug</td>
<td>(p5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappus-Beattie, Kathryn</td>
<td>(p37)</td>
<td>Zornik, Susan</td>
<td>(p32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Malmstrom AFB, Great Falls, Montana  
(Document 507)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiken, Ardith</td>
<td>(p36)</td>
<td>Larson, Edward</td>
<td>(p52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baiz, Claire</td>
<td>(p75)</td>
<td>Lowthian, Harvey</td>
<td>(p74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland, Tom</td>
<td>(p64)</td>
<td>Matheson, Gordon</td>
<td>(p59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon, Roscoe</td>
<td>(p83)</td>
<td>Matteucci, Ed</td>
<td>(p58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crough, Will</td>
<td>(p85)</td>
<td>Maybanks, Sheila</td>
<td>(p82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings, Jim</td>
<td>(p57)</td>
<td>Novak, Mauri</td>
<td>(p97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickoff, Art</td>
<td>(p87)</td>
<td>Parker, Bill</td>
<td>(p78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasvode, Richard</td>
<td>(p36)</td>
<td>Phillips, John</td>
<td>(p34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn, Allan</td>
<td>(p69)</td>
<td>Reichert, Arlyne</td>
<td>(p81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs, Alan</td>
<td>(p94)</td>
<td>Ryan, Tim</td>
<td>(p46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey, James, Jr.</td>
<td>(p87)</td>
<td>Stephens, Paul</td>
<td>(p47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey, Lucretia</td>
<td>(p92)</td>
<td>Whirry, Gordon</td>
<td>(p55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jergeson, Ray</td>
<td>(p53)</td>
<td>Williamson, Doug</td>
<td>(p40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson, Doug</td>
<td>(p37)</td>
<td>Young, Roger</td>
<td>(P102)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minot AFB, Minot, North Dakota  
(Document 508)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aas, Lynn</td>
<td>(p49)</td>
<td>Christensen, George</td>
<td>(p39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Earl</td>
<td>(p99)</td>
<td>Chumas, Effie</td>
<td>(p44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakke, Steve</td>
<td>(p73)</td>
<td>Dienst, Brad</td>
<td>(p60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballman, Everett</td>
<td>(p63)</td>
<td>Ekblad, Art</td>
<td>(p62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breding, Bill</td>
<td>(p73)</td>
<td>Fedorchak, Mike</td>
<td>(p103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevik, Charles</td>
<td>(p102)</td>
<td>Frey, Larry</td>
<td>(p57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Minot AFB, Minot, North Dakota
(Document 508)
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenup, Wayne</td>
<td>p84</td>
<td>Redland, Roland</td>
<td>p41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermodson, Al</td>
<td>p105</td>
<td>Robinson, Albert</td>
<td>p73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, Charles</td>
<td>p89</td>
<td>Rosenberg, Ronnie</td>
<td>p77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koland, David</td>
<td>p51</td>
<td>Ruedisili, Neal</td>
<td>p96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramlich, Gary</td>
<td>p93</td>
<td>Schoenwald, Larry</td>
<td>p55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn, Ed</td>
<td>p85</td>
<td>Semrau, Marvin</td>
<td>p93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lange, Larry</td>
<td>p70</td>
<td>Sydness, Steve</td>
<td>p52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallberg, Leon</td>
<td>p110</td>
<td>Tollefson, Ben</td>
<td>p46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattson, Brenda</td>
<td>p75</td>
<td>Waind, David</td>
<td>p87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison, Ethel Mae</td>
<td>p91</td>
<td>Wickre, Gary</td>
<td>p58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pence, John</td>
<td>p87</td>
<td>Wilson, Herbert</td>
<td>p82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, James</td>
<td>p48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whiteman AFB, Warrenburg, Missouri
(Document 509)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash, Richard</td>
<td>p102</td>
<td>Kurth, Woodrow</td>
<td>p47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachand, Marc</td>
<td>p87</td>
<td>Landewe, Robert</td>
<td>p73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogue, Laura</td>
<td>p77</td>
<td>Lombardi, Gregg</td>
<td>p62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brame, William</td>
<td>p50</td>
<td>Mangina, Ben</td>
<td>p44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Jerry</td>
<td>p127</td>
<td>Marble, Robert</td>
<td>p92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnham, Helen</td>
<td>p88</td>
<td>Maring, Ray</td>
<td>p48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chudomelka, Helen</td>
<td>p99</td>
<td>Massey, Kimberly</td>
<td>p85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffman, Amy</td>
<td>p75</td>
<td>McNally, Phillip</td>
<td>p57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crouch, Lorraine</td>
<td>p56</td>
<td>Myers, Eva</td>
<td>p60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denman, Edwin</td>
<td>p41</td>
<td>Pearce, David</td>
<td>p109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuCharme, Charles</td>
<td>p96</td>
<td>Prins, Karen</td>
<td>p82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick, Thomas</td>
<td>p69</td>
<td>Purves, Patty</td>
<td>p124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammeter, Daniel</td>
<td>p89</td>
<td>Renkaski, Ron</td>
<td>p90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsburg, Anna</td>
<td>p114</td>
<td>Russell, Frances</td>
<td>p103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haim, Mark</td>
<td>p105</td>
<td>Schulte, Luanne</td>
<td>p122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmon, Lynn</td>
<td>p75</td>
<td>Stack, Jeff</td>
<td>p116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, Robert</td>
<td>p119</td>
<td>Thomas, Kathy</td>
<td>p97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, James</td>
<td>p95</td>
<td>Wax, Jack</td>
<td>p100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Thomas</td>
<td>p50</td>
<td>Wilbur, Eric</td>
<td>p54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klotz, John</td>
<td>p68</td>
<td>Wittstruck, Scott</td>
<td>p68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krider, LeRoy</td>
<td>p51</td>
<td>Wolff, Mike</td>
<td>p61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young, Christi</td>
<td>p112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wurtsmith AFB, Oscoda, Michigan
(Document 510)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, James</td>
<td>p53</td>
<td>Gothson, Henrick</td>
<td>p74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatel, Thomas</td>
<td>p37</td>
<td>Hammis, Keith</td>
<td>p45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferber, Ralph</td>
<td>p53</td>
<td>Hartzler, Lois</td>
<td>p92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, Robert K.</td>
<td>p36</td>
<td>Hunter, Willard</td>
<td>p83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Barbara</td>
<td>(p49)</td>
<td>Riebling, Leona</td>
<td>(p61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, David</td>
<td>(p41)</td>
<td>Rose, Larry</td>
<td>(p32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansson, Eva</td>
<td>(p72)</td>
<td>Shireman, Jan</td>
<td>(p45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenhart, Harold Blondin</td>
<td>(p100)</td>
<td>Skochdopole, Richard</td>
<td>(p80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCoy, Joan</td>
<td>(p88)</td>
<td>Smith, Susan</td>
<td>(p50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGarvey, Metta</td>
<td>(p76)</td>
<td>Snider, Glenna</td>
<td>(p95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Terry</td>
<td>(p57)</td>
<td>Snider, Robert</td>
<td>(p39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowery, Doug</td>
<td>(p70)</td>
<td>Titus, Keith</td>
<td>(p47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myles, Bruce</td>
<td>(p64)</td>
<td>Troester, Rosalie</td>
<td>(p94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeway, Peg</td>
<td>(p65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Summary of Public Comments Received by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Documents</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.E. Warren AFB</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barksdale AFB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyess AFB</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaker AFB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairchild AFB</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks AFB</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock AFB</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmstrom AFB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minot AFB</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteman AFB</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurtsmith AFB</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>519</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,670</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1Includes transcripts for 11 public hearings.
Table 4
Summary of Public Comments by Issue Category and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Category</th>
<th>F.E. Warren</th>
<th>Barkendale</th>
<th>Dyess</th>
<th>Eaker</th>
<th>Fairchild</th>
<th>Grand Forks</th>
<th>Little Rock</th>
<th>Malmstrom</th>
<th>Minot</th>
<th>Whiteman</th>
<th>Wurtsmith</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Air Force Policy</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Systems Requirements</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Safety</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EIAIP Process</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employment/Income</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Population/Demographics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Public Finance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Utilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Transportation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Land Use</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cultural Resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Biological Resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Water Resources</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Geology and Soils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Air Quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Noise</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. General Comments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Comments and Responses

Section 1.2.1 consists of the issues and responses for the 497 written documents received on or before the 31 August 1988 public comment deadline. Section 1.2.2 consists of issues and responses for the 11 public hearing transcripts. To reduce the size of this document, if a response was used for more than one comment, the later responses were referred back to the first time a given response was used.

The majority of issues were paraphrased by the preparers of this document. For the complete verbatim comment, reproductions of the original written documents and public hearing transcripts are provided in Sections 2 and 3 respectively.

For many comments, particularly those where the commentor makes a general statement and no specific response is warranted, the response is listed as "Noted." "Noted" is used to denote that the comment was recognized, but that the Air Force does not necessarily agree or disagree with the statement made.

### 1.2.1 Written Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc No</th>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>ISSUE:</th>
<th>RESPONSE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) withholding comment on the Draft EIS regarding impacts at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because archaeological survey and testing is still underway.</td>
<td>The report detailing the results of cultural resources investigations at Barksdale AFB has been transmitted to the SHPO in accordance with standard reporting procedures. The SHPO has concurred that no NRHP eligible archaeological sites would be affected by the Proposed Action, but suggested the architectural importance of the historic buildings be considered. Program impacts on the historic buildings are addressed in EIS Section 4.3.5.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final comments on the Draft EIS regarding cultural resources at Wurtsmith AFB will be made by the Michigan SHPO after review of the cultural resources survey report.</td>
<td>The report detailing the results of cultural resources investigations at Wurtsmith AFB has been provided to the SHPO in accordance with standard reporting procedure. Verbal agreement with the EIS findings has been given by the SHPO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commentor in support of the No Action Alternative in the interest of love and peace on earth and all of its creatures.</td>
<td>This comment does not deal with the environmental matters that are the subject of the EIS on the deployment and peacetime operation of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. Whether the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program should be deployed is a matter for decision by the President and the Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commentor in support of the No Action Alternative because deployment of nuclear weapons in the State of Michigan increases the danger and decreases their safety.</td>
<td>See response to Document 3, Comment 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 1 **ISSUE:** Commentor opposed to the Rail Garrison program because of broader social, economic, political, and health consequences of nuclear arms build-up.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 2 **ISSUE:** Commentor concerned about disposal of radioactive waste. Prevention is better than cure. This can only be achieved by reducing production of nuclear warheads.

**RESPONSE:** The issue of ultimate disposal of the components of decommissioned warheads is beyond the scope of this EIS. The radioactive components of the missiles will be reused, recycled, or disposed of in accordance with the status, regulations, and procedures in effect at the time those actions are taken. The appropriate environmental analyses will likewise be prepared under the regulations applicable at that time. Also see EIS Section 1.10 and Chapter 5.

5 3 **ISSUE:** Commentor states that the Rail Garrison program is contradictory to the spirit of START and should not be implemented.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 4 **ISSUE:** Commentor states that little is said about the security needed for the rail garrisoned nuclear missiles. The missiles would be more vulnerable to accidents, sabotage, and terrorism than silo based missiles.

**RESPONSE:** Security measures are expected to provide early warning of sabotage attempts and prevent disabling of the system.

5 5 **ISSUE:** Commentor states that the MIRV warheads invite early, preemptive Soviet response.

**RESPONSE:** This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 6 **ISSUE:** Commentor states that dispersal of missile trains would invite saturation bombing by the Soviets to destroy the missiles and the rail system.

**RESPONSE:** This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 7 **ISSUE:** Commentor states that the Rail Garrison program would violate the ABM Treaty although abandoned years ago, but was resurrected in the form of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

**RESPONSE:** Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 8 **ISSUE:** Commentor states that personnel charged with maintaining our nuclear weapons have a substantial rate of alcoholism, substance abuse, and aberrant behavior.

**RESPONSE:** Crew members will be subject to the Air Force Personnel Reliability Program (Air Force Regulation [AFR] 35-99) or Civilian Personnel Reliability Program (AFR 40-925). These programs are designed
to ensure that military and civilian personnel who are assigned to nuclear weapons duties have no medical problems or psychological traits which might result in behavior which would threaten the national security of the United States. Candidates must meet all the requirements of personnel reliability programs before they may perform duties associated with nuclear weapons. The requirements include security clearance, medical and psychological screening, and random drug testing (see EIS Section 5.1.2).

5 9 ISSUE: Commentor states that the scoping hearing was hastily convened with little time for the public to respond. Only one hearing was set for the entire State of Michigan, and it would be important that communities all along the proposed railroad route be alerted to elicit their concerns.

RESPONSE: Scoping meetings were held in the communities in the immediate vicinity of the candidate deployment locations where the greatest impacts would likely occur.

5 10 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the dispersal of the missiles over a four to six hour period may not make them less targetable by Soviet missile operators.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 11 ISSUE: Commentor supports the No Action Alternative because they believe in the "First do no harm" principle.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 12 ISSUE: How will the presence of MX missiles affect local property values?

RESPONSE: No change in land values near the installations or along rail lines are expected.

5 13 ISSUE: How often will the missiles be sent out on cars for testing?

RESPONSE: One missile (without warheads) per year would be moved by rail to F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming and then to Vandenberg AFB, California for test launching. No other movement of missiles on the rail network for test purposes is proposed. There will be no advance public notice of the missile movements for those test firings.

5 14 ISSUE: What is the psychological effect on children who discover that nuclear missiles are in their neighborhood?

RESPONSE: The issue of moral or psychological concerns about defense strategy is beyond the scope of this EIS. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that psychological impacts attributable to fear of a program is not an appropriate subject for EIS analysis because it is not related to the physical impacts of the program (Metropolitan Edison vs. People Against Nuclear Energy, April 1983).

6 1 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the high risk of derailment and collision the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program entails.
RESPONSE: The probability of a Peacekeeper train being involved in a derailment or collision is low. In the unlikely event that a Peacekeeper train is involved in a collision or derailment, the risk to health and safety is extremely low. However, to present a complete analysis these risks are analyzed in detail in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

6 2 ISSUE: Commentor concerned of the ever increasing risk of sabotage that threatens the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison basing mode and operation.

RESPONSE: Security measures are expected to provide early warning of sabotage attempts and prevent disabling of the system.

6 3 ISSUE: This basing mode would heighten tensions between the superpowers.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

7 1 ISSUE: State of Arkansas Technical Review Committee has no objection to the Draft EIS and the preferred alternative provided the Department of Health's concerns are addressed. (See Document 7, Comments 2 to 5.)

RESPONSE: Noted.

7 2 ISSUE: Arkansas Department of Health sees no major long-term environmental health related impacts due to radiation identified in the EIS. The Department concurs with the conclusion that the radiation risk to the general population is negligible due to the low probability of an offsite release of radioactive material and that the health risks to crews will be extremely small.

RESPONSE: Noted.

7 3 ISSUE: Arkansas Department of Health stated that the more significant risk in this system is the hazardous material and not the radioactive material.

RESPONSE: The risk analysis of hazardous and radioactive materials are analyzed in Section 5 of the EIS.

7 4 ISSUE: The emergency response activities appear to be in keeping with current government policy. State and local governments are noted although activity involving the warhead is correctly restricted to specially trained federal responders.

RESPONSE: Noted.

7 5 ISSUE: Arkansas Department of Health stated that while the figures in the tables regarding radiation-induced cancer are reasonable, no data source for the figures was given.

ISSUE: Statements were made that Eaker AFB, Arkansas seems to be an unlikely candidate, due primarily to the New Madrid fault and the potential for a severe earthquake during the proposed 20-year life of the program.

RESPONSE: The issue of earthquakes at Eaker AFB has been addressed in EIS Sections 3.9.4 and 4.5.8.2. Structures constructed for the proposed program would be designed with consideration given to the maximum credible event. The occurrence of an earthquake and potential environmental effects of the program have also been addressed as a separate issue in EIS Section 5.2.3.

ISSUE: Concerned about the presence of archaeological sites at Eaker AFB.

RESPONSE: Discovery of an archaeological site does not preclude the use of the area by the Air Force. Federal law requires that the existence of the site be taken into account during program planning. It is Air Force policy to minimize harm to important sites and protect them to the extent possible. Often sites can be avoided by changing the project design. The revised garrison design in EIS Section 4.5 represents such an effort to avoid site 3MS105. When complete avoidance is not practical, data recovery may be necessary. The appropriate level of data recovery is determined through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, any concerned Indian tribal authorities, and the interested public, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

ISSUE: Bossier City-Parish Metropolitan Planning Commission in support of the selection of Barksdale AFB, Louisiana as one of the MX missile locations because neither safety nor environmental assets will be sacrificed.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison being placed at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because the adverse environmental issues are insignificant.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: No action should be taken to deploy more nuclear weapons in Michigan or anywhere.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about Peacekeeper Rail Garrison basing at Wurtsmith AFB and supports reducing the number of nuclear weapons deployed in Michigan.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will Little Elm Creek be contaminated and flow into Lake Abilene, which is a water reservoir?

RESPONSE: Little Elm Creek, which drains Dyess AFB, lies downstream of Lake Abilene and does not affect the lake. However, the creek does
drain to Lake Fort Phantom Hill, a major municipal supply reservoir located downstream of the base. No permanent, new wastewater discharges to surface or groundwater will result from the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. The only project-related pollutants likely to find their way into Lake Fort Phantom Hill would be suspended sediment eroded from the construction sites at Dyess AFB. Accelerated sediment loss to Little Elm Creek is expected to be minor, with temporary impacts occurring during construction (see EIS Section 4.4.7.3). No substantial reservoir effects are anticipated.

12 2 ISSUE: Ground squirrels in the Abilene, Texas area will be harmed because of the contamination caused by the program.

RESPONSE: Potential contamination associated with the program is unlikely to have a notable adverse impact on ground squirrels or other wildlife species because the program will affect an area that is relatively low quality habitat, and any toxic spill that does occur will be contained onbase. The safety analysis done for the EIS includes calculation of the incorporation of radioactive materials into the food chain and resulting human exposure. The contribution to the total risk from that possibility is very small because the predominant radioactive material that might be dispersed, plutonium dioxide, is relatively insoluble and very little would enter the food chain (see EIS Section 4.4.6.3).

13 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to all nuclear weapons and Rail Garrison basing in Michigan or anywhere else because of Christian convictions and concerns for public safety.

RESPONSE: Public safety issues are discussed in Chapter 5. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

14 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB, Texas. Also supports the Air Force and anything good that needs to be done for the protection of our grand old America.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

15 1 ISSUE: Wyoming Public Service Commission concerned about the need for and availability of utility services for the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, and the population growth attributable to installation of the program.

RESPONSE: For the Proposed Action, utility demands are identified in EIS Section 4.2.2.3. Alternative Action requirements are given in EIS Section 4.2.2.4, while cumulative impacts are identified in EIS Section 4.2.2.5. Data on the growth in population are given in EIS Sections 4.2.1.3, 4.2.1.4, and 4.2.1.5.

15 2 ISSUE: Statement concerning the effect the construction and operation of the program will have on utility facilities in the area, including damage due to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the program.

RESPONSE: Design of the onbase facilities and railroad track takes into consideration the protection or modification of existing and proposed utility services such as water, electric, and gas lines. Consultation with the affected utility will take place during design. Operation and maintenance of the program are not anticipated to significantly affect utility service.
ISSUE: What steps will be taken to ensure the safety and integrity of the railroad track and rolling stock and to ensure the operating viability of the program?

RESPONSE: Peacekeeper trains will operate on the commercial rail network. The track and railroad rights-of-way are maintained by railroad companies who keep the track operational and safe. Normal monitoring is expected to be effective in preventing impairment of the mission and accidents due to damaged track. No environmental impact will result from those measures so the issue is not discussed further in the EIS. The rolling stock will belong to the Air Force and will be maintained by the Air Force or contractors in accordance with Federal Railroad Administration and American Association of Railroads procedures and will meet or exceed their standards.

ISSUE: What steps will be taken to ensure that train crews are functioning with the necessary physical and mental facilities to safely operate a train?

RESPONSE: The Air Force would provide crews qualified to operate the locomotives. The railroads would provide a pilot who is fully knowledgeable on the physical characteristics and rules of operations of railroads (see EIS Sections 1.4.4 and 5.1.3). In addition to the existing railroad personnel and safety programs, crew members will be subject to the Air Force Personnel Reliability Program (Air Force Regulation [AFR] 35-99) or Civilian Personnel Reliability Program (AFR 40-925). These programs are designed to ensure that military and civilian personnel who are assigned to nuclear weapons duties have no medical problems or psychological traits which might result in behavior which would threaten the national security of the United States. Candidates must meet all the requirements of personnel reliability programs before they may perform duties associated with nuclear weapons. The requirements include security clearance, medical and psychological screening, and random drug testing (see EIS Section 5.1.2).

ISSUE: What steps will be taken to ensure that military train crews are knowledgeable of the operating rules of each railroad so that accidents can be avoided?

RESPONSE: The training programs for Peacekeeper train crews will be similar to Air Force flight crew training programs and will ensure that the crews are fully qualified before they are assigned operational duties. The training will include classroom work, train simulator experience, job proficiency and safety evaluations on training trains, and continuing performance evaluations during exercises and maintenance operations (see EIS Section 5.1.2). The military train crews will be assisted by a pilot who is a railroad employee assigned to a train. This person will advise crews on the physical characteristic and traffic rules of the specific railroad, or portion of the railroad, over which the train is to be moved (see EIS Sections 1.4.4 and 5.1.3).

ISSUE: Statement made by the Texas State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that an archaeological survey should be undertaken by a qualified professional in the proposed areas of construction. Field examinations should include shovel testing to identify subsurface cultural deposits.
RESPONSE: An archaeological survey of proposed program impact areas was recently undertaken by the Texas Archeological Research Lab, Austin. The scope of work, previously approved by the SHPO, included subsurface testing. The report of investigations has been prepared and transmitted to SHPO for comment and the results of the survey have been incorporated in Section 4.4.5 of the EIS. The SHPO has not provided final comment at this time.

17  1 ISSUE: Commentor in opposition to the installation of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system at Barksdale AFB because the system may potentially destroy the wetlands, home of the red-cockaded woodpecker and the American alligator.

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system will have no impacts on the red-cockaded woodpecker. Some wetlands may be affected but this would not threaten the integrity or survival of alligator populations. See details in EIS Section 4.3.6.3.

18  1 ISSUE: Montana State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) requested the Cultural Resource Inventory Report for Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

RESPONSE: The report detailing the results of cultural resources investigations at Malmstrom AFB has been forwarded to the SHPO in accordance with standard reporting procedures and results have been incorporated in Section 4.9.5 of the EIS. The SHPO has not provided final comment at this time.

19  1 ISSUE: Commentor in full support of the proposed selection of Whiteman AFB, Missouri as a site for the deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

20  1 ISSUE: City of Sedalia, Missouri in support of the addition of Rail Garrison at Whiteman AFB because there would be little inconvenience in relocating two buildings and inconsequential impacts on wildlife and wetland/forest habitats.

RESPONSE: Noted. Section 4.11.6.3 of the EIS provides a discussion of the impacts on wildlife and wetland/forest habitats.

21  1 ISSUE: A nuclear accident would kill thousands. The whole world would be affected not just a few families or lives.

RESPONSE: The EIS addresses safety concerns associated with deployment of peacetime operation of the system. Dispersal of radioactive materials as a result of an accident is considered to be extremely unlikely, but was addressed in the EIS in considerable detail, including the combination of events necessary to create a possibility of occurrence, the health risk created by such an event, and emergency response and cleanup actions (See EIS Section 5.1.1.2). Nuclear detonation resulting from an accident is virtually impossible as discussed in Section 5.4.4 of the EIS.

22  1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison being located at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

23 1 ISSUE: The environmental issues were addressed very thoroughly at the public hearing in Abilene, Texas. The majority of citizens in Abilene heartily welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB.

RESPONSE: Noted.

24 1 ISSUE: Defending the nation as a whole is far more important than creating more income opportunities in Louisiana. Therefore, the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system is not suitable at Barksdale AFB.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

24 2 ISSUE: Has the Air Force studied the number of derailment incidents in recent years? The Barksdale area has some of the worst tracks in the nation.

RESPONSE: The risk assessment conducted for this EIS takes into account all rail accidents for the years 1983 to 1987. Regional differences in accident rates were not found to be significant. In addition, the Air Force has conducted exhaustive track investigations in the vicinity of each candidate installation. There is sufficient quantity and quality of track in the vicinity of each installation to warrant retention as a candidate for deployment. Additionally, the Federal Railroad Administration, through the railroad companies, assessed the national rail network with regard to the Peacekeeper train parameters. There exists more than 120,000 miles of track nationwide upon which the trains could safely operate without restriction.

24 3 ISSUE: If Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is located at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana the people would eventually pay for rebuilding all the railroad systems. Why can't the railroad concerns and those who use them regularly pay for a safe rail system?

RESPONSE: The tracks and railroad rights-of-way are maintained by railroad companies who own them. Since Peacekeeper trains will operate on the commercial rail network, the Air Force will operate through a track usage fee agreement and structure similar to commercial operations.

24 4 ISSUE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison trains could be easily located.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

24 5 ISSUE: Why is Barksdale AFB, Louisiana one of the bases being considered?

RESPONSE: Each candidate installation was one of hundreds of military bases in the 48 contiguous states that were initially considered. Eleven installations were identified through the rigorous application of siting criteria. Such critical factors as an existing weapons handling capability at the installation, available land on or adjacent to the installation, Air Force control or ownership of the installation, security, and access to a suitable rail network were taken into consideration.
I ISSUE: The Iosco County Board of Commissioners feels the DEIS overstates the seriousness of the groundwater contamination problem at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan. The quality of the groundwater aquifer supplying water to the base has not inhibited the continued operation of the base. Strong efforts to protect the water supply and clean up the contamination in the aquifer are being carried out by the base. Wurtsmith AFB's groundwater quality situation should not be a stopper for any future development or mission changes to the base.

RESPONSE: The State of Michigan considers the groundwater contamination at Wurtsmith AFB to be serious enough to rate the base as one of the state's top-priority cleanup sites. Although aquifer contaminant concentrations have dropped considerably due to base cleanup actions, several of the base supply wells remain uncontaminated due only to continued operation of special groundwater purge wells. Increased water demand due to the Proposed Action would intensify this situation. Although this impact is rated as significant, it does not preclude selection of Wurtsmith AFB as a garrison installation (see EIS Sections 3.8.7 and 4.12.7.3).

2 ISSUE: Resolution of the Iosco County Board of Commissioners in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program for its importance to the strategic posture of the United States. Also encourages placement of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan for its economic importance to Iosco County.

RESPONSE: Noted.

26 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan. The local electrical workers union could provide local manpower to support construction with very little impact on local housing.

RESPONSE: Noted.

27 1 ISSUE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas should have minimal or no adverse impacts on the environment since any development would be in an area currently developed or recently occupied by military buildings. The project should have beneficial impacts due to elimination of blighted areas and improved storm drainage in the area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

28 1 ISSUE: Comments made by others at the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas public hearing about nuclear buildup and threat in general were entirely inappropriate and not appreciated by the majority of the community people who choose to let their elected officials represent them, rather than waste the valuable and generously given time of the gentlemen conducting the hearings.

RESPONSE: Noted.

29 1 ISSUE: What color is the missile?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper missile is light grey.
ISSUE: Resolution from Nolan County, Texas in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system for its low-cost strategic deterrent capability and the missile's proven success. The system is a vital national program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will U.S. 23 near Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan be able to accommodate the heavy transportation of all materials needed for the construction of the garrison? What would be the plans to alleviate the congested highway?

RESPONSE: U.S. 23 would be able to accommodate the heavy vehicles to be used for hauling construction materials. Since no significant impacts are expected on roads due to the program, no mitigation measures are planned (see EIS Section 4.12.3.3).

ISSUE: The MX missile program should contribute its proportionate share of the $25 billion needed to upgrade nuclear weapon production facilities and operate them in a safe and environmentally acceptable manner, the $35 billion to $65 billion to clean up the existing nuclear facilities and their surroundings, and the $45 billion cost of disposing of nuclear wastes and decommissioning weapon production facilities.

RESPONSE: The scope of this EIS on the proposed deployment and peacetime operations of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system includes discussion of the expected environmental and socioeconomic impacts and safety concerns. Issues of national security policy (including consideration of alternative strategic weapon systems), morality (including consideration of alternative means to ensure peace), and resource allocation (including consideration of alternative uses of funds) are among the important factors that affect the decision-making process of the executive and legislative branches of the Government. However, the EIS is not an appropriate place to address these issues.

ISSUE: Why is the MX Rail Garrison needed?

RESPONSE: The purpose and need for this system are described in EIS Section 1.1.

ISSUE: Why put MX in Oscoda, Michigan?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 5.

ISSUE: What will be the environmental impact on Oscoda and on Michigan?

RESPONSE: Potential environmental impacts resulting from the deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system at Wurtsmith AFB are presented in Section 4.12 of the EIS.

ISSUE: What will be the impact on tourism in Michigan?

RESPONSE: Deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system is not expected to have an effect on tourism in a region and for a state as a whole. The proposed program may have an adverse effect on how a state is perceived by potential tourists because of media attention focused on
the deployment of the system and its peacetime operation (though the system may be an attraction for some individuals). However, the deployment of other missile systems in the past (e.g., Peacekeeper missiles in Wyoming) has not resulted in a large amount of media attention. General media coverage of the deployment and peacetime operation of the system would not likely result in a noticeable effect on tourism in a region or state and any decrease would likely be of short duration. However, given the scenario that extensive media coverage does occur, deployment of the system could result in an adverse effect on a state's travel promotion efforts.

33 5 ISSUE: What will be the environmental impact of the measures necessary to handle increased traffic on the roadways and railways in Oscoda and throughout Michigan?

RESPONSE: The small increase in highway traffic and infrequent train movements caused by the program are not projected to require any mitigation measures. Existing road and railroad systems are adequate to handle program requirements and will not result in significant impacts (see EIS Section 4.12.3.3).

33 6 ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of building an ABM system in order to protect MX Rail Garrison?

RESPONSE: Since no ABM system is proposed, no analysis of the impact of such a system has been conducted.

33 7 ISSUE: What security measures will be implemented to protect MX?

RESPONSE: Appropriate security measures are planned for protection of the system. These measures will be similar to current security systems already in effect at each installation and for military transport. The trains will be secured by military personnel onboard the trains. In the event that individuals were to interfere or attempt to interfere with train operations, appropriate security measures will be taken (see also EIS Sections 1.3.5, 1.4.4 and 5.1.6).

33 8 ISSUE: Will the security measures on railway properties be under military command?

RESPONSE: There will be no new security measures affecting railway properties and no railway properties off existing military installations will be under military command. Peacekeeper trains will have independent security systems that will be in effect both in the garrison and in transit (see also EIS Sections 1.3.5, 1.4.4, and 5.1.6).

33 9 ISSUE: If not the military, who will control the railway security network?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 8.

33 10 ISSUE: What will be MX's impact on local police authorities?

RESPONSE: No significant impacts on local police authorities are expected to occur as a result of the program. Their participation and assistance may be required in the unlikely event of accidents, emergencies, or civil disputes outside a garrison installation.
ISSUE: What powers will the local military security commanders have?

RESPONSE: There will be no change in the authority of local military commanders. They will continue to have the authority currently granted them to maintain the security of their installations.

ISSUE: Will any security commander or subordinate have the power to automatically detain and search persons found on the railroad rights-of-way as may be done on military reservations?

RESPONSE: The offbase tracks will not be secured by military personnel. However, the trains will be secured by military personnel onboard the trains. In the event that individuals were to interfere or attempt to interfere with train operations, security measures would be taken including detention of those responsible for criminal offenses against the train or the crew. Such detainees would be turned over to the appropriate civil authorities.

ISSUE: Will homes and properties immediately adjacent to the rights-of-way be subject to unannounced searches and/or systematic observation?

RESPONSE: No.

ISSUE: Will plainclothes or secret agents be stationed in towns, villages, or at other intervals along MX rail lines for security purposes?

RESPONSE: No.

ISSUE: Will persons living near the MX routes be advised that their activities are subject to systematic monitoring?

RESPONSE: They will not be subject to systematic monitoring.

ISSUE: Will deployment of MX result in the establishment of a network of secret police across the dispersal area?

RESPONSE: No network of secret police will be created.

ISSUE: Will there be congressional oversight of this security network?

RESPONSE: No network of secret police will be created.

ISSUE: In view of recent FBI disregard for civil liberties, is it reasonable to ask citizens to allow the formation and widespread deployment of another secret security organization?

RESPONSE: No network of secret police will be created.

ISSUE: To what uses other than MX railway security will the security network be utilized?

RESPONSE: No network of secret police will be created.

ISSUE: What additional security measures will be taken to prevent sabotage or acts of terrorists?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.
ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of safeguards on the affected areas?

RESPONSE: No significant environmental impacts are projected to result from program security.

ISSUE: How extensive will the "off limits" perimeter be?

RESPONSE: The security fences and base boundaries for each candidate installation are depicted in the EIS. There will be no off limits perimeter established when the trains are outside an installation and no physical security measures will be imposed on the rail network.

ISSUE: What will be the impact of MX security measures on hunters, fishermen, and other outdoor enthusiasts?

RESPONSE: None.

ISSUE: How will the MX impact on the constitutional right to bear arms?

RESPONSE: There will be no impact.

ISSUE: To what degree will the civil liberties of those living adjacent to the MX railways be diminished?

RESPONSE: None.

ISSUE: To what degree will the civil liberties of persons in towns along MX routes who oppose MX deployment be diminished?

RESPONSE: None.

ISSUE: What will be the sociological impact on the communities having security personnel collecting information on them and their citizens?

RESPONSE: They will not be subject to systematic monitoring.

ISSUE: How many military personnel and how many civilian personnel will be employed to secure the rail system?

RESPONSE: Additional employment which would result from deployment of the system is described in base specific sections of the EIS. See Section 4.2.1 through 4.12.1.

ISSUE: Where will MX trains travel?

RESPONSE: The routes used for initial system deployment, maintenance, operational readiness testing, and training will be preplanned by the Air Force and will consider safety as a major factor. If there is ever a strategic dispersal in a time of national need, the trains will make maximum use of all track in the national rail network, excluding only track whose conditions or geometry would not accommodate the train.

ISSUE: What is the environmental impact on communities throughout the state located along railways to be traversed by MX?
RESPONSE: Other than safety risks, no environmental impacts will occur in communities along the rail network. Potential safety risks for communities along the rail network are discussed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

33 31 ISSUE: What is the likelihood of train collisions and derailments?

RESPONSE: The likelihood of such accidents is covered in detail in Section 5.3 of the EIS.

33 32 ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of a MX train collision and derailment?

RESPONSE: The environmental consequences of such accidents are covered in detail in Section 5.4 of the EIS.

33 33 ISSUE: What is the environmental impact on nearby states of various kinds of accidents involving MX trains or the missiles?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 32.

33 34 ISSUE: A Titan missile exploded in a Damascus (Arkansas) silo because of a dropped wrench; how susceptible to accidental explosion will MX be?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper missile contains solid-fueled propellant (except small, well protected liquid fuels in the fourth stage) and is many times more safe than the liquid-fueled Titan missile. A similar occurrence involving a Peacekeeper missile would not cause a fire or explosion, though it might cause damage to the missile that would need to be repaired.

33 35 ISSUE: What are the chances of an explosion aboard the MX trains in percent per year?

RESPONSE: Chapter 5 of the EIS contains a summary of the methods and findings of a thorough risk assessment for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system. The results of that study are reported there in a form that is generally accepted for risk assessment. The figure requested was not computed.

33 36 ISSUE: What are the chances in percent that an MX missile will explode somewhere on the rail route sometime during the 20-year life of MX?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 35.

33 37 ISSUE: What is the likelihood of an accidental explosion of MX fuel?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 5.3.

33 38 ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of an accidental explosion in the garrison and during dispersal?

RESPONSE: The environmental impact of an explosion of a missile is described in detail in Section 5.4 of the EIS.

33 39 ISSUE: In tests on warheads, what can and cannot cause detonation of the warheads and of the propellant? Can detonation be caused by the force of collision or derailment; bridge collapse in transit; heat from fire or explosion; or propellant explosion?
RESPONSE: The warheads would not detonate under any, evenly remotely foreseeable, circumstances during Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system deployment and operation. The risk assessment in Chapter 5 of the EIS does take into account the possibility that a very severe accident and accompanying fire might cause the missile propellant to burn or explode.

33 40 ISSUE: What is the effect on MX of sideways motion, such as that present during transit on the railways?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper missile propellants are insensitive high explosives (IHE). The characteristics and resistance of those propellants to abnormal environments are well known. They can tolerate strong shock and high temperatures without detonating. The characteristics of rail travel, such as vibration, harmonics, and change in temperature, are well within the range of environment which the IHE can experience without chance of decomposition, explosion, or detonation. The system will also be shock isolated which will mitigate the effects of sideways motion.

33 41 ISSUE: What is the effect on the MX solid fuel of the rhythmic vibrations of rail travel?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 40.

33 42 ISSUE: Have the linear and nonlinear oscillations (including harmonics and subharmonics) induced into the missile carrier and missile fuel by movement over the rail system been defined, quantified, and applied to the detonation characteristics of the rocket fuel? What do these calculations indicate the effects to be on the fuel long-term over the projected life of the missiles? Were these calculations applied to the varying speeds at which the carrier will be operated?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 40.

33 43 ISSUE: Since the rail network is not physically uniform throughout, have the quantitative determinations been applied specifically to: a) oscillations induced by trestles; b) oscillations induced by various rail lengths found throughout the system; c) frequency changes due to the changes in soil geology over which the railbed is built; and d) the effects achieved when conditions from the lowest temperature recorded through the highest temperature recorded in the area of MX distribution are applied to the moving system?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 40.

33 44 ISSUE: What is the likelihood that an accidental explosion would trigger a nuclear explosion?

RESPONSE: Virtually none.

33 45 ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of an explosion of one or more of the nuclear warheads?

RESPONSE: An accidental, inadvertent, or deliberate (without emergency war orders) detonation of the warhead is virtually impossible. Also see EIS Section 5.1.1.2.
ISSUE: If a 1-megaton explosion destroys nearly everything, including the population, in a 4.3-mile radius, would an explosion of all the garrisoned MX trains do the same in a 68.8-mile radius?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 45.

ISSUE: What is the environmental impact on Jacksonville, Little Rock and the rest of the State of Arkansas from a first-strike nuclear attack on MX?

RESPONSE: The issue of impacts due to nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What is the likelihood of accidental launch?

RESPONSE: An accidental launch is virtually impossible. See EIS Section 5.1.1.2.

ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of MX launch on the immediate area?

RESPONSE: The intentional launch of a missile is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How will the warheads be transported to Arkansas? How will they be handled? What is the environmental impact of the transportation risks involved?

RESPONSE: The warheads will be transported in assembled reentry systems to the garrison installations by specially certified aircraft and crews. The risk assessment for that transportation, and environmental impacts of a release are presented in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

ISSUE: Why are scoping hearings not being held at an adequate number of locations throughout the state to assure public involvement from all areas of the state put at risk by MX?

RESPONSE: Scoping meetings were held in the communities in the immediate vicinity of the candidate deployment locations where the greatest impacts would likely occur.

ISSUE: Why was there not adequate prior notice given to citizens on the scoping hearings, especially since four dates were given for this one (for Little Rock AFB)?

RESPONSE: The Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register and was released to national and local media outlets. That announcement noted that the scoping meetings would be held in the communities adjacent to the candidate deployment locations and that the specific meeting information would be released through the local media. Newspaper, radio, and television outlets were provided with the meeting information by the base Public Affairs Officer as soon as pertinent travel and auditorium schedules were confirmed.

ISSUE: What are the environmental impacts due to the following: a) the scoping hearings are not a truly open process; b) the process is not presided over by an impartial party; c) the hearing was not adequately
advertised; d) the hearing site is an obscure, out of the way place far away from the main population center; e) no notice was given to other impacted communities throughout the state along the MX rail routes; f) civic officials are allowed to make self-serving statements subject to no time constraints, thereby stealing the limited time available for public input; and g) Congressman Robinson abused his franking privileges in his attempts to stack the hearing with MX supporters?

RESPONSE: All public meetings were held in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508) and Air Force Regulation 19-2. Public hearings are held by the lead agency, in this case the Air Force. Elected public officials were given an opportunity to speak first as they represent a large constituency. The 3-minute time limit was imposed to allow the largest number of individuals to speak. The 10 P.M. closing was the standard at all hearings. Those who did not have an opportunity to speak were encouraged to submit written comments as these were treated equally. The Final EIS covers all issues that are within the scope of the EIS, whether identified at scoping meetings, in public comments to the Draft EIS, or at any other time.

33 54 ISSUE: Will local authorities be notified during times of MX train dispersal?

RESPONSE: No.

33 55 ISSUE: Will there be emergency training, evacuation plans, or medical care for civilians in communities along MX train routes?

RESPONSE: Generally, emergency response and disaster preparedness training and planning assistance for civilian communities is available from several sources, including the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The Air Force routinely participates in those planning processes. Funds for this training come from those agencies' budgets. For further information, please contact FEMA, 500 C Street Southwest, Washington DC 20472. See Section 5.5 of the EIS.

33 56 ISSUE: What fire prevention measures will be installed on MX trains?

RESPONSE: Fire prevention measures are receiving special attention in the design of the train including: 1) All possible sources of fire will be designed to prevent ignition from occurring; 2) All possible fire sources will be isolated from possible fire propagation paths; 3) Fire extinguishing devices will be strategically located at all possible fire sources and propagation paths; 4) Monitoring devices will be strategically located at all possible fire sources and propagation paths to immediately detect fire/smoke and activate alarms and fire extinguishing devices; 5) Fire retardant materials will be used throughout the train; and 6) All personnel onboard the train will receive special training in fire prevention and control.

33 57 ISSUE: Who will fight fires, civilian or military fire fighters? If military, will they be on the trains? If so, who will fight fires in case of accident, when the train crew is injured or disabled? If they will not be on the trains, how will they be transported to the scene of an accident? If civilian fire fighters will be responsible, what additional training will they need? Who will bear the cost of such training? Is there any possibility of
special equipment being necessary to respond to train accidents carrying nuclear warheads and missile fuel? Who will bear the costs of obtaining such equipment?

RESPONSE: The trains will be equipped with equipment for fighting small fires on the trains. If the crew members were disabled in an accident, the local fire departments, federal or civilian, in the area would respond. Specialized equipment for handling accidents involving hazardous and radioactive materials would be brought to the scene, if necessary, by the Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Energy, Department of Defense, and other agencies (see EIS Section 5.5.1).

33 58 ISSUE: How large will the MX project be?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.3.

33 59 ISSUE: How many workers, military and civilian, will be imported for this project at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan and for how long? What special services will be set up for those who come seeking work but do not find it and who stay?

RESPONSE: Military worker immigrants would number approximately 345 persons and would remain for the life of the program (with normal turnover). Approximately 45 of the 63 civilian operations workers are projected to immigrate. Unsuccessful job-seekers are not expected to number more than 20 to 30 persons within the region. No special services are expected to be required.

33 60 ISSUE: How will land values around Wurtsmith AFB and along Michigan's railways be impacted by the deployment of MX?

RESPONSE: No change in land values near the base or along railway lines are expected.

33 61 ISSUE: When will this system become obsolete? Will it be obsolete before it is deployed on rails?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program has an expected life span of up to 20 or more years. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

33 62 ISSUE: What will be the economic environmental impact of MX obsolescence?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of the EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

33 63 ISSUE: What plans are being made for decommissioning?

RESPONSE: When the decision is made and the manner of decommissioning is known, the Air Force will perform the appropriate environmental analyses (see EIS Section 1.10).

33 64 ISSUE: Why is Rail Garrison so near an active earthquake fault?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 7, Comment 6.
ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of an earthquake on MX trains garrisoned at the air base and dispersed on the railways?

RESPONSE: The environmental impacts and the probability of mishaps caused by natural disasters is addressed in EIS Section 5.2.3. The potential effects of an earthquake on program components and operations are discussed in EIS Section 3.9.4.

ISSUE: What is the likelihood of radioactivity escaping into the environment in the event of tornado, flood, fire, or other natural occurrence?

RESPONSE: There is virtually no possibility of an escape of radioactive materials as a result of a tornado, flood, or other natural hazards. See EIS Section 5.2.3. A series of events necessary to expose an RV to a fire either of natural causes or from an accident are very unlikely to occur. Although such an event is very improbable, to provide a complete environmental analysis, the human health effects of exposure to aerosolized plutonium are described in EIS Section 5.4.4.

ISSUE: Have studies been conducted on the effects of wind in case of a radiation leak?

RESPONSE: The consequences of a radiation leak, including the effect of wind, were analyzed in the study of the safety of the system presented in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

ISSUE: What toxic or hazardous wastes will be generated by MX? What is the environmental impact of these wastes?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper missile is composed of various chemical/propellant and radioactive materials that are hazardous. These materials include ammonium perchlorate, hydroxyl-terminated polybutadiene, cyclotetramethylene tetranitramine, nitroglycerine/polyethylene glycol, monomethylhydrazine, radioactive materials and nitrogen tetroxide. Additionally, the maintenance of the rail cars will generate various hazardous wastes consisting of solvents, waste oils and lubricants, hydraulic fluids, anti-corrosives, and battery acid. Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Defense, and Department of Energy regulations govern the handling and disposal of hazardous waste. These regulations will be complied with when dealing with all waste generated by this program. The Air Force hazardous waste program at all bases must comply with the "cradle to grave" management concept of material and wastes required by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 as amended. All federal, state and local standards and procedures required to manage, store, transport and dispose of wastes are used (see response to Document 33, Comment 68). Air Force managers at each installation have and will continue to participate in local planning commissions for the purpose of sharing information to include hazardous materials needed in responding to an emergency involving Air Force property.

ISSUE: What funds will be set aside for hazardous waste cleanup?

RESPONSE: In the unlikely event of a mishap, funds from the Department of Defense will be used to respond.
ISSUE: How often will MX trains need to be returned to F.E. Warren AFB?

RESPONSE: It is not envisioned that an entire train will be moved from a garrison to F.E. Warren AFB. Maintenance/repair calculations indicate that an average total for all the selected deployment bases would be about two moves from the garrisons to F.E. Warren AFB per year. Prior to any such moves, the reentry systems would be removed.

ISSUE: What will be the environmental impact of an accident during transportation?

RESPONSE: The environmental impacts of accidents are described in detail in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of a surprise enemy attack on the garrison before dispersal and on Michigan after dispersal?

RESPONSE: The environmental impact of a surprise enemy attack is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Periodic adjustment of the guidance system is necessary to missiles in stationary silos; how will this be handled on rail garrisoned MX?

RESPONSE: Operational requirements of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: MX railcars will need a special design to carry their load. Will existing tracks and bridges sustain the anticipated weight? What is the environmental impact of replacing tracks and bridges? What is the environmental impact of altering the railway grades to accommodate MX?

RESPONSE: The design and fabrication of special cars to carry heavy loads is not unusual. The dimensions of the missile launch car will conform to Association of American Railroads (AAR) and Federal Railroad Administration design constraints and, in addition, will conform to Air Force Regulation 122-10, Nuclear Surety/Safety, design constraints as necessary. Currently, the missile launch car will weigh approximately 550,000 pounds, including the missile. This weight is well within the capabilities of the rail network projected for use. To verify the missile launch car performs as required, the car will be subjected to numerous tests and analyses and will be certified by the AAR. No track or bridges will be replaced, nor will any grades be redesigned to accommodate the system. Rail spur access between the installations and railroad main lines may be built new or upgraded.

ISSUE: How many miles of new track will be laid? Where? How many miles of track must have grade elevation changes? Where? Where will the fill come from? Where will the gravel come from?

RESPONSE: See EIS Sections 4.2 through 4.12 for a discussion of the amount of new track required at each installation.

ISSUE: What is the impact to commercial traffic during MX train dispersal?
RESPONSE: Peacetime training train activity will be a well-planned, scheduled, and coordinated activity between the Air Force and the railroad industry. The training trains will be scheduled with regular traffic on the commercial rail network on a regular basis to maintain crew proficiency. The trains will be operated by Air Force personnel guided by railroad "pilots." Railroads will be compensated for services provided. The Peacekeeper trains would be blended in with commercial traffic. The addition of 25 trains to a system which handles thousands of trains a day will not significantly affect traffic patterns during dispersal. However, disruption of commercial rail schedules could occur at varying degrees based on the particular tactical situation at the time each train initially joins the rail network. The Peacekeeper train could ask for highest priority, blend with the existing commercial traffic, or travel at night when traffic is at a minimum.

33 77 ISSUE: What is the economic environmental impact of halting commercial train traffic during times of dispersal, which may be for extended periods?

RESPONSE: No extended interference with commercial train traffic is foreseen. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 76.

33 78 ISSUE: During times of MX train dispersal, who dispatches and controls rail traffic?

RESPONSE: During normal peacetime operating conditions, Air Force personnel will operate the locomotive together with a railroad industry "Pilot." The Air Force train commander is in charge of all operations on the train. Train movement would be in close coordination with dispatch centers to provide safe and effective movement.

33 79 ISSUE: Will the electronic interference caused by a surprise nuclear attack prevent dispersal? Who controls MX trains in such a case?

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

33 80 ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of the MX electronic communications system on communities through which MX trains pass?

RESPONSE: There is no significant impact.

33 81 ISSUE: Will railways be constantly monitored for damage? Who will be responsible for maintaining the integrity of the track and railbeds?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.

33 82 ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of floods, tornados, blizzards, earthquakes, mechanical failures, and train wrecks on dispersal of MX trains?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 65.

33 83 ISSUE: Will MX be protected by helicopters? What is the environmental impact of this increased air traffic around the air base and along the railways?
RESPONSE: The Proposed Action does not include use of helicopters to protect the system except for surveillance during the transport of reentry systems between the Cheyenne Airport and F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

ISSUE: The impact of living in fear of nuclear war or accident has profound psychological effects on children and other vulnerable persons. What impact will there be if the MX comes to Arkansas?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: What psychological effects can be expected in various age groups near the garrison and along the MX rail routes?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: What corporations will benefit from the economic environmental impact of MX Rail Garrison?

RESPONSE: Many industries, including construction, manufacturing, trade, and transportation will be involved in the production and deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. Specific contractors are selected by competitive bidding on a nationwide basis. It is not possible to predict which contractors will be awarded the contracts. Chapter 4.1 of the EIS provides an evaluation of the national economic impacts.

ISSUE: What will be the effect on MX of a treaty eliminating half of all strategic weapons as proposed by President Reagan? What would be the economic environmental impact on Arkansas?

RESPONSE: Issues of the environmental and economic impact of treaties are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What will be the costs of the EIS process, including the scoping hearings?

RESPONSE: The entire EIS process and associated hearings will cost approximately $9 million.

ISSUE: What will be the completed costs of the MX project?

RESPONSE: The entire system would cost between $10 and $12 billion.

ISSUE: What will be the annual cost of maintenance and operation?

RESPONSE: Approximately $200 million (86 dollars) is currently budgeted for annual maintenance and operations of the system.

ISSUE: Have any studies been done to determine how many industries will not locate in the MX deployment area because of MX?

RESPONSE: No formal studies have been done but historical precedence does not suggest that industrial development has been deterred due to the presence of a military base. Indeed it has been documented that economic growth has frequently been stimulated by the presence of a military installation.
ISSUE: What will be the effect on the economic development of the deployment areas with the systematic denial of good industries?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 91.

ISSUE: How will these areas be compensated for the loss of well-paying, high tech jobs?

RESPONSE: The military is itself a high-tech industry that requires a great deal of support from similar private industries. Proximity to military facilities is frequently a consideration for the location of such firms.

ISSUE: Will the denial of high quality jobs cause emigration of the educated who can find no jobs commensurate with their educational level, thereby further eroding the economic development of the area?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 93.

ISSUE: What will be the sociological impact of erosion of economic development in the area?

RESPONSE: The deployment of a Rail Garrison is expected to increase direct and secondary employment and income and not expected to cause an erosion of economic development.

ISSUE: With regard to the international political environment, is the aggregation of MX trains in garrison at the air base more likely to invite enemy attack? Does it increase the probability of an enemy first strike?

RESPONSE: Issues of enemy targeting are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Who or what is the high authority that will authorize dispersal of MX trains during times of heightened international tensions?

RESPONSE: The high authority is defined as the President and Secretary of Defense and their duly designated alternates and successors.

ISSUE: What constitutes the state of "heightened international tensions?"

RESPONSE: National need will be determined by United States leadership based upon careful evaluation of all known relevant factors. While it is not useful to speculate about possible scenarios, it is expected that "national need" might occur during periods of heightened international tensions such as occurred during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis and the 1973 Middle East War.

ISSUE: Who may authorize firing MX?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will launch control officers be educated about their duty to disobey unlawful orders under the Nuremberg principles?
RESPONSE: The issue of officer education is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

33 101 ISSUE: What safeguards will be instituted to prevent unauthorized or accidental firing?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 5.1.1.2

33 102 ISSUE: MX is claimed to be aimed at Soviet missiles. It is also called a deterrent, rather than a first-strike weapon. Will it be fired on empty Soviet missile launching sites as logic dictates, or will it be used as a first-strike weapon?

RESPONSE: Discussion of nuclear strategy is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

33 103 ISSUE: If MX is to fire after computers indicate an enemy nuclear attack has begun, what is the likelihood of a mistaken launch order?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

33 104 ISSUE: What will the ultimate environmental impact be after the firing of MX and the ensuing escalation of nuclear warfare?

RESPONSE: The impacts of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

33 105 ISSUE: What will be the social and economic impacts on our area if the President is successful in his intent to "rid the world of them" (all nuclear weapons)?

RESPONSE: The social and economic impacts of elimination of all nuclear weapons are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 1 ISSUE: Define the entire body of information regarding nuclear waste as it relates to the MX missile system. What is produced? How much? Where? How is it buried? What environmental impact does it create?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 2.

34 2 ISSUE: What is done with hazardous waste at Wurtsmith AFB? Tell us the entire body of information surrounding this concern.

RESPONSE: See EIS Sections 4.12.2.2 and 4.12.2.3. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 68.

34 3 ISSUE: Have doctors done an entire study of the contamination effects on all military and civilian personnel at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan over the past 20 years as it relates to miscarriages, stillbirths, baby deaths, and gynecological problems?

RESPONSE: The issue of health effects of any prior contamination of military and civilian personnel is outside the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Basing modes have not been compared in this study. If there is the possibility of taking no action, what proves to be the best of the 30 basing modes? Is there another that is more environmentally sound?

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: Michigan voted in November 1982 that deployment of nuclear weapons in Michigan is to be rejected. Therefore, prove to the public that the MX Rail Garrison is actually needed for national defense and security when its only stated use is to be reserved for attacks after the United States has been attacked.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: If the MX is using the commercial rail system which spreads through various Michigan cities, hearings of environmental impact on the air, land, and water of these communities must be held for public testimony. Persons who traveled at great inconvenience (4 hours) from these cities were not heard because of limitations on time. All of us present for the hearings believed that the hearing was totally for the public after our reading of the document. We were willing to stay beyond your 10:00 P.M. curfew because of the urgency of this matter.

RESPONSE: Public hearings were held in the communities in the immediate vicinity of the proposed garrison installations where the greatest impacts would most likely occur. The 10:00 P.M. closing was the standard at all hearings. Those who did not receive an opportunity to speak were encouraged to submit written comments as these were treated equally.

ISSUE: In commentor's opinion, international law and the laws of God prohibit the possession, use, and threat of use of nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What assurance is there that these hearings are meant to truly assess the will of the people?

RESPONSE: The hearings are intended to receive comments on the Draft EIS. The will of the people regarding the deployment of the system must be expressed through the President and Congress.

ISSUE: Why was inadequate notice given?

RESPONSE: Notification of all public hearings was made to local media by the base public affairs offices at least three weeks prior to each hearing when all pertinent travel and auditorium schedules were confirmed.

ISSUE: Why has no information been forwarded to any of us who have requested it from Congress persons?

RESPONSE: The inquiry should be addressed to the individual member of Congress.

ISSUE: Why have all of the communities in which rail lines will be used not been informed and called to public hearings in their local areas?
RESPONSE: Public hearings were held in the communities in the immediate vicinity of the proposed garrison installations where the greatest impacts would most likely occur.

34 12 ISSUE: What evidence substantiates the need for the MX for national security?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 13 ISSUE: Has there been any difficulty with the functioning of MX missiles?
RESPONSE: Issues relating to the development of the missile are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 14 ISSUE: Did the people of other parts of the country willingly accept MX?
RESPONSE: Evaluation of public acceptance of the system is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 15 ISSUE: What is the total projected plan for the Rail Garrison system? What is the total cost?
RESPONSE: EIS Section 1.3 discusses the Proposed Action for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system. Deployment of the system is anticipated to be $10 billion to $12 billion.

34 16 ISSUE: Has Congress allocated all of the funds for the rail line system and carriers, along with warheads?
RESPONSE: No decision about deployment has been made. Funding to date is for research and development only.

34 17 ISSUE: If an attack were to occur on one of the railcars, what would the result be?
RESPONSE: The security measures to be implemented are expected to prevent any successful attack. However, in the event of a successful attack, the environmental consequences would not be any worse than those described in EIS Section 5.4.

34 18 ISSUE: Would there be a greater possibility that military bases and weapon systems will be attacked by an opponent or terrorist if the system were deployed?
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy and enemy threat assessment are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 19 ISSUE: What materials/chemicals must be used to keep the MX rail system from deteriorating? Is this material toxic? How is it contained or is it disposed of?
RESPONSE: Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Defense, and Department of Energy regulations govern handling and disposal of toxic wastes. These regulations will be complied with when dealing with all waste generated by this program. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 68.
34 20 ISSUE: Is the same rail system used for carrying contaminated materials or is it carried on roadways? Is it buried at the site?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 68 and Document 34, Comment 19.

34 21 ISSUE: What is the chain of command to actually use the MX system on potential enemies?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 22 ISSUE: Is the Peacekeeper considered to be a first-strike weapon?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 23 ISSUE: What numbers of people who live in Iosco County, Michigan or relocate there would be affected by environmental hazards?

RESPONSE: Significant environmental impacts and safety concerns of the affected population are described in EIS Section 4.12 and Chapter 5.

34 24 ISSUE: How many persons live near the rail lines that will be used by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system?

RESPONSE: The analysis of environmental and human health impacts included estimates of how many persons would be affected in a particular situation. The results of the calculation of how many would be affected are reported in the EIS. No attempt was made and nothing could be gained in estimating the total number of persons who live within a specific distance from all rail lines which might be used by the system.

34 25 ISSUE: Name the advantages and disadvantages of the Rail Garrison MX in the State of Michigan and the Oscoda area.

RESPONSE: The significant environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the system are discussed in EIS Section 4.12.

34 26 ISSUE: Give a summary of any environmental impact studies over the past 30 years. What was done to improve these problems?

RESPONSE: An EIS appropriately covers the impact of the Proposed Action and Alternatives, and discussion of previous EISs and problems identified in them is not required, nor relevant.

34 27 ISSUE: Will the Department of Natural Resources of Michigan be able to testify at the hearings? Will the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) be available to respond to questions?

RESPONSE: Any organization (public or private) or individual was permitted to submit written comments at the public hearings. Public hearings are held by the lead agency (in this case, the Air Force). Public hearings on the proposed program were held at 11 locations between 25 July and 11 August 1988. The EPA received and reviewed the Draft EIS and will receive the Final EIS.

34 28 ISSUE: What have been the negative effects of the base on well water, Lake Van Etten, and Lake Huron in Michigan?
RESPONSE: A great deal of effort and money has been expended to define and control the groundwater contamination at Wurtsmith AFB. The groundwater purge systems constructed at the base appear to be successfully maintaining the quality of the current water supply wells used by the base at an acceptable level. Although considerable quantities of organic contaminants have been removed from the aquifer, the most recent published report from the U.S. Geological Survey (in 1986) indicates that trichloroethylene concentrations in the Arrow Street plume are about 200 mg/l while tri- and dichloroethylene concentrations in the Mission Street plume are over 1,000 mg/l, far above potable water standards. Several of these plumes are in close proximity to water supply wells and must be carefully controlled through the pumpage of purge wells to prevent contamination of the supply wells. The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program will increase pumpage from the base wells by about 14 percent, further stressing the groundwater management system. The program does have the potential for a low, but significant local groundwater impact at the base. This does not, however, imply that this groundwater impact cannot be managed nor is this impact by any means sufficient grounds for not siting the program at Wurtsmith AFB. It should be noted that the base engineering staff has endorsed the concept of shifting to a proposed regional water supply from Lake Huron as a permanent solution for water supply at Wurtsmith AFB. The groundwater contamination problems at Wurtsmith AFB are further discussed in EIS Section 4.12.7. Little or none of the groundwater contaminants have been found in Van Etten Lake. No effects from the base upon Lake Huron have been documented.

34 29 ISSUE: Have any medical studies been done in the area to evaluate the effect on human health of past use of contaminants, toxics, and injurious materials?

RESPONSE: The effects of any past use of contaminants, toxics, etc. is beyond the scope of this EIS.

34 30 ISSUE: What plans are being made to research the high number of baby deaths, stillbirths, and women's pregnancy problems in the base area?

RESPONSE: These issues are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 31 ISSUE: From the military vantage point, what are the advantages and disadvantages of this suggested basing mode?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of the EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 32 ISSUE: How does the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison basing mode compare to the other 30 basing mode possibilities?

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

34 33 ISSUE: Is no action a possible alternative at this time?

RESPONSE: Yes.

34 34 ISSUE: Why should the MX be placed on the rail systems of Michigan?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

34 35 ISSUE: What previous studies have been made regarding this system? What are the conclusions?
RESPONSE: No previous environmental impact studies have been done on this system.

34 36 ISSUE: What is the complete history of the Rail Garrison MX system?
RESPONSE: The relevant history of the system is summarized in EIS Section 1.1.

34 37 ISSUE: What is the impact of the necessary antiballistic missile system needed to protect the project?
RESPONSE: No antiballistic missile system is proposed and therefore any potential impacts of such a system have not been analyzed.

34 38 ISSUE: What safety of the people and environment is being assured?
RESPONSE: The safety concerns regarding the system are described in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

34 39 ISSUE: What insurance is available for persons and property?
RESPONSE: No impact on insurance availability is anticipated.

34 40 ISSUE: What is the impact on the local land values around the base and around the entire railway system in various parts of the State of Michigan?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 60.

34 41 ISSUE: What kind of security, besides armed guards, will be implemented to safeguard the MX? What impact will these safeguards have on the lifestyles of persons living near the affected areas?
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 7 through 16.

34 42 ISSUE: How often will the missiles be moved out onto the rail lines for testing purposes? How will people be alerted to this?
RESPONSE: One missile (without warheads) per year would be moved by rail to F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming and then to Vandenberg AFB, California for test launching. No other movement of missiles on the rail network for test purposes is proposed. There will be no advance public notice of the missile movements for those test firings.

34 43 ISSUE: What is the impact on the environment and people if there were a derailment while using it?
RESPONSE: See Section 5.4 of the EIS. Also see response to Document 6, Comment 1.

34 44 ISSUE: Who is responsible for the upkeep, repair, and safety of the tracks and surrounding rights-of-way?
ISSUE: If lawsuits or costs are incurred, who will pay for damages?

RESPONSE: Resolution of those issues would be decided by an agreement between the affected parties, or in the event of a dispute by an appropriate court.

ISSUE: How long will it take to move the trains from the base in case of attack? Will the cruise missiles be removed at the same time?

RESPONSE: The issue of whether cruise missiles would be removed during dispersal is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What railroad track will be used by the Rail Garrison system and will the same lines be used for commercial rail traffic?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 29.

ISSUE: How many workers will be employed for this project at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan, both short and long term?

RESPONSE: During the construction phase, up to 535 workers will be required by the program at Wurtsmith AFB. During operations, 345 military and 63 civilian workers will be employed.

ISSUE: How many workers will be employed from all of the areas affected by the project at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan?

RESPONSE: Up to 919 direct and secondary workers will be needed during the peak construction year at Wurtsmith AFB. During operations, 585 direct and secondary workers will be employed as a result of the program.

ISSUE: How many workers will be imported from outside of the Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan area?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 59.

ISSUE: How many workers will be retained for ongoing employment for this project at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 59.

ISSUE: Will the federal government guidelines be followed for affirmative action?

RESPONSE: Hiring practices would be set by the contractors who successfully bid on the construction and assembly and checkout projects. While no plans exist to specifically offer positions to minorities, women, or handicapped persons, the Air Force, as well as its contractors, are required to follow the law regarding hiring and employment practices and are prohibited from discriminating against any individual. Advancement opportunities would follow standard practices of the federal government as well as for individual contractors.
ISSUE: What services will be set in place in Oscoda, Michigan and other affected areas for persons applying for employment but not hired?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 59.

ISSUE: What is the projected length of time for the whole proposal?

RESPONSE: For purposes of the EIS analysis, construction activities at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan are expected to begin in 1990 and completed in 1992 with full operations beginning in 1993. The expected life span of the program is 20 years.

ISSUE: What support systems will be put in place for the communities disrupted by this project?

RESPONSE: If significant impacts are identified in the EIS, appropriate mitigative measures, if necessary, will be coordinated with affected local jurisdictions.

ISSUE: What evacuation plans are being made for areas through which the trains will pass? How is the public informed of the plans? Have there been any practices?

RESPONSE: See Section 5.5 of the EIS. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the Arkansas rail system should be in excellent condition prior to use by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison train.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 2.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Little Rock AFB because of the lack of negative impacts on the environment.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Who will review the classified annex to the EIS?

RESPONSE: Review and comment will be done by Department of Defense officials and contractors who are knowledgeable about the program. Only those with need-to-know interest and proper clearance will have access to those portions that are classified.

ISSUE: Commentor strongly objects to word "Peacekeeper" in naming the system because the system has nothing to do with peace. Request name be discontinued.

RESPONSE: President Reagan announced on 22 November 1982 that this missile system would be named "Peacekeeper."

ISSUE: Commentor feels the prepared presentation at the Louisiana hearing was technically correct, but was biased and incomplete. Hearing should also have had a prepared presentation of opposing views.

RESPONSE: The purpose of the public hearing is to summarize and present the findings of the Draft EIS and to solicit public comment on the
environmental adequacy and accuracy of the Draft EIS. It is not the purpose of the hearings to discuss nonenvironmental controversial subjects, morality, military tactics or general societal issues. Concerns about these issues are best addressed to Congress and the President.

37 3 ISSUE: How can a car designed to work on the commercial rail system be designed to safely deploy a 195,000 pound missile?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

37 4 ISSUE: When derailments occur with regularity in both populated and rural areas of east Texas and northwest Louisiana, how can this system be considered safe for missile transportation in emergencies?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 2.

37 5 ISSUE: Who will drive the trains?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 78.

37 6 ISSUE: Who will determine the routes of the trains?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 29.

37 7 ISSUE: If the trains are taken out with the missiles, will they be moved through highly populated areas? What does the Air Force consider a highly populated area and will it stop for commercial rail traffic?
RESPONSE: Depending on the type of movement (initial deployment, movements for maintenance, or for dispersal), highly populated areas will be avoided where feasible. However, during times of national need, the train commander of a dispersed operational train would have authority to travel the national rail network, including through highly populated areas if necessary. He would have the responsibility to ensure safety for the local population. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 76.

37 8 ISSUE: What is the expected life span of the system?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 61.

37 9 ISSUE: How long before the system is obsolete and negotiated peace treaties call for its dismantling?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

37 10 ISSUE: What is the projected risk factor for nuclear accident probability? Hearings stated one to three persons might die as a direct result of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system. Explain how this might occur.
RESPONSE: All United States nuclear weapons are designed to withstand extreme conditions without any possibility of nuclear detonation. The risk of other kinds of potential accidents and their environmental consequence are addressed in EIS Section 5.3.4.

37 11 ISSUE: Is this a first-strike system?
ISSUE: How often will the active system be circulating in the commercial system?
RESPONSE: Only during time of national need.

ISSUE: How long will it take to activate the system?
RESPONSE: Operational details involving no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: The protection of animals is important, but the protection of humans is more important.
RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: What is the No Action Alternative?
RESPONSE: With this alternative, the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system would not be deployed. Activities at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming and each candidate Air Force installation would continue to support existing and other proposed missions. Predictions for conditions with the No Action Alternative are discussed under baseline conditions of each location in EIS Chapter 4.

ISSUE: While the administration is dismantling missiles, the Pentagon is seeking to build more. This is illogical, threatening, and a wasteful action. Conflict resolution is the result of diplomacy and negotiations.
RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Why wasn't a copy of the Draft EIS sent to the university library in Warrensburg, Missouri? The only available copy was in the Warrensburg Public Library.
RESPONSE: University libraries are not as easily accessible to the public as the public libraries, hence copies were sent to public libraries. Additional copies were made available to all who asked for them.

ISSUE: Commentor states that the EIS does not adequately examine social effects (such as on family, marriage, race relations, and politics) in interrelation with other effects.
RESPONSE: The National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing Council on Environmental Quality regulations stipulate that an EIS discuss significant environmental impacts (40 CFR 1502.1). Social and socioeconomic impacts are properly included in this discussion to the extent they are judged to be significant. The population changes due to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri are expected to be small in magnitude compared to the baseline military and civilian population of the area (see EIS Section 4.11.1.3). Moreover, these new residents are likely to have many of the same demographic characteristics as baseline residents of the area, many of whom also are military personnel and dependents. Because these new residents are expected to be both few in number and qualitatively similar
demographically to baseline area residents, effects on family, marriage, race relations, politics, and other social relationships are expected to be negligible. These effects consequently do not warrant further analysis and discussion.

38 3 ISSUE: Commentor states that there is no comprehensive, holistic assessment of both short-term and long-term consequences of the interrelationships between changes in the biophysical and sociocultural environments.

RESPONSE: Discussion of the relationships between short-term changes in the environment and the long-term consequences are presented in EIS Sections 4.2.13 through 4.12.13.

38 4 ISSUE: Commentor states that there are a number of programs being developed in Missouri as well as current projects whose cumulative impacts need to be systematically analyzed in relation to this proposed program.

RESPONSE: The cumulative impacts of the proposed program and other known or proposed projects were considered in the EIS to the extent that these projects would be influenced or affected by the proposed program. In some instances, such as the B-2 bomber program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri the cumulative impacts of known or proposed projects were incorporated into the existing and future baseline analyses.

38 5 ISSUE: Issues of morality, national security policy, and psychological effects need to be part of the assessment process for any EIS. If they are not, the issue of controversy over the effects on the quality of the human environment will not be adequately assessed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

38 6 ISSUE: In the Draft EIS, it is often difficult to figure out exactly how conclusions were reached. Footnotes to actual sources used and to describe step-by-step data collection and analysis are needed.

RESPONSE: Descriptions of the criteria used for conclusions regarding the level of impacts and their significance are presented in EIS Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis Methods.

39 1 ISSUE: Commentor objects to procedures used at public hearings. Air Force officials took up too much time at the beginning of the hearing and a military judge presided.

RESPONSE: The Air Force follows the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508) in its environmental impact analysis process. Those regulations require that agencies "make diligent efforts to involve the public." They allow considerable leeway in the conduct of public hearings. The presentation made by the Air Force at the beginning of each hearing was intended to provide a concise synopsis of the Proposed Action and significant impacts so everyone would have a common understanding of the subject matter. The presentation is believed to have been effective in informing the public and focusing comments on relevant issues.
39 2 **ISSUE:** Commentor believes more public hearings should be held in the State of Missouri.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

40 1 **ISSUE:** Commentor opposed to the system because it is destructive, irrational, and endangering more of the population. To negotiate from strength, we have to be strong economy-wise.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

41 1 **ISSUE:** Commentor in support of the mission because of the belief that a strong national defense is required for the preservation of our constitutional freedom and that the Rail Garrison plan is a vital part of that defense.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

42 1 **ISSUE:** Commentor in support of the selection of Whiteman AFB, Missouri for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. In addition to its role in maintaining a strong defense, the base has contributed significantly to the growth and development of this area through its economic impact and the participation of its personnel in community and civic affairs.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

43 1 **ISSUE:** Commentor states the present rail system in Missouri would not be able to support the extra heavy load.

**RESPONSE:** See responses to Document 24, Comment 2 and Document 33, Comment 74.

43 2 **ISSUE:** The civilian dispatcher would have to be notified if the MX train entered regular rail systems.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

43 3 **ISSUE:** Commentor states that to leave and deploy from Whiteman AFB, Missouri for any distance, the train would pass through heavily populated areas. This is against the law.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 37, Comment 7.

43 4 **ISSUE:** The addition of Rail Garrison would make our state (Missouri) a prime target for an attack.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

43 5 **ISSUE:** The world applauded the INF treaty, reducing by a small percentage the nuclear weapons we possess. Why add to the overkill when we already have 150 missile sites and the stealth bomber in this area?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

43 6 **ISSUE:** Train crashes and derailments are not uncommon in this country, frequently due to the age and condition of the rails.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 1.

43 ISSUE: Commentor resents the title Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program. The MX is an offensive weapon and killer, not a Peacekeeper.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

44 ISSUE: Sworn affidavit by the Commission of Henry County, Missouri endorsing Whiteman AFB as a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

45 ISSUE: The proposed Rail Garrison program will affect the moral, sociological, and psychological environment. Why haven't the measurements of the social scientists been sought?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 5, Comment 14 and Document 38, Comment 2.

46 ISSUE: Commentor states there are too many unprotected environments in the Fairchild AFB/Spokane, Washington area and the program should be placed in an alternate site.

RESPONSE: Noted.

47 ISSUE: Commentor states that Medical Lake and Spokane, Washington support the Rail Garrison project.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

48 ISSUE: The world's environment has not been addressed as it affects such things as the technology race, accidental nuclear war, increased striking power, and nonnuclear powers seeking their own weapons.

RESPONSE: These issues are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

48 ISSUE: The hypothetical "accidents" are only of one warhead. There may be more. The Draft EIS seems to forget the oversized and overweight system needed.

RESPONSE: The safety analysis considers the fact that each missile carries ten warheads. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 74.

48 ISSUE: The EIS says nothing about the effects of vibration and harmonics on, for example, metal fatigue.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 40.

49 ISSUE: Commentor opposes delivery, burial, and transportation of nuclear missiles with plutonium because no safe method for plutonium storage has been found.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 2.

49 ISSUE: The presence of weapons of this magnitude poses a direct threat to the citizens around the storage areas, for they become a prime target.
ISSUE: The development, presence, and maintenance of the missile contradicts the spirit of the recent United States - Soviet agreement.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Why not use what appears to be abandoned missile silos near Altus?

RESPONSE: Comparison of alternative basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: Comment made that the Draft EIS was received less than a month from the scheduled hearing for Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: The Council on Environmental Quality regulations, which implement the National Environmental Policy Act, require the Draft EIS be available at least 15 days prior to the hearing. The Air Force allowed 60 days instead of the required 45 days for public comment in view of the nature of the program. All written comments received consideration equal to verbal ones.

ISSUE: All referenced documents in the Draft EIS should have been made easily accessible to the public.

RESPONSE: All referenced documents are in the public domain and can be accessed through public libraries. The Council on Environmental Quality regulations require that the public have access to the Draft EIS and be allowed to comment on it, including any perceived, specific inadequacies of that document. The process does not require that collateral documents be supplied. The military standards and Air Force regulations may be obtained from any Air Force base for reproduction cost ($0.15 per page) or by mail from Publication Distribution Office, Technical Order Distribution, 63 MAW/DAPD, Norton AFB, CA 92409-5000. For the Integrated System Safety Program for the MX Weapon System, Space and Missile Systems Organization Standard 79-1, you should write to HQ BMO/DADF, Norton AFB, CA 92409-6468. Other documents cited in the Draft EIS may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161, Attention Order Control.

ISSUE: If the cumulative environmental impacts of classified programs are covered in a classified annex to the Final EIS, how can the public comment on it? Who will review and comment on it?

RESPONSE: There is no requirement for the public to review and comment on a classified document. Also see response to Document 36, Comment 1.

ISSUE: On Draft EIS page S-38, it states that the Air Force will follow all relevant laws at the time of decommissioning. What laws will be followed now?

RESPONSE: If decommissioning were to take place soon after the start of operations, National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable environmental laws will be followed.
50  5 ISSUE: If a new arms control treaty is signed, how will the Rail Garrison project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas be decommissioned? How will propellant and nuclear material be disposed of? Is there money set aside for site cleanup?

RESPONSE: The Air Force will fund any required site cleanup. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 63.

50  6 ISSUE: Of the 12,000 program-related employment by 1994, how many of these jobs will be military, and how many will be civilian?

RESPONSE: Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS, the national economic impact analysis (see EIS Section 4.1.1) was revised to include more recent economic information. On the basis of this revision, the number of steady-state jobs is projected at 9,000 in 1994 and thereafter. Approximately 3,000 of these jobs are expected to be military personnel. The remaining 6,000 would be civilian jobs.

50  7 ISSUE: Of the civilian jobs in 1994, how many are likely to be with the missile builder?

RESPONSE: Nearly 3,000 jobs, or just under half of all civilian jobs created by the program, are projected to be in the manufacturing sector. A substantial portion of these manufacturing jobs would be in sectors closely associated with production of ongoing replacement and upgrading of missile components and similar technical equipment required by the program.

50  8 ISSUE: How many local hires are expected?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is projected to generate about 6,000 civilian jobs during the operations phase (see response to Document 50, Comment 6). About 1,600 of these civilian jobs would be in the areas near the deployment installations. Approximately 1,300 of these jobs are projected to be filled by local hires. Additional information on civilian jobs and local hires at each location is presented in Sections 4.2.1 through 4.12.1 of the EIS.

50  9 ISSUE: What skills will be needed?

RESPONSE: Skills needed for the construction jobs associated with this program correspond to the skills needed for the various crafts in the construction trade. These would range from general laborers, painters, and drywall installers to operating engineers, electricians, and carpenters. Secondary jobs are expected to include those in the wholesale and retail trade and services sectors. Skills required would vary depending on the positions available.

50 10 ISSUE: Can communities support the local labor needs? If not, how many people outside of the communities would be needed?

RESPONSE: Because most of the jobs created by the program would be in urban areas, be small in number compared to the economies of those areas, and require skills presently utilized on similar programs, most of the employees needed by the program are expected to be available in the areas where the jobs would be created. Relatively few people would need to move into the areas where these jobs would be located, and impacts
resulting from the small number of workers who may relocate are expected to be negligible.

50 11 ISSUE: Will the program-related employed labor force work for minimum wage?

RESPONSE: All of the jobs created by the program are expected to pay wages at or above the minimum wage, with many of the skilled jobs well above the minimum wage. Many similar jobs are presently filled by workers on the Peacekeeper and Minuteman programs. Hiring an adequate labor force for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at these prevailing wages is not expected to present problems.

50 12 ISSUE: Will training of personnel be provided? Will workers be assisted in locating jobs at the end of construction projects?

RESPONSE: For government personnel employed by the program, the agencies involved have their own training policies and procedures. The EIS assumes that these training policies and procedures would remain in place for this program. For private-sector workers employed by the program, it is not possible to determine precisely who the employers would be. As a result, their personnel policies covering such matters as training cannot be projected with any certainty. Numerous government and private-sector employers would be involved in the program. For government personnel, the agencies involved have established procedures for transferring and reassigning personnel upon completion of either construction or operational assignments, as appropriate, given agency responsibilities and funding at that time. Many private-sector employers are expected to have similar procedures. Some workers may be laid off when construction or operation of the system is completed. Employers on the program will be covered by the unemployment insurance system and related labor laws in the states where the jobs are located. These laws are designed to mitigate the impacts of unemployment on the individuals and communities involved in any lay-offs, and are assumed in this EIS to remain in force.

50 13 ISSUE: How many minority, handicapped, and women workers will be hired?

RESPONSE: As indicated in the response to Document 50, Comment 12, numerous government and private employers would be involved in the program, each responsible for compliance with applicable labor laws in the states where the jobs would be located. These applicable labor laws include those related to equal employment opportunity and affirmative action in hiring and advancement for minorities, the handicapped, women, and the economically disadvantaged. This EIS assumes these requirements would remain in force. Government regulations require compliance with these requirements for all government agencies, and public contracting laws stipulate compliance by all government contractors.

50 14 ISSUE: What jobs will you offer to disadvantaged teens?

RESPONSE: No special programs for providing jobs to disadvantaged teens other than those in response to Document 50, Comment 13 are planned.

50 15 ISSUE: What benefits will employees receive?
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RESPONSE: Employment benefits available to personnel working on the
program depend on the employers involved. Government employees
typically are eligible for sick leave, vacation, partial medical insurance
coverage, and other benefits. Many private employers on the program
would offer similar benefits to their personnel, though coverage would
vary among employers. This EIS assumes these benefit programs would
remain in place. For reasons indicated in the response to Document 50,
Comment 12, precise information about these benefits is not available at
the present time, and further analysis is not warranted since no
environmental impacts are expected to be associated with these programs.

50 16 ISSUE: Will workers be allowed to unionize?

RESPONSE: Unionization of employees is governed by federal and state
labor laws. This EIS assumes these laws would remain in force. Many
employees of contractors providing construction and operation supplies
and services are unionized at the present time, and this pattern is assumed
to continue.

50 17 ISSUE: Will part-time positions be available?

RESPONSE: Jobs created by the program are expected to include both
full-time and part-time jobs, depending on the specific requirements of
the employers involved.

50 18 ISSUE: Will advanced notice of decommissioning be given?

RESPONSE: The government will provide advance notice of any
decommissioning actions, in the manner required under federal laws and
regulations in force at that time.

50 19 ISSUE: What kind of advancement opportunities will be offered?

RESPONSE: Advancement opportunities and skill development will
depend on the characteristics of individual workers and the nature of their
employment. As indicated above, policies will vary from employer to
employer, though all will be subject to applicable labor laws and
regulations regarding equal employment opportunity and affirmative
action.

50 20 ISSUE: What skills will employees take to other jobs?

RESPONSE: Since the range of employment opportunities will be large,
the range of skills learned by employees will also be large. For this
analysis, it was not necessary to identify these particular skills.

50 21 ISSUE: How will budget cuts affect the employees on the Rail Garrison
program?

RESPONSE: Issues of budget cuts are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also
see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

50 22 ISSUE: Who will oversee civilian employee health and safety?

RESPONSE: The U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and
Health Administration, and state agencies in states where program jobs
are located administer federal and state laws and regulations regarding
employee health and safety. These requirements have the purpose of protecting covered employees while on the job. Government agencies and firms under contract to the federal government will be required to comply with applicable regulations. This EIS assumes these requirements would remain in force.

50 23 ISSUE: Commentor thinks a discrepancy exists between Draft EIS Page S-39 and Draft EIS Page A-2. If as stated on Page A-2, contract awards to local firms would reduce population immigration and consequently lower demands for temporary housing, how can Page S-39 say that there would be beneficial socioeconomic effects, such as increases in employment and income and greater utilization of vacant housing.

RESPONSE: Beneficial effects would occur because the population immigration would be reduced, not eliminated. Increases in employment and income would be virtually identical regardless of how contracts are awarded.

50 24 ISSUE: Because on Draft EIS Page S-43 you have identified a major and important archaeological site at the Eaker AFB, Arkansas onbase option, you really have no choice but to avoid this planned site for basing according to Draft EIS Appendix A.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 7, Comment 7.

50 25 ISSUE: Statement made that eventually we will run out of all common prehistoric sites at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: Avoidance is generally the preferred treatment for important (National Register of Historic Places-eligible) archeological sites of all types, whether common or rare. Most sites have at least some research potential, and common site types can be important for understanding past lifeways. Therefore, even impacts on common sites like 3MS528 can be significant. Nevertheless, all sites are not equally important, and the LOI reflects the relative magnitude of the loss to the regional resource base should a given site be disturbed. This evaluation is vital to the decision makers.

50 26 ISSUE: Draft EIS page 1-3 states that "certain technical aspects of the engineering design and operating concepts for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system are still undergoing change." What guarantee can you give that these changes will not affect the Final EIS? Will the public be told if there is a change? If there is a significant change, will the project be abandoned? Why aren't all engineering aspects nailed down yet?

RESPONSE: The environmental impacts of the Proposed and Alternative Actions that are analyzed are not expected to change substantially as a result of changes in certain technical aspects of the program. However, if major changes in the program concept which could have significant environmental impacts are proposed for implementation subsequent to filing of one or more Records of Decision, appropriate additional environmental analyses would be prepared prior to any decision on such changes.

50 27 ISSUE: In times of national need, civilian traffic is expected to increase. The Draft EIS states that on a national average, the increase in rail traffic would impact the rails slightly. Is this statement true for every
state? What about the local level? Commentor concerned that looking at
the problem from a nationwide scope tends to hide any problems that may
arise at a local or statewide level.

RESPONSE: At both the local and nationwide levels, the small increase in
the number of train trips generated by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison
program would be negligible in terms of the current rail traffic in the
affected locations.

50 28 ISSUE: If servicing is done offbase, how would you establish an explosive
safety zone? How will these zones impact the work areas in train yards or
in populated areas?

RESPONSE: Servicing and resupply of the trains would require only brief
stops and an explosive safety zone would therefore not be required.

50 29 ISSUE: How will garbage and other wastes be collected and disposed of?
How will these wastes be collected and stored onboard the trains?

RESPONSE: Domestic solid waste generated onboard the trains will be
gathered, stored onboard, and returned to the base for disposal.

50 30 ISSUE: How will hazardous wastes, specifically nuclear materials,
propellants, igniters, petroleum products, and other explosive materials be
stored, handled, and picked up for disposal? How will you inform local
public health and safety officials about these hazardous materials under
the right-to-know laws?

RESPONSE: The Environmental Protection Agency, Department of
Defense, and Department of Energy regulations govern the handling and
disposal of hazardous waste. These regulations will be complied with
when dealing with all waste generated by this program. The Air Force
hazardous waste program at all bases must comply with the "cradle to
grave" management concept of material and wastes required by the
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, as amended. All
federal, state and local standards and procedures required to manage,
store, transport and dispose of wastes are used (see response to Document
33, Comment 68). Air Force managers at each installation have and will
continue to participate in local planning commissions for the purpose of
sharing information to include hazardous materials needed in responding
to an emergency involving Air Force property.

50 31 ISSUE: On Draft EIS Page 1-14 it states that "Peacekeeper Rail Garrison
test facility requirements at other locations are generally minor and form
part of their regular missions." What exactly are these test
requirements? What are the chances of a mishap occurring?

RESPONSE: Since a silo-based Peacekeeper system is currently in
operational status at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, testing requirements for
proposed Rail Garrison basing will primarily involve its adaptation to a
rail-mobile system. Initial launch ejection tests of missile-weight
dummies from rail-based canisters will not create significant health or
safety risks under any potential mishap possibility. Full operational tests
will be conducted at Vandenberg AFB, California where risk management
procedures have prevented all mishap-related public consequences.
ISSUE: Will new scoping hearings be conducted if a second rail connection from a garrison to a main line is considered at a later date? Will a new EIS be drafted and opened to public comment?

RESPONSE: Appropriate environmental analyses will be prepared in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR §§ 1500-1508) and Air Force Regulation 19-2. (See Section 1.3 of the EIS.)

ISSUE: At the time of decommissioning, what happens to the nuclear material such as the solid propellant, igniter, liquid fuel, any high explosive material, and other components of the missile.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

ISSUE: If the destruction method of decommissioning is to be by firing the missile, as the Pershing missiles are, how will this impact the environment at the firing line?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

ISSUE: If you stockpile the weapons at decommissioning, how will leakage be prevented?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

ISSUE: The rail transportation section needs to address the impacts on state and local levels as well as national levels.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 76.

ISSUE: Will the garrison trains pick up empty rail cars to make it look real? What impact will this have on the railroads?

RESPONSE: The trains would resemble existing railroad equipment as much as possible. The current concept is to include two locomotives, two missile launch cars, two security cars, a launch control car, and a maintenance car. Additional cars may be added as required for operation. These cars will not be taken from the regular rail car inventory and will have no impacts on the railroads.

ISSUE: If loaded rail cars are used as extra rail cars, will the criteria for explosive zones apply to them?

RESPONSE: As a general precaution at all Air Force bases, explosive safety zones provide safe distance between places where explosives are stored or processed and other specified locations. The explosive safety zone for the Peacekeeper train will not be affected by the addition of any extra cars. Explosive safety zones are established from the perimeter of facilities containing explosive material, not from the equipment or material inside the facility. The size of the zone is determined by the net equivalent weight (to TNT) of the explosive material stored.

ISSUE: How will the public be protected from attack?

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
50 40 **ISSUE:** Why wasn't the controversy over the purpose, need, or desirability of this program not considered in evaluating the significance of impacts?

**RESPONSE:** Possible controversy over the purpose, need, or desirability is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

50 41 **ISSUE:** Why weren't the psychological impacts of the basing plan addressed?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

50 42 **ISSUE:** Why are only the elementary schools looked at when applying the significance criteria of pupil-to-teacher ratios?

**RESPONSE:** The education analysis in the EIS primarily addressed impacts on elementary schools because the majority of program-related students, 55 percent of the total, were expected to enroll in grades at the elementary level, versus approximately 15 percent at the junior high level, and 30 percent at the senior high level. Given these projections, even at the base with the most additional students, no more than 30 junior high and 50 senior high students would be expected. These additions would be manageable in light of the higher pupil-to-teacher ratio prevalent at the secondary level, the flexibility of a period/module system to evenly absorb students, and the option to bus secondary students. Most school districts in order to maintain the neighborhood school concept, are adverse to busing at the elementary level.

50 43 **ISSUE:** What methods will be used to keep vegetation clear of the area between the garrison perimeter fences, plus two additional 45-foot clear zones immediately inside and outside of the fences? If herbicides are used, what will they be?

**RESPONSE:** The Air Force uses a variety of methods to control vegetation for security purposes including mowing and herbicide application. When herbicides are required, an EPA approved herbicide will be applied by a licensed contractor in accordance with the instructions on the container label.

50 44 **ISSUE:** If herbicides are used to clear vegetation between the garrison perimeter, how will this affect the soil both in the short term and long term?

**RESPONSE:** The application of chemical pesticides and herbicides will not cause significant adverse environmental impacts. These chemicals are regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and when applied in the prescribed concentration for their intended use, will not present unreasonable risks to the environment or human health effects.

50 45 **ISSUE:** When the garrison is decommissioned, will the land be restored to its original condition?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

50 46 **ISSUE:** Draft EIS Page 4.8-1 states that "the 3.6 miles of existing track would require upgrading." Is this rail an example of the rail systems in Arkansas? Will all the rails in the state be upgraded?
RESPONSE: No, this information was provided to describe program requirements to upgrade this spur line and not as an example of the rail system in Arkansas. No other rail tracks in the state will be upgraded as part of the program.

50 47 ISSUE: Will all the rails in the State of Arkansas be nuclear certified?

RESPONSE: The rails are not critical nuclear weapon components and therefore will not be nuclear certified.

50 48 ISSUE: Who will pay for the additional teachers in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area? Where will the qualified teachers come from?

RESPONSE: The referenced increases refer to normal growth under baseline conditions of approximately 1.3 percent per year during the 1990 to 1995 period. This level of baseline growth would be able to be accommodated through existing funding mechanisms.

50 49 ISSUE: Can the local economies in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area withstand tax increases to pay for additional teachers?

RESPONSE: The projected teacher requirements under baseline conditions would be funded through a combination of state, federal, and local revenue sources. State funding accounts for about two-thirds of local district revenues. Revenue from local tax sources would naturally increase as the tax base expands under normal baseline growth conditions. No increases in the tax burden on existing residents is projected.

50 50 ISSUE: Why is it that the Draft EIS never mentioned that Arkansas ranks near the bottom of nearly every measure when it comes to education? Commentor concerned that the education system in Arkansas is already overburdened.

RESPONSE: The purpose of the Draft EIS is to ascertain the impact of the additional enrollment due to the program. A comparative analysis of educational measures between all Arkansas schools and other schools is not within the scope of this analysis.

50 51 ISSUE: Who will pay for the additional people needed in public services in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area? If additional people are not hired, what will be the impacts on the already rising crime rate and burdened health care system?

RESPONSE: The additional personnel required under baseline conditions would be supported under existing programs. If additional personnel were not hired, service levels, as measured by the number of personnel per 1,000 population, would decrease from 6.5 to 6.4 in the City of Jacksonville. This reduction in personnel per 1000 population will not greatly affect the city's ability to provide public safety and health services.

50 52 ISSUE: Of the new jobs created in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area, will these jobs be skilled or unskilled positions? Does the community have the necessary skills to support this effort?
RESPONSE: During the construction phase, the direct employment would generally be for skilled workers, although some unskilled labor would also be required. Approximately 80 percent of the direct, civilian worker, and secondary jobs created by the program would be filled from the local labor market.

ISSUE: Will the new jobs created in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area be paid minimum wage only or better?

RESPONSE: See EIS Sections 4.2.1 through 4.12.1.

ISSUE: What secondary jobs in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area will the project create? What is the creation of secondary jobs based on?

RESPONSE: Secondary job creation is assumed to be across all sectors of the local economy and is based on respending of program-generated income in the local economy.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force pay for the costs incurred by the increased demands in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area on potable water treatment, wastewater, and solid and hazardous waste?

RESPONSE: The Air Force contracts with the City of Jacksonville for potable water and wastewater treatment and private firms for waste disposal. No new facilities would be required to provide the service, and the fees paid for these services should cover any increased costs associated with meeting the new demands.

ISSUE: Will the proposed increases in diesel fuel demand cause shortages in the country and drive prices up? Where will the fuel come from? Will this use impact whatever local area you stop in? Will accidents and spills increase because of an increase in traffic from hauling in the fuel?

RESPONSE: The Air Force will purchase diesel fuel through contracts with local suppliers. These purchases are not anticipated to affect the supply and price. The Air Force will be revising the Spill Prevention and Response Plan for each installation to include new procedures necessary to react to any mishaps associated with the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

ISSUE: What are the environmental impacts of moving the seven existing onbase facilities, the conventional weapons storage area, and especially the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO) and its hazardous waste storage area at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas as discussed in Draft EIS Page 4.8-21?

RESPONSE: The relocation of these facilities will be accomplished in accordance with Air Force construction and environmental regulations. The environmental impacts are discussed in EIS Section 4.8.

ISSUE: If the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO) at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas is relocated, where will the hazardous wastes be disposed? Will this facility comply with the right-to-know laws?

RESPONSE: The DRMO will be relocated to another site onbase and will continue to store the waste prior to shipment to Environmental Protection Agency approved treatment and disposal facilities. Also see response to Document 50, Comment 30.
ISSUE: Commentor thinks that with the recent drought and groundwater levels dropping steadily in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area, any increased water usage should be considered significant. Will additional studies be conducted in the area using more current data?

RESPONSE: According to the U.S. Geological Survey in Little Rock, Arkansas groundwater declines are prevalent in the rice-growing areas of Lonoke County, 5 to 10 miles east of Jacksonville. The Jacksonville Water Department reports little decline in its wells in recent years. The amount of water needed to support the Rail Garrison program is relatively minor, approximately 180 acre-ft/yr, and will be supplied primarily from Jacksonville's water system. This 3 percent increase in water use in the Jacksonville system is not expected to materially affect groundwater availability in the area. No additional water supply studies are planned in support of this program (see EIS Section 4.8.7).

ISSUE: Will farmers in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area be compensated when they are no longer able to pump water to irrigate their crops?

RESPONSE: This program is not expected to materially diminish groundwater supplies available to local farmers. Therefore, no need for compensation is anticipated (see EIS Section 4.8.7).

ISSUE: What will the extra water on the project be used for?

RESPONSE: Of the approximately 180 acre-ft/yr of water needed for long-term operations of the program at Little Rock AFB, 24 acre-ft/yr or 13 percent would be used for office workers and system support at Little Rock AFB. The remaining 87 percent would be used to meet the domestic water needs of the estimated 426 new workers and dependents who will move into the area as a result of the program (see EIS Section 4.8.7.3).

ISSUE: What would be the effects of an earthquake on the garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas?

RESPONSE: Earthquakes at Little Rock AFB have been addressed under EIS Sections 3.9.4 and 4.8.8.2. Structures constructed for the proposed program would be designed with consideration given to the maximum credible event. The occurrence of an earthquake and potential environmental effects of the program have also been addressed as a separate issue in Safety under EIS Section 5.2.3.

ISSUE: Should an earthquake occur, what safeguards will protect the public from radioactive material and other hazardous materials?

RESPONSE: No radioactive or hazardous material release risk is expected from the effect of an earthquake (see EIS Section 5.2.3).

ISSUE: If an earthquake damages the rails such that the trains could not be deployed from the garrison, will the missile be launched at the garrison site? What would be the impact of launch?

RESPONSE: Issues of intentional launch of the missile are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: What if the missile fails to fire, or if the rocket does ignite, strays off course? And even if the rails are not damaged, would the missile be launched from the garrison site anyway (upon orders)?

RESPONSE: Issues of intentional launch of the missile are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What training will be given to local and state agencies? Who will pay for this training?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: Who will pay if the public needs to be evacuated for any reason? What would be the impacts of evacuations on the local economy? Will the loss of business and crops be compensated?

RESPONSE: Requests for compensation for damage or loss involving an Air Force activity will be evaluated in accordance with Air Force regulations.

ISSUE: How will the spread of chemical and/or nuclear contamination be controlled? Who will pay for current and future medical bills if the public inhales or ingests nuclear material?

RESPONSE: Control of chemical and/or nuclear contamination from an accident would depend on such factors as terrain, geology, and meteorological conditions and the manpower and equipment available. See the discussion in EIS Section 5.5. The question of damages to injured parties in case of an accident is beyond the scope of this EIS. Requests for compensation for personal injuries involving an Air Force activity will be evaluated in accordance with Air Force regulations.

ISSUE: Will the civilian employees and railroad crews be trained in accident/incident response?

RESPONSE: The personnel training programs will include appropriate emergency response procedure training. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: In a national emergency, will the civilian pilots be overruled on rail safety matters and operating practices?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 78.

ISSUE: Who will monitor the trains during normal operating conditions?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 78.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force submit to any ruling or judgment against them on bad rail practices or rule/law infractions?

RESPONSE: Yes. Appropriate disciplinary action will be taken against Air Force personnel who violate the law or are derelict in the performance of their military duties.

ISSUE: In the State of Arkansas, what are the chances of a grade crossing collision between the train and other vehicles? Has this problem been looked into on a state-by-state basis?
The chances of a grade crossing collision were considered in the safety analysis using rail incident data provided by the Federal Railroad Administration. The national rail network averages were used in the safety analysis; regional differences in reported rail incidents were judged not to be substantially different from the national averages.

**ISSUE:** What are the details of the training to be given to the operating crew? Will trainees drive the train? Who will design and develop these courses? What retraining requirements will there be? How often will new personnel come onboard? How long will it take these personnel to be fully qualified? Will civilian employees and train crew members be trained?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 15, Comment 5.

**ISSUE:** What hazardous materials will be used or generated by the Rail Garrison?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 33, Comment 68.

**ISSUE:** Will the local public safety and health officials receive the Material Safety Data Sheets listing all hazardous wastes associated with the Rail Garrison program?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 50, Comment 30.

**ISSUE:** If a blizzard stops a train, will an explosive hazard zone be established? If yes, how will this be done? Will any of the local population that falls in this zone be relocated?

**RESPONSE:** If it becomes necessary to stop the train for natural causes such as a blizzard, relocation of local personnel would be evaluated. If relocation is carried out, it would be accomplished considering federal, state, and local disaster plans and regulations.

**ISSUE:** Will the Air Force compensate businesses or farmers for loss of income if a blizzard requires establishment of an explosive safety zone and relocation of the local population?

**RESPONSE:** In the extremely remote situation where natural causes such as a blizzard stop the train and it becomes necessary to relocate local population, compensation for damages and loss involving this Air Force activity would be evaluated in accordance with Air Force regulations.

**ISSUE:** Why aren't man-made disasters addressed, such as collisions by other trains, sabotage, or plane crashes?

**RESPONSE:** The accident statistics used in the safety analysis for the EIS are collected by the Federal Railroad Administration. They include all accidents causing more than a certain monetary level of damage to railroad equipment (approximately $5,000). The accident rate used for the analysis thus includes collision with other trains, vandalism which leads to serious accidents, and derailment caused by sabotage. Plane crashes are analyzed in EIS Section 5.3.2. Also see EIS Sections 5.2.1.1 and 5.3.1.1 for the rail accident data used in this analysis.

**ISSUE:** What is the environmental impact of fuel leakage during refueling or maintenance?
RESPONSE: All refueling and maintenance facilities will be designed to capture any release of fluids and these fluids will be disposed of in an environmentally safe manner.

50 81 ISSUE: What are the chances of an accident during maintenance?

RESPONSE: The probability and consequences of accidents during maintenance were considered. The probability of such accidents is so low compared to the probability of transportation accidents that they do not contribute substantially to the total risk.

50 82 ISSUE: How will the environment be protected from runoff of spilled material?

RESPONSE: If it ever becomes necessary, runoff from a spill will be contained to the extent possible using the materials and equipment available at the time. Because there is no way to be sure it can be contained, the environmental impacts of spills are described in EIS Chapter 5.

50 83 ISSUE: Because water is incompatible with many of the missile components, what will be used for fire fighting or spill control?

RESPONSE: Though water would not be an effective fire fighting substance, it could be used to prevent the spread of the fire or to extinguish secondary fires. There is no substantial risk from using water on or in the vicinity of missile components, for either fire or spill control.

50 84 ISSUE: If spilled toxic material gets into the local creeks and rivers, how will this impact the wildlife? Who will clean up this problem?

RESPONSE: The release of toxic substances into aquatic habitats would adversely affect wildlife including increased mortality and disruption of feeding and reproductive behavior. The extent of the impact on wildlife would be dependent upon the quantity of toxic substance released, the toxicity of the substance, and the susceptibility of the wildlife species affected. The Air Force will be responsible for cleaning up toxic substance spills that originate on Air Force installations or from Air Force equipment such as the Peacekeeper train. This will be done in accordance with the National Contingency Plan published by the Environmental Protection Agency in 1985 and currently being reissued to reflect the amendments made under the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 and Executive Order 12580.

50 85 ISSUE: What are the chances of a high explosive detonation? What are the toxicological effects of the nonnuclear materials in the warhead?

RESPONSE: It is assumed that the question asks about an explosion of the high explosive (nonnuclear) in the warhead. They are insensitive high explosives which tolerate strong shock and high temperatures without detonating. As a result, such an explosion is a much less likely cause of radioactive material dispersal than a missile propellant fire or explosion. The missile and warhead contain metals and plastics which would produce toxic gases if burned. In the event of a fire involving the missile, the toxic effects of nitrogen oxides and hydrochloric acid would overwhelm other toxic gases. The toxic effects of those gases are described in Section 5.4 of the EIS.
ISSUE: Because most of the operations will be in rural areas in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area, will local law enforcement agencies be able to handle the security required? When and how will they be trained? Who will train them? What kind of training will they receive? Who will pay for this training and who will pay for the use of these officials in an emergency?

RESPONSE: The operational Peacekeeper trains would only be on commercial tracks when directed to disperse by a higher authority. If trains were dispersed, Air Force security personnel would deploy with the trains. Security personnel would react to threats as necessary. If an accident involving a Peacekeeper train, airplane, or truck carrying missiles or components should occur, the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would respond and assume responsibility of the cleanup from whatever local response agencies that initially arrived. DOD and EPA would deploy teams specially trained and equipped to deal with any contingency. They would also obtain assistance from other federal or local agencies as necessary. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 10.

ISSUE: If crime, riots, etc., arise because of the program in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area, how will these problems be handled?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 30, Comment 86.

ISSUE: Regarding Draft EIS Appendix A, will studies be conducted on the air, ground, water, and animal and plant life at all proposed sites to establish baseline data for such chemicals such as nitrogen, nitrate, nitrous acid, ammonia, sulfide, sulfites, methane, organic halogen, and chloroform?

RESPONSE: No such monitoring is planned regarding water or air quality. The Air Force does not anticipate conducting detailed studies at the proposed sites in order to establish baseline data for nitrogen, nitrate, nitrous acid, ammonia, sulfide, sulfites, methane, organic halogen, and chloroform, nor for natural and man-made radioactive elements such as rubidium, strontium 90, cesium, iodine, cobalt, and tritium. However, the flora and fauna of the proposed sites have been characterized and documented.

ISSUE: Regarding Draft EIS Appendix A, will the Air Force perform continuous monitoring at all sites to look for changes and trends in chemical baseline data?

RESPONSE: No such monitoring is needed.

ISSUE: Regarding Draft EIS Appendix A, will the Air Force conduct studies on the air, ground, water, and animal and plant life at all proposed sites to establish baseline data on natural and man-made sources of radiation and radioactive elements such as rubidium, Strontium 90, cesium, iodine, cobalt, and tritium?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 88.

ISSUE: Regarding Draft EIS Appendix A, will baseline data and continuous trend monitoring be conducted at all sites for gross alpha and beta radiation emissions from natural and man-made sources?
RESPONSE: No such monitoring is needed.

50 92 ISSUE: Regarding Draft EIS Appendix A, will the Air Force establish continuous monitoring at all sites for oil and grease contamination of the ground and water?

RESPONSE: Many of the bases routinely monitor for oil and grease concentrations downstream of runways and flight operations areas. No additional monitoring of this type will be carried out for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

50 93 ISSUE: Regarding Draft EIS Appendix A, will the Air Force set maximum limits on chemicals, elements, and materials? What will the environmental impacts be of exceeding the limits that are set?

RESPONSE: No. The Air Force Occupational Safety and Health and Environmental Protection Programs use established Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards to monitor and prevent occupational exposures in the workplace and applicable Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards to preserve the quality of the environment on our installations. If an incident should occur, where a release to the environment is possible, investigative actions to determine the impact will be in concert with EPA, state, and local regulatory authorities.

50 94 ISSUE: Regarding Draft EIS Appendix A, will the Air Force monitor the workplace and surrounding environment for beryllium and beryllium compound contamination as well as chromates and hydrazine? What are the environmental impacts of exceeding established limits?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 93.

50 95 ISSUE: During welding activities at the sites, especially when welding stainless steel components, will the Air Force monitor the environment for ozone production and for chromium and nickel compounds?

RESPONSE: Yes, Welding by products are routinely monitored to protect our workers from any occupational exposures. Also see response to Document 50, Comment 93.

50 96 ISSUE: Should an accident involving extremely flammable materials occur with one of the MX trains nearby, could the missile cars withstand the force of the LP gas explosion and resulting fire? Could the heat from such a fire cause the rocket's solid or liquid fuel to ignite? What would be the environmental impact of such a combined disaster? How could fire fighters cope with such a problem?

RESPONSE: The probability of a series of events such that components of the Peacekeeper train (e.g., the missile car) could be damaged by accidents involving volatile materials associated with a nearby facility or train is extremely remote. Nevertheless, the EIS (Chapter 5) described the environmental and human health effect of such an event.

50 97 ISSUE: Will the Air Force place LP gas tank cars or any other type of rail cars carrying hazardous materials on an MX train to make it look real?

RESPONSE: No.
ISSUE: Even though preventive maintenance of the garrison's rail cars is planned, will that extra maintenance be performed on the other rail cars which may be used?

RESPONSE: Maintenance will be performed on all rolling stock used on the Peacekeeper trains.

ISSUE: Will the garrison train crews be allowed to take drugs to keep the crews alert, such as Dexedrine and Seconal, during the dispersal runs and heightened tensions?

RESPONSE: No. Also see response to Document 15, Comment 4.

ISSUE: How often will the crews be relieved? How will this be accomplished when the garrison is dispersed?

RESPONSE: No problem with fatigue is anticipated. Operational Peacekeeper trains will have sufficient crew members onboard to perform the required duties during dispersal.

ISSUE: How can the Air Force say for sure that they will be able to clean up any contamination from accidents involving a nuclear warhead when post accidental contamination is still present in the world?

RESPONSE: Cleanup would be to acceptable levels, as defined by Environmental Protection Agency. Responsible Air Force, railroad, and civilian authorities will be notified and corrective actions will be taken. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: How would the Air Force attempt to clean up a nuclear warhead accident?

RESPONSE: The methods used would depend on the local conditions, the extent of contamination, etc. A general description of possible methods is included in Section 5.5.2 of the EIS.

ISSUE: Can any radioactive materials or contamination enter the food chain?

RESPONSE: The safety analysis done for the EIS includes calculation of the incorporation of radioactive materials into the food chain and resulting human exposure. The contribution to the total risk from that possibility is very small because the predominant radioactive material that would be dispersed, plutonium dioxide, is relatively insoluble and very little would enter the food chain.

ISSUE: What is the toxicologic effect of ingesting or inhaling plutonium?

RESPONSE: The toxicological effects of ingesting or inhaling plutonium include deposition in the lung, liver, and bone with resulting disease including the induction of cancer. However, the toxic effect is negligible compared to the radiation risk.

ISSUE: What is the half-life of plutonium and other nuclear material in the warhead? What elements will the nuclear materials decay to? Will these daughter products be toxic also?
RESPONSE: Plutonium 239 has a half-life of 24,390 years. The other radioactive materials in the warhead and plutonium decay daughter products contribute insignificant levels of radiation exposure and toxicity risks compared to the plutonium. Analysis of the risks as though only plutonium was dispersed in EIS Chapter 5 adequately quantifies the risk.

51 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

52 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

53 ISSUE: Commentor supports deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri. The economic impact of the program and additional diversification of people coming to the area would be a benefit to Warrensburg, Johnson County, and the surrounding area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

54 ISSUE: Commentor supports the removal of all nuclear weapons because of religious beliefs.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

55 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program, sees no adverse effect on the environment which cannot be controlled and believes the central location of Whiteman AFB, Missouri is an ideal location for deployment of the system.

RESPONSE: Noted.

56 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to placing Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan because the commentor does not like the trains on the state's commercial tracks; increased danger of sabotage, terrorism, and accident; and the negative impact on the environment.

RESPONSE: Noted.

56 ISSUE: What happens to the program if a new arms control agreement is signed?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

57 ISSUE: Commentor enclosed various pieces of literature in support of his opinion that nuclear weapons are unjustifiable and it is a crime against humanity to develop or deploy them.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

58 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
59 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

60 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because the base is designed to accommodate more active duty personnel, work ethic is strong, quality of life is excellent, and attitude toward military presence is very supportive.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

61 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

62 1 ISSUE: West Plains Association of Cities (Washington) supports the results of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison EIS. The report is environmentally and economically balanced reflecting a fair and accurate report of the facts.

RESPONSE: Noted.

63 1 ISSUE: It is not ethical to spend so much money, resources, and time on a project which ultimately does not keep peace, but robs human development and the environment.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

64 1 ISSUE: Statement in support of Rail Garrison at Whiteman AFB, Missouri. No significant problems foreseen in changes of wetlands, and the economic base would be enhanced in Henry County.

RESPONSE: Section 4.11.6.3 of the EIS provides a discussion on the impacts to wetlands at Whiteman AFB. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

65 1 ISSUE: Public hearing should have been held at several locations in Missouri.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

65 2 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to address the economic impacts on tourism.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 4.

65 3 ISSUE: You must consider the environmental impacts of a first strike.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

66 1 ISSUE: Statement and resolution from the City of Clinton, Missouri in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Whiteman AFB because of positive economic impacts and excellent community support.

RESPONSE: Noted.
ISSUE: The system would make the Midwest an even more likely target. Statements make reference to a report on Rail Garrison basing mode, its trains and movements. System violates the Geneva Convention and has the intention to violate the Salt II Treaty. System will destabilize START talks and decrease national security. System inconsistent with United States negotiating position. Need to pursue policies to enhance security through mutual, verifiable agreements to halt and reverse the arms race.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The effects of deployment on civil defense as system is dispersed need to be addressed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: The system is a threat to life, our foreign policy, and how safe is it?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1. Safety is addressed in EIS Chapter 5.

ISSUE: Since train tracks are easily destroyed, why not put these weapons on trucks and use the road system.

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: Statement from Johnson County Commission in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison deployment at Whiteman AFB, Missouri for its strategic location and the added economy the base will generate.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Statement for the record in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system at Whiteman AFB, Missouri because of the base's location and accessibility, most of the impacts would not be significant, and there would be economic benefits.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor endorses the Draft EIS for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program because it is an effective product and provides anyone with the totality of information needed to make an enlightened decision on the program.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the efforts of the Armed Forces in their attempts and successes in maintaining proper balance of world power in order to preserve world peace.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports and endorses the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Whiteman AFB, Missouri because of positive community support, good base relations, and strong positive economic impact.

RESPONSE: Noted.
ISSUE: Commentor supports the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor feels the Rail Garrison program would be an asset to the area and would be welcomed by the citizens.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison facility at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Statement for the record supporting the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Whiteman AFB, Missouri because of its strategic location, its accessibility, and the continued added economy the base generates.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program and suggests a comprehensive test ban treaty. Also has concerns of national security.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: We should decrease, not increase, bombs as, in fact, we and the Soviets are dismantling bombs. Putting more bombs on rail increases the chance of accidents.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Whiteman AFB, Missouri because the area already has the Minuteman missile and the Stealth bomber is coming and because the Peacekeeper is too costly.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor thinks the railroads are not safe enough to handle the system. They should be put on submarines instead. Peacekeeper would be safer in submarines than the railroads.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Why has the Air Force restricted its investigation of environmental impact issues to only the area immediately surrounding the proposed bases, specifically Whiteman AFB, Missouri?

RESPONSE: Environmental impacts are evaluated in the areas where program induced effects of any magnitude may be expected to occur. At Whiteman AFB, as with all candidate bases, the region of influence will only extend outward from the base, a certain distance. Since no impacts are expected to be experienced beyond this distance, an investigation outside the ROI is not necessary. Nationwide impacts are discussed for relevant issues such as socioeconomics, transportation, and safety. See EIS Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 and Chapter 5.
82 2 ISSUE: Why were there no hearings held in any areas except at the proposed sites?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

82 3 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not address the human factor, i.e., issue of human fallibility.

RESPONSE: See Section 5.1.2 of the EIS.

82 4 ISSUE: What number of people would constitute a reasonable amount as expendable in an accident in order to implement this system?

RESPONSE: People are not expendable. Our American tradition places great value on human life. Safety has been, and will continue to be, the primary concern in the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system deployment and operation.

82 5 ISSUE: The Draft EIS barely touches on the environmental impact that would occur should an MX train have an accident in a relatively isolated area or near a vast metropolitan city with millions of people.

RESPONSE: The safety analysis summarized in Chapter 5 of the EIS considers the consequence of accidents at all locations adjacent to the track that the Rail Garrison train might utilize. The greater consequences in populated areas are reflected in the rail unit risk factors which are described in Section 5.4 of the EIS.

82 6 ISSUE: Why did the Draft EIS not examine and address a comparative study on more than 30 basing modes.

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

82 7 ISSUE: Why has the Air Force considered the 100 MX missiles as an alternative when Congress has mandated only 50 missiles?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.1.

82 8 ISSUE: Why has the Air Force not considered the "No Action" Alternative?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

82 9 ISSUE: Why do we need a land-based mobile system when we already have the Trident submarine program?

RESPONSE: To ensure a high degree of survivability of our nuclear deterrent, the United States relies on the Triad system of land, sea, and air-based nuclear assets. The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is in response to the country's need to modernize the land leg of the Triad.

83 1 ISSUE: Statements from U.S. Senators J. Bennett Johnson and John Breaux supporting the program because it will provide much needed jobs in the Barksdale AFB, Louisiana area and proper mitigation will ensure threatened and endangered species impacts would be minimal.

RESPONSE: Noted.
ISSUE: The Rail Garrison system at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan will disrupt the prime tourist and recreational areas throughout the eastern part of Michigan's outstanding tourist areas.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Concerned that Michigan's whole life support system of air, earth, and water are being held hostage by the military.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Concerned that the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program will impact the water supplies in Michigan -- its lakes and streams.

RESPONSE: Impacts on water supplies are discussed in EIS Section 4.12.7.

ISSUE: Concerned that the wetlands in Michigan and all the fish and wildlife that are dependent on them will be threatened by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Wurtsmith AFB.

RESPONSE: A summary of potential impacts is presented in Table 4.12.6-2 and Section 4.12.6.3 of the EIS. The proposed location of the rail spur would disturb approximately 3.2 acres of wetlands in the Au Sable River floodplain and is the only siting design that would accommodate the special engineering constraints of the program. However, the Air Force would take actions to mitigate this loss (see the Appendix of the EIS).

ISSUE: Concerned that the groundwater supply wells are already vulnerable to contamination from adjacent locations within the principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan area. With the Rail Garrison system, groundwater use would increase by 12 percent which might pull contaminated groundwater into uncontaminated wells and may threaten the health and safety of the citizens of the region and visitors to the area.

RESPONSE: The groundwater contamination problem at the base has been recognized for quite some time and cleanup actions have been extensive. For more than a decade the U.S. Geological Survey has carried out a series of studies, drilling hundreds of monitoring wells to trace the extent of the contamination. Through this effort, several additional groundwater contaminant plumes have been identified. Working with the State of Michigan, the base has constructed two purge-well and groundwater treatment systems with a third scheduled to go into operation in 1989. Expenditures for groundwater cleanup measures at the base have reached $8 million since 1977. Nearly $200,000 is spent annually for monitoring and water testing to assure the quality of the water from the wells currently in use. If monitoring indicates local migration of contaminated groundwater toward production wells, purge well pumping can be increased to help control the extent of contaminant migration. These actions indicate a strong commitment on the part of the Air Force to control and eventually eliminate the contaminated groundwater plumes at Wurtsmith AFB. All of this does not minimize the level and significance of impacts of water resources at the base which have been judged to be low but significant. This, however, would not threaten the water supplies of nearby townships nor the health and welfare of the people who visit this area.
Statement made that the No Action Alternative should be chosen because the military mentality that computes for levels of acceptable losses of human lives does not apply to the civilian population.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Commentor supports project because Missouri is in the center of the United States, the main line of the Union Pacific Railroad is adjacent to the base, land is available for necessary facility construction, and there is public support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

The potential impact of the earthquakes related to the New Madrid fault system in the Blytheville, Arkansas area could conceivably affect the Little Rock AFB area as well. This alone should eliminate Blytheville as a potential site and render Little Rock questionable.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 3, Comment 1 and Document 50, Comment 62.

Commentor states that Little Rock AFB, Arkansas should be an unlikely choice because the frequency of tornados could make tracks impassable and train wrecks more likely.

RESPONSE: Noted.

The Draft EIS fails to consider the extent of the impact the Rail Garrison program would have on the already environmentally stressed Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. The base already has 18 areas that have been contaminated.

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program will not create new areas of contamination on the base.

Commentor states that the defense of the nation should be contracted to some private firm that has a good environmental record and does not depend upon young careless men as the main component of their labor force.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Population growth in the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area has outstripped the areas water supply. Some communities, including Jacksonville, have had to go to outside water supplies in Little Rock and Lonoke County.

RESPONSE: Currently, Jacksonville, which supplies water to Little Rock AFB, receives about 75 percent of its annual 4,560 acre-ft water requirements from the Little Rock city supply. The water sources available to Jacksonville are 3,370 acre-ft/yr from the metropolitan system and 6,130 acre-ft/yr from city wells. This adds up to a total of 9,500 acre-ft/yr. When the program is in full operation in 1993, total water use in Jacksonville is projected to be about 5,600 acre-ft or 59 percent of the supply available to the city. The Jacksonville Water Department has stated that it can readily meet program needs (see EIS Section 4.8.7.3).
87 6 ISSUE: Commentor states that both the military and railway workers in Arkansas have been notorious for their high drug use rates. This could contribute to the high accident rate of train accidents.

RESPONSE: The military crews are not expected to have drug problems. See Section 5.1.2 of the EIS.

87 7 ISSUE: Commentor states that wastewater treatment has been stressed due to the influx of population into the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area.

RESPONSE: The City of Jacksonville has just completed construction of three new wastewater treatment facilities to treat flows from the base and the city's residents. Little Rock AFB contributed to the cost of constructing these facilities and pays for the treatment of their wastes.

87 8 ISSUE: Commentor states that police protection has been stressed due to the influx of population into the Little Rock AFB, Arkansas area.

RESPONSE: There has been a slight reduction in staffing levels recently for the Jacksonville Police Department due to budgetary problems. Local officials believe they are still providing the area with the same level of public safety protection as in the past, although this has required some overtime work by the staff. The population influx associated with the program is not expected to add measurable increases in demand for public safety services.

87 9 ISSUE: Statement made that Arkansas far exceeds the national average for rail accidents and therefore should not be chosen as a Rail Garrison site.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 2.

87 10 ISSUE: Statement made that the MX is unnecessary and is a destabilizing contributor to the possibility of nuclear war and shouldn't be based in Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

88 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison mission at Eaker AFB, Arkansas for its excellent year-round weather that will not shut things down and the patriotic citizens who are interested in peace, freedom, and a strong defense.

RESPONSE: Noted.

89 1 ISSUE: The EIS should address the consequences of a collision with another train at the time the missile is ready to be launched.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

89 2 ISSUE: The environmental analysis for a catastrophic accident should include the number of citizens who would be impacted and how they are affected by the worst possible disaster. In other words, describe the type of destruction possible at different distances from the disaster site.

RESPONSE: The consequences to persons, plants, and animals at various distances from a fire or explosion are described in detail in Section 5.4 of the EIS.
ISSUE: The environmental impacts at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan will be detrimental to wetlands in the Au Sable River watershed and Van Etten Lake areas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 84, Comment 4.

ISSUE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is not feasible.

RESPONSE: In the past, the Air Force wanted to deploy a portion of its land-based missile force in a mobile mode, but the guidance system technology would not allow it. This was solved by the late 1970s and several mobile basing modes were examined, including the Rail Garrison basing mode. The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison mode is not only feasible, but also allows the United States to reap the advantages of the world's most accurate ICBM.

ISSUE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is a first-strike weapon.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The entire rail system would be at risk in case of an actual attack which would endanger all shipping of necessary goods.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the nonexpansion of defense and deterrent atomic weapons and urges that the Peacekeeper missile system be discontinued as an unwarranted expense for national security.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor states first-strike capabilities of the Peacekeeper missile are not addressed in the Draft EIS. The United States strategy has resulted in the arms race which includes first-strike capabilities as with the Peacekeeper missile.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The MX cannot be allowed in Missouri because of moral and spiritual convictions.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: If tax dollars are spent at the Pentagon and with the Peacekeeper, where is the money needed for environmental problems such as nuclear waste, industrial waste, erosion, etc.?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The jobs are largely for males and do not create a product, or service human needs. Therefore, no taxes are paid, and mental and educational programs suffer.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: It was said 18.5 percent fewer accidents occurred on railroads this year. Where was that number taken from?
RESPONSE: As reported in the revised Chapter 5 of the EIS, the rail accident rate per million miles traveled for the years 1983-1987 were: 1983 - 5.11; 1984 - 4.84; 1985 - 4.28; 1986 - 3.64; and 1987 - 3.45. The average five year period of rates, or 4.27, is now used to calculate the probability of an accident involving a Peacekeeper train. The 1987 rate is 14.8 percent lower than the average for the five years.

92 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota for its substantial benefits to the economy, defense, and deterrence.

RESPONSE: Noted.

93 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota for its economic benefit, no risk to the community and environment, and the need for diversity and flexibility in our strategic defenses.

RESPONSE: Noted.

94 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Peace through strength.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

95 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the system at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota. Excellent defense system with its mobility and has many positive impacts for the area.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

96 1 ISSUE: Resolution from Grand Forks County Board of Commissioners in support of Grand Fork AFB, North Dakota being chosen as a deployment site for the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

97 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

98 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system near Grand Forks, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

99 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Rail Garrison project at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota for economic benefits that can be generated by construction services required of such a project.

RESPONSE: Noted.

100 1 ISSUE: Commentor in full support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because it is a cost-effective mobile system, will increase deterrent capabilities, and strengthen business in the community.

RESPONSE: Noted.

2 ISSUE: Resolution from Polk County (Minnesota) Board of Commissioners in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because it will promote world peace and have a strong, positive effect on the local economy.

RESPONSE: Noted.

3 ISSUE: Resolution for the record in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because it is highly mobile, survivable, and a cost-effective deterrent for the national defense. Grand Forks has an extensive rail system, land, and people to deploy this system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

4 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the project because the "No Action Alternative" is the only realistic option available.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 ISSUE: During wartime, isn't playing hide and seek with ICBMs endangering and not protecting United States citizens.

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

6 ISSUE: The Draft EIS deliberately limited the scope of the document to eliminate controversial topics.

RESPONSE: Controversial topics were discussed in the EIS when it involved disagreement among recognized professionals over environmental impacts or assessment methods. Possible controversy over the purpose, need, or desirability of the program are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

7 ISSUE: The EIS needs to look at the effects of the system on human psychology.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

8 ISSUE: The EIS should look at impacts (social) that death row inmates have on their environment and how this relates to the social impacts of the project on people.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

9 ISSUE: MX missiles garrisoned at Fairchild AFB, Washington would make Spokane County a general target area.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
104 7 ISSUE: The EIS should look at wartime effects of the system.

RESPONSE: Issues of wartime effects are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

104 8 ISSUE: Commentor dislikes the name Peacekeeper.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

104 9 ISSUE: Commentor feels the threat to our vulnerability of all land-based missiles is not real. Why should I pay for this protection?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

104 10 ISSUE: Fairchild AFB, Washington should not be chosen because of impacts on wetlands, Swainson's hawk, ferruginous hawks, and the great blue heron.

RESPONSE: Impacts on biological resources at Fairchild AFB are addressed in EIS Section 4.6.6.3.

104 11 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to adequately assess program impacts to plant and animal communities, because it does not address the effects of a nuclear explosion.

RESPONSE: Nuclear explosion effects are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

104 12 ISSUE: The operation scenario (Draft EIS Page 1-11) never addresses the launching of a missile.

RESPONSE: The issue of intentional launching of the missile is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

104 13 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not analyze the health effects of incoming missiles, nor is there an analysis of the effects of outgoing missiles on a Soviet city.

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

104 14 ISSUE: The EIS needs an in-depth analysis of the effects of bombing of Spokane, Washington or the USSR.

RESPONSE: The issue of the effects of nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

105 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the system being situated anywhere and also opposed because the system won't move until it is too late.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

106 1 ISSUE: The railway is in bad condition in Michigan. The Air Force should do an inspection.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 2.
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107 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the system. Believes the system is antiquated and therefore represents a waste of tax dollars and will place a drain on the economy. Present missile system is adequate to meet defense needs.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

107 2 ISSUE: The EIS fails to address the psychological impacts of the Peacekeeper missile.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

107 3 ISSUE: The effects of a nuclear accident are inadequately addressed in the EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 21, Comment 1.

107 4 ISSUE: Commentor objects to hearings only being held in one location when other areas with rail lines would also be impacted.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

108 1 ISSUE: Commentor urges a thorough environmental impact study by local scientists of the disturbance of the red-cockaded woodpecker colonies in the forest in the Barksdale AFB, Louisiana area.

RESPONSE: In compliance with a recommendation of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Lafayette, Louisiana Field Office), a survey was conducted in the spring of 1988 by a qualified wildlife biologist to determine whether suitable habitat for the red-cockaded woodpecker is present on Barksdale AFB. The results of the survey indicate that some suitable (although not prime) habitat is present in the upland pine forest on the eastern side of the base; however, no individuals of the species were observed. Facilities for the proposed Rail Garrison program have been sited in areas of bottomland hardwood forest on the western side of the base. Therefore, this program will not have any impacts on red-cockaded woodpeckers or potential habitat.

109 1 ISSUE: Texas Governor's Office of Budget and Planning provides list of Draft EIS review participants.

RESPONSE: Noted.

110 1 ISSUE: Commentor strongly supports the development of Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

111 1 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that 244 acres of jack pine forest in the Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan area will be devastated as a result of the deployment of the MX Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: The potential impact is discussed in Section 4.12.6.3 of the EIS.

111 2 ISSUE: Commentor is concerned about the disruption of 437 acres of undeveloped land including wetlands as a result of the project at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.
ISSUE: Commentor is concerned about the contamination of the shallow aquifer supplying water to Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan, and the townships of Oscoda and Au Sable, due to the expanded water usage demanded by the missile system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 84, Comment 4.

ISSUE: Commentor states that the program increases the likelihood of a nuclear accident and/or a nuclear exchange, is vulnerable to attack, and a waste of taxpayer's money.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 84, Comment 5.

ISSUE: Commentor opposes the project because it represents a threat to life, both nuclear and environmental, is too costly, and money could be better spent on the real problems of the global community.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the No Action Alternative.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The First America Bank in Michigan is in the planning stage of providing the funds necessary to build the housing required to correct the housing shortage identified in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the project because it is in defiance of international law and is a crime against God and humanity.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Statement by the local governmental units of Eastern Iosco County, Michigan clarifying the current status of the proposal within the Department of Defense and to note the urgency of expediting current and associated reviews and approvals associated with Wurtsmith AFB participation in a regional water system.

RESPONSE: The EIS has identified a significant groundwater impact at Wurtsmith AFB due to increased reliance for water supply on a locally contaminated shallow aquifer underlying the base. One mitigation measure to avoid this impact would be for the base to switch to an alternate water source. Participation in the proposed Lake Huron regional supply system would mitigate this ground water impact as identified in EIS Section 4.12.7.3. Also see response to Document 84, Comment 5.

ISSUE: Charter Township of Oscoda in support of the project at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan because the mission is critical to our free society and lifestyle.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
116 1 ISSUE: Commentor feels that the MX missile system is designed to fight a nuclear war and not for nuclear deterrence. Has the government changed its policy on nuclear deterrence?

RESPONSE: The policy of the United States government has not changed with regard to deterrence of nuclear war. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

116 2 ISSUE: Comment made that it is not sensible to choose a crowded area such as the Midland-Bay City-Saginaw, Michigan area with 250,000 people as a potential deployment site for launching nuclear missiles.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

116 3 ISSUE: Will the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency hold a hearing on this EIS? Who will act on it and decide the alternative?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 27.

116 4 ISSUE: Statement made that the building of bridges across streams is known to severely degrade the stream quality. In the analysis for Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan, has this been considered and provided for so that long-term sedimentation does not occur at the railroad bridges to be built?

RESPONSE: Should bridges be constructed, water quality impacts can be avoided if construction proceeds during periods of little or no flow. All bridges will be built to pass flood flows and no long-duration water quality impacts are expected to result from the bridges.

117 1 ISSUE: If the Rail Garrison system has negligible chances of explosion, why is there a large safety area on the base where they will be housed?

RESPONSE: As a general precaution at all Air Force bases, explosive safety zones provide safe distance between places where explosives (including rocket propellants) are stored or processed and other specified locations, such as inhabited buildings, public traffic routes, recreational areas, utilities, petroleum storage facilities, and storage or processing facilities for other explosives.

118 1 ISSUE: Has it been shown that the 125,000 or more miles of commercial railroads will be able to safely handle these missile cars, which are much heavier than normal cars and at 70-plus feet long are a third longer than the usual 55 feet for a normal car.

RESPONSE: Most commercial rail track in the United States currently can accommodate trains composed of rail cars that approximate the size and weight of the Rail Garrison cars. Also see response to Document 24, Comment 2.

118 2 ISSUE: How has it been shown that a deployment time of two to six hours could be in any way survivable or even effective when Soviet ICBMs attack 30 minutes after launch?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
118 3 ISSUE: Why hasn't the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR), at least on a local or district level, been contacted or notified about the Rail Garrison proposal at Wurtsmith AFB?

RESPONSE: The Air Force began coordinating with the Michigan DNR as soon as Rail Garrison facility siting plans for Wurtsmith AFB became available (early 1988). The Air Force contractor, Tetra Tech, was referred to specific offices and individuals for consultation on the various biological issues (e.g., wetlands, sensitive species, habitats). The early consultations with the DNR and siting modifications helped to minimize the potential impacts on biological resources that would result from this program.

118 4 ISSUE: Why would a second rail line be needed, as discussed in Draft EIS Pages 4.12-43 to 46, since it appears to run nearly parallel to the present line? The construction of this new line would be very costly and environmentally damaging.

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.8.

118 5 ISSUE: On Draft EIS, Page 4.12-45, third paragraph it states that "The most western three miles (36 acres) of ROW would be located near the urban area of Midland, Michigan. Specific land use in this area is unknown." Why is nothing known about this area if such a supposedly carefully detailed and complete study was made?

RESPONSE: The question relates to possible dual-rail egress. If the option for construction of a second rail connection is adopted at a later date, appropriate environmental analysis will be accomplished at that time (see EIS Section 1.8).

119 1 ISSUE: Commentor states that nuclear accidents have and will happen.

RESPONSE: Accidents involving nuclear weapons, nuclear generators in satellites, and nuclear power plants have occurred, but no United States nuclear weapon accident has caused even a partial nuclear detonation.

119 2 ISSUE: Commentor states that the Rail Garrison system is the most expensive missile program in American history on a per unit basis.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

119 3 ISSUE: Commentor states that from a public perspective, the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system is frightening and loaded with potential danger. He feels that with this basing mode we have more to worry about from our own Air Force than from Soviet missiles.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

119 4 ISSUE: Commentor assumes that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will conduct the formal public hearings.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 27.

119 5 ISSUE: Commentor feels that the Draft EIS is inadequate because there is little or no data to support the conclusions that the sponsor's proposed action is environmentally safe. Background information on the safety analysis was totally excluded.
RESPONSE: See EIS Chapter 5 which has been revised to clarify several points raised during public hearings.

119 6 ISSUE: What kind of analysis was done on the Draft EIS when statements such as "specific land use in this area is unknown, but there could be a conflict with inhabited buildings on the eastern edge of town" were made?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 118, Comment 5.

119 7 ISSUE: On Draft EIS Page 4.0-2, it is very fuzzy on which state and local environmental laws will be followed. Which Environmental Protection Agency, state and environmental regulations will be impacted by your actions? Will you comply with them or not?

RESPONSE: Generally, activities undertaken by the federal government are not subject to state regulation or control unless the Congress specifically invites that regulation and control. However, the Air Force will cooperate with the appropriate agencies to meet their requirements to the extent possible.

119 8 ISSUE: In regard to the performance of the missile cars in the event of a possible accident, an actual test of the safety of the cars in the worst-case scenario should be conducted. A computer simulation is not acceptable.

RESPONSE: The design certification process includes testing as applicable to assure all requirements are met. Computer simulation for purposes of accident risk assessment is an acceptable procedure.

119 9 ISSUE: When will the missile cars be moved?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.3.6.

119 10 ISSUE: What evacuation plans have you prepared and discussed with local communities in Michigan?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

119 11 ISSUE: What training will be provided to local fire departments in the Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan area for handling radiation mixed with lethal plumes of gases?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

119 12 ISSUE: What rail restrictions will you follow in moving the trains both back to the home base and when loaded with the nuclear weapons? At what speeds will you move these trains, and what quality of track will you move on?

RESPONSE: All track segments used to support the dispersed movement of Peacekeeper trains will be of the quality needed to ensure the safety of the train, crew and public. Civilian pilots, thoroughly familiar with the track and all other aspects of the route will be on board each Peacekeeper train. No unique restriction will be imposed on the train and speeds will be established to conform with routine railroad procedures as outlined by the Federal Railroad Administration.
119 13 ISSUE: What is the quality of the Detroit and Mackinac track servicing Oscoda and the remainder of that line? How will you handle the oversized cars?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 118, Comment 1.

119 14 ISSUE: How will you decommission the missiles, trains, and garrison facilities?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

119 15 ISSUE: When the system is decommissioned, how will you handle contaminated equipment and earth?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

119 16 ISSUE: Statement made that the Draft EIS is full of comments about computer simulations. Commentor asks where is the output of the computer simulations and what assumptions did you make to run the models?

RESPONSE: The output from the various computer simulations have been used in the analysis of impacts and are summarized in Chapters 4 (Affected Environments and Environmental Consequences) and 5 (Safety Considerations). Assumptions used in performing these simulations are referenced in Chapter 3 (Environmental Analysis Methods) and Chapter 5 (Safety Consideration) as appropriate.

119 17 ISSUE: Statement made that key sections of the Draft EIS gloss over decommissioning and transportation of the weapons by hiding behind references to non-Department of Defense agencies.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

120 1 ISSUE: Commentor called the Draft EIS consideration of the No Action Alternative feeble. States that National Environmental Policy Act requirements to "identify alternatives as to their beneficial and detrimental effects on the environmental elements, specifically taking into account the alternative of No Action" were not met.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

120 2 ISSUE: As a railroad system, what does the MX Rail Garrison produce, and what if anything does it contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity? More than 380 congressional districts will experience net losses in both capital resources and jobs. Every job involved with the Rail Garrison program will be offset by the loss of one job in the production economy.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

120 3 ISSUE: Statement made that the project is too costly and that the balance of trade deficit is the single-greatest threat to the national security of the United States.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
120 4 ISSUE: Commentor thinks the money spent on the project in Michigan would be better spent on a more productive and efficient rail system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

121 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas because it is highly survivable, low risk, low cost, and fully flexible.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

122 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas because the system is highly reliable, survivable, and the community is supportive.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

123 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

124 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of low cost, reliability, survivability, and location.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

125 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because it would be a practical and geographically advantageous site, and has community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

126 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

127 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

128 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

129 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because the system is highly survivable.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

130 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
131 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of its geography and support of the community.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

132 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because it has a low risk, low cost, and is highly survivable.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

133 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

134 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

135 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of location and community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

136 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

137 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

138 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

139 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

140 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of low cost, high mobility, and community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

141 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

142 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of its location.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support, size and location of the base, and many miles of accessible railroad track.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of its location, effectiveness in administrating new programs, widespread and adequate railway tracks, positive economic impact, and community support.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of the positive economic effect on the Fort Worth area and the entire State of Texas.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support and location.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
154 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of its usefulness as a deterrent.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

155 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because the base meets all Defense Department qualifications and would provide the necessary infrastructure for the system, its geography, and its location.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

156 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of positive economic impacts and community support.

RESPONSE: Noted.

157 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

158 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support and the need for a strong national defense.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

159 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

160 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because the State of Texas supports a strong role in continuing military preparedness.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

161 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of its location, minimal building of new railway lines, adequate space, and community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

162 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

163 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support and the base is strategically located.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

164 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support and location.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
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165 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support, geography, and existing railroad capabilities.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

166 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support and because the area offers all the benefits needed to support the project.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

167 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of its accessibility to 170,000 miles of rail lines and community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

168 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

169 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

170 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

171 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

172 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of a positive economic impact to the State of Texas, climate, and adequate rail lines.

RESPONSE: Noted.

173 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of strong community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

174 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

175 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
176 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

177 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

178 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

179 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

180 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

181 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

182 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of an excellent work force and community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

183 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

184 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support and the good condition of the railroad network in west Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

185 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

186 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support and a need for a strong national defense.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

187 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

188 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of no adverse impacts on the community, additional jobs, and economic boost.

RESPONSE: Noted.

189 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of community support, climate, location, and the low cost of locating the system at Dyess AFB.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

190 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

191 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

192 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

193 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

194 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

195 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

196 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

197 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

198 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

199 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

200 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Resolution supporting the project at Dyess AFB, Texas because of increased employment, diversification of the economy, increased revenue, and community support.
RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because the area is centrally located and has a considerable amount of rail mileage available.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Is there a lease cost imposed on the use of the national rail system by the Air Force?
RESPONSE: Since Peacekeeper trains will operate on the commercial rail network, the Air Force will operate through a track usage fee agreement and structure similar to commercial operations.

ISSUE: Commentor submitted newspaper articles on train accidents in Missouri and asked that we stop this expensive and immoral program.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What is the civil defense plan being considered for this system at Whiteman AFB, Missouri?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 55.

ISSUE: What is considered an adequate defense? We should hold up development of a new weapons system.
RESPONSE: Issues of national defense are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What could be done in our county if we took similar dollars to protect and renew our resources in Johnson and Pettis Counties, Missouri?
RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Air Force should establish a program of peace studies dollars for dollars with defense spending.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
222 1 ISSUE: The notification of hearings was inadequate and the cities and towns along the rail lines should have hearings.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 34, Comments 9 and 11.

222 2 ISSUE: The missile propellants present a hazard in case of derailments in and around populated areas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 30.

222 3 ISSUE: Commentor wants the Missouri soil to give life and not be planned for death.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

222 4 ISSUE: Commentor feels hearings should be held in other cities and towns that will have to be host to the MX as it passes through on practice runs.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

222 5 ISSUE: Our nuclear strategic forces do not need the Peacekeeper in light of such things as the new D-5 missile and the C-4.

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

223 1 ISSUE: Commentor suggested an alternate routing for the connector rail spur for the onbase option at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: The routing of the connector rail spur at Eaker AFB for the onbase option was determined based on required engineering specifications (e.g., degree of track curvature and surface drainage characteristics), including crossing Pemiscot Bayou at right angles to minimize the length of the bridge required to cross the channel. The proposed routing would traverse an area with few inhabited structures and would coincide with property lines where possible, to minimize disruption of current land uses.

224 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to placement of nuclear weapons in any kind of rail system. The money and jobs are not important compared to the death and destruction these weapons can incur.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

224 2 ISSUE: Commentor dislikes the name "Peacekeeper."

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

225 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because of long-term economic benefits and to protect the national security.

RESPONSE: Noted.

226 1 ISSUE: The need for newer aircraft is greater than the need for long-range missiles. Opposes appropriation of $1.4 billion for electronics with the missile program.
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

226 2 ISSUE: Electromagnetic energy densities are now an issue for the Final EIS; e.g., effects on vegetation, air quality, a health hazard issue, and should be an issue for legislative controls.

RESPONSE: The levels of electromagnetic energy which would be generated by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system are lower than those generated by many common commercial sources. While the human health effects of high energy electromagnetic fields and pulses are being studied, no such effects have been identified as an expected consequence of this system as currently proposed. Therefore, no analysis of that issue is included in the EIS.

226 3 ISSUE: Foreign countries are leading the United States in many areas of electronic technology and production. It is also another opportunity for nondomestic companies to place embedded surveillance systems, sneak circuits, hackable hardware, or overrides on our equipment. Please address both the human health hazards of embedded foreign electronic equipment not purchased and used by the Air Force and those purchased and used by the Air Force in the missile program.

RESPONSE: No human health effects have been identified as expected consequences of electromagnetic emissions from equipment used in the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system. It is not expected that embedded surveillance systems and the like will be in the equipment, but they would be suppressed, removed or destroyed whenever detected.

226 4 ISSUE: Would the Air Force support the public right to know and support a warning device about local electronic transmitter or emission sources that are intermittently pulsed, or in continuous operation in communities around missile sites, the health hazard capabilities of each, who owns and operates it, and what purpose it serves in the community whether located on private or public property?

RESPONSE: Any electromagnetic field or pulse sources would be evaluated for safety before being installed. Whether or not information about those sources would be made available to the public would depend on national security and classification considerations.

227 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because of continued base support for the community, the economic benefits and to help keep this country free.

RESPONSE: Noted.

228 1 ISSUE: Commentor expressed concern over rail upkeep, personnel reliability, and sabotage.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

229 1 ISSUE: The Air Force should address the psychological impact upon the population in Cheyenne, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.
ISSUE: Why does the United States need the MX (Peacekeeper)? Don't we already have enough missiles?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Why does the United States need the Rail Garrison program?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How often will the missiles be moved around?

RESPONSE: See EIS Chapter 1.

ISSUE: What will be the impact on the communities they (missile trains) move through?

RESPONSE: The movement of the Peacekeeper train through communities will not be different than a commercial train. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 30.

ISSUE: Will there be local training in case of accidents?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: What security systems will be implemented to safeguard Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and how will these affect the lifestyle of the area?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 7 and 21.

ISSUE: What are the alternatives to Rail Garrison including the No Action option?

RESPONSE: Comparison of alternative basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 37, Comment 15.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because no significant environmental problems are foreseen and the excellent relationship between the base and the community.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Resolution for the record in support of Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota being chosen as a site for the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Resolution for the record in support of Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota being designated as a site for the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
232 1 ISSUE: The psychological environment should be studied as those which affect the physical elements.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

232 2 ISSUE: Opposed to additional weapons that are vulnerable to attack, yet also possess a prompt hard-target kill capability; in other words, a first-strike weapon.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

232 3 ISSUE: Increasing the number and deployment of the Peacekeeper is a destabilizing factor.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

232 4 ISSUE: Questions on environment, such as clean water, clean air, medical and housing should be given priority considerations.

RESPONSE: The EIS equally addresses the elements mentioned and others in regard to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

233 1 ISSUE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison serves to attract barrage attack by the Soviets and saturate tracks and support facilities with nuclear explosions.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

234 1 ISSUE: Testimony given at Great Falls, Montana public hearing opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison deployment for such reasons such as dollars spent on the system, need for the system, limited economic benefits, and production of nuclear weapons is environmentally harmful.

RESPONSE: Noted.

235 1 ISSUE: Commentor in strong support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because we need to keep this country militarily strong to counter Soviet strategy, and the economic benefits with no negative impacts.

RESPONSE: Noted.

236 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the Peacekeeper at Fairchild AFB or in the State of Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

237 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Minot AFB, North Dakota because there will not be any environmental impacts, and the benefits to the economy.

RESPONSE: Noted.

238 1 ISSUE: Commentor strongly supports selection of Minot AFB, North Dakota for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program for its positive socioeconomic impact and because the community wants the program and America needs the program.
ISSUE: Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Minot AFB, North Dakota for its strong, existing base-community infrastructure, minimal environmental impacts, its current mitigation activities, the socioeconomic values, and a need for a strong national defense posture.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Minot AFB, North Dakota for its many beneficial impacts on the community, such as more jobs, increased school enrollment, and increased real estate activity.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Minot AFB, North Dakota for its strength to protect our peace and security, to aid in arms reduction talks, its beneficial economic impacts, and safety assurances from a clear, detailed Environmental Impact Statement.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison EIS for Minot AFB, North Dakota because they are in agreement with statements made in interested areas.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison EIS for Minot AFB, North Dakota because they are in agreement with statements made in interested areas.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Rail Garrison project for the benefits it will bring to the local communities.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in agreement with cultural resources statements made on Draft EIS Page 4.10-21, Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 6.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system at Minot AFB, North Dakota because we need a strong defense for our nation and our allies to continue our way of life.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: More than 600 acres of good farmland will be needed in Minot, North Dakota for the project. What happens to the farmers?

RESPONSE: Agricultural operations would not be affected on the proposed 666 acre restrictive easement (Proposed Action). The 317 acres required for fee acquisition represents less than 0.1 percent of farmland in the local county, and land owners would be compensated.
ISSUE: The dollars spent for this program would be better spent in other areas such as the environment, schools, and public services that would result in good economic growth.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the EIS, and Rail Garrison being located in Minot AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the findings of the EIS. Supports the selection of the North Dakota Air Force bases because it will strengthen the economy, the rail system is sufficient or can easily be upgraded if needed, and believes in a strong defense system to support freedom.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Submitted excerpt from a newspaper article on a speech made by Governor Dukakis on the Peacekeeper missile.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Comment by a religious movement opposed to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison basing mode because of beliefs expressed in and from a pastoral document that nuclear weapons are not morally justified.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Peacekeeper has a first-strike capability and is vulnerable to attack.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Money for military spending would be better spent on other areas such as child care, homeless, and the hungry.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor reaffirms that the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison will not have a negative impact on natural gas in Minot, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Minot, North Dakota because it will benefit the local economy and it will make a strong military presence for our nation's defense.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Minot AFB, North Dakota for reasons such as: the program will not result in any significant impact on any resource; will have beneficial socioeconomic impacts on employment and income; greater utilization of temporary housing; plus a belief that strong deterrent is the best defense.

RESPONSE: Noted.
ISSUE: Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Minot AFB, North Dakota because the Draft EIS states there will be no adverse impacts in the resource areas. The program is a must to provide incentives for the Soviets to seriously engage in arms control negotiations and also to help assure our national security.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Comment for the record in support of the Rail Garrison project at Minot AFB, North Dakota for its economic benefits that can be generated by construction services required of such a project.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Comment for the record in full support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program for North Dakota and Minot; the program can supply skilled workers for any construction project, and feels the program will help the defense of this country.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor pledges support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system at Minot AFB, North Dakota. They have a good working relationship with the Air Force and can supply a well-trained work force for all phases of construction and maintenance.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the Draft EIS as presented because the community of Minot, North Dakota is in a very good position to host deployment at Minot AFB.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor assures that the people of the Great Falls, Montana area will welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to deployment of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison in the State of Michigan for such reasons as the Peacekeeper is destabilizing, vulnerable, costly, increases risk on rail lines, and makes all communities along rail lines targets of attack.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor states that with baseline growth alone, elementary and junior high schools in Cheyenne, Wyoming will be at their capacities in the early 1990s with existing facilities. If the project increases student enrollments, it will create severe hardships on the district and compromise student/teacher ratios without major financial commitment for capital construction.

RESPONSE: EIS Sections 4.2.1.2 and 4.2.1.3 contain discussions of education impacts which have been revised to reflect the new information.
260 2 ISSUE: Commentor states that the Laramie County School District which is number one in Wyoming will compromise the quality of education if enrollment is increased.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 260, Comment 1.

260 3 ISSUE: The Draft EIS estimates the cash reserves in Laramie County School District Number 1 in Wyoming to be $12.4 million. The actual cash balance is projected to shrink to $4.1 million at the end of the current fiscal year from $11 million on July 1, 1986. The projected funding from the state may zero out this cash reserve by the 1990 fiscal year, creating additional hardship on the district to maintain its current level of educational programs.

RESPONSE: EIS Section 4.2.1.2 has been revised to reflect the new information.

260 4 ISSUE: Due to cuts in revenues and increases in personnel costs mainly due to increasing enrollment, the district is in serious financial difficulty and will be unable to handle any increase in enrollment due to the proposed program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 260, Comment 1.

260 5 ISSUE: The Draft EIS needs to further analyze the fact that elementary students in Cheyenne, Wyoming represent 60 percent of military-related students and specific neighborhoods are more impacted than others.

RESPONSE: The Draft EIS analysis assumes a 55 percent and 45 percent split between elementary and secondary levels for immigrant students. These ratios came from Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos monitoring data and are thought to be reflective of the demographic characteristics associated with the Rail Garrison program personnel. The summation of individual choices for housing locations that reflects the existing distribution of military-related enrollment throughout the district would not necessarily be valid for Rail Garrison immigrants since there would be changes in the underlying housing market conditions on which these choices were based. Therefore, the assumption that "students would be dispersed throughout the district, reducing instances of localized overcrowding" seems appropriate.

260 6 ISSUE: The location of appropriate/available housing needs in the Cheyenne, Wyoming area need to be further analyzed.

RESPONSE: Discussion with local housing market representatives indicate available housing is dispersed throughout the community.

260 7 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not address the impacts on school district property. If the north site is used for the Missile Assembly Building, what restrictions would be placed on this property?

RESPONSE: The restrictive easement for the Missile Assembly Building does not involve the school district land. However, the restrictive easement for the Rail Garrison Train Alert Shelters does. About 160 acres of the school property (the southwest area) would lie within the inhabited building restrictive easement. This land would be treated no differently than private land within the easement. Current uses (grazing
and an uninhabited building) could continue without restriction. Air Force Regulation 127-100 would preclude from the restrictive easement any future structure designed for human occupation (on a permanent basis), gathering places for outdoor recreation (such as athletic fields or stadiums), overhead power lines of 69 KV or more, and nonmilitary runways. There would be no Air Force restriction on the approximately 246 acres of school district land outside the restrictive easement.

261 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because without our military services, we would not have this opportunity to voice our opinions.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

262 1 ISSUE: Request that dust control measures during construction, open burning, indoor air quality, and compliance with air quality standards be included in the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: It was assumed for the air quality modeling of fugitive emissions that sufficient watering would be performed to reduce emissions by 50 percent. Open burning was not discussed in the Draft EIS. This activity is controlled by local and state air pollution control agencies. Open burning is not planned for the Proposed Action. Indoor air pollution is not discussed under the Air Quality sections. The Clean Air Act, which deals with atmospheric air quality, does not include any regulations regarding indoor air quality. In the workplace, air quality is an occupational safety and health issue and is regulated by the Occupational Health and Safety Administration. The compliance with air quality standards is discussed in the EIS. Compliance is part of the level of impact criteria.

262 2 ISSUE: Request that potable water, body contact recreation, and compliance with wastewater treatment standards be included in the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: These concerns have been incorporated into the environmental analyses in the water resources section at each base.

262 3 ISSUE: Request that any unusual or suspected health effects associated with solid waste disposal, the effects of littering, and provisions for cleanup of solid waste should be included in the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is not anticipated to generate any solid waste with unusual or suspected health effects. Onbase construction activities will be conducted in a manner that reduces the amount of litter and all sites will be maintained in a manner that reduces the potential for vectors.

262 4 ISSUE: Request that ambient noise levels during construction and implementation, and the effectiveness of any proposed noise reduction measures following construction and implementation be included in the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: Ambient noise levels during the construction and operations phases were considered in the EIS. Since none of the noise impacts were considered significant, noise mitigation measures were not proposed.
5 ISSUE: Request that the Final EIS include exposures to ionizing and nonionizing radiation which may adversely affect human health.

RESPONSE: The significant ionizing radiation risks are discussed in Chapter 5 of the EIS. No significant nonionizing radiation hazard has been identified in the Proposed Action.

6 ISSUE: Request that the Final EIS include solid, liquid, or gaseous wastes which because of their physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics pose a substantial threat to human health.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 68.

7 ISSUE: Request that the Final EIS include contamination of floodplains and how the food chain is affected.

RESPONSE: Construction and operation activities in or adjacent to wetlands and floodplains may result in increased siltation or the accidental release of waste oil, gasoline or other foreign substances into these areas and the subsequent contamination of the food chain. Also see responses to Document 50, Comments 84 and 103.

8 ISSUE: Request that the EIS include an analysis of construction in floodplains which may endanger human health.

RESPONSE: Construction activities would occur in floodplains only at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana and are discussed in EIS Section 4.3.8. Also see response to Document 262, Comment 7.

9 ISSUE: The Final EIS should include evaluation of the occupation and public health hazards associated with the construction and operation of the proposed program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 22.

10 ISSUE: Request that the Final EIS include general worker safety/injury control provisions.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 262, Comment 9.

11 ISSUE: Will the Air Force provide adequate ventilation, heating, insulation, and lighting in housing?

RESPONSE: Government-built housing will comply with all regulations concerning specifications for these items. The Air Force, however, does not have control over privately developed units.

12 ISSUE: The Final EIS should include vector control provisions.

RESPONSE: Vector control provisions were not specifically analyzed since the proposed program is not expected to result in any vector control problems at any of the candidate installations. Also see response to Document 262, Comment 3.

13 ISSUE: The Final EIS should include the impacts of the project on the displacement and/or relocation of persons.
RESPONSE: Wherever an inhabited building is located within an area proposed to be acquired in fee, the owner may sell the residence to the Air Force. The Air Force would pay fair market value for the land and structures. The owner would be given the opportunity to repurchase the house and improvements at salvage value. Relocation benefits would be paid as authorized by law. Wherever an inhabited building is located within a proposed restrictive safety easement area, the same rules would apply to the building. The land, however, would remain with the present owner and could be used for any purpose other than inhabited buildings (see EIS Section 4.0 for details).

263 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas for reasons as overwhelming local acceptance and peace through a strong national defense system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

264 1 ISSUE: The Final EIS should address the environmental impacts associated with all stages of nuclear warhead production, handling, shipping and all other processes or activities that are part of the warhead manufacturing process.

RESPONSE: The production of warheads for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missiles is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

265 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison in the State of Michigan or anywhere and requests that no action be taken on the system proposed for Wurtsmith AFB.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

266 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program in Minot, North Dakota because of increased jobs the project will bring to the area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

267 1 ISSUE: Commentor on the Draft EIS states that the very small increases to public services such as fire, police, and public works will not result in deterioration of the quality of services received by the public in Minot, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: Noted.

267 2 ISSUE: Commentor on the Draft EIS states that there is no need for concern about water shortages in Minot, North Dakota due to the adequate supplies and reserves of fresh water in Minot.

RESPONSE: Noted.

267 3 ISSUE: Commentor on the Draft EIS states the City of Minot, North Dakota can handle the anticipated small increases in solid waste without hiring any additional manpower or purchasing new equipment.

RESPONSE: Noted.
268 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Whiteman
AFB, Missouri because it will be an asset to the community and our
country must have defensive power.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

269 1 ISSUE: Concerned about the noise level near Fairchild AFB, Washington
due to the proposed move of the ATC resistance training compound and
the relocation of the explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) range.

RESPONSE: The Bartholomew Road area is currently subjected to noise
from Fairchild AFB aircraft operations and from activities at the EOD
range and the ATC resistance training compound (RTC). Noise levels in
the Bartholomew Road area, resulting from aircraft operations, range
from 75 to 80 dBA (L_{dn}). Estimated noise levels resulting from activities
in the EOD range and the RTC (existing locations) are approximately 35
to 40 dBA. The proposed relocation of these facilities will reduce their
distance to the Bartholomew Road area. However, calculations, based on
the attenuation of sound with distance, indicate these distance reductions
will increase the noise levels in the Bartholomew Road area by about 3
dBA. It has been found experimentally that most people can just detect
noise level changes of 2 to 3 dBA. Thus, the projected increase of 3 DBA
in noise levels should hardly be noticed by Bartholomew Road residents.

269 2 ISSUE: Concerned that property values in the Medical Lake, Washington
area will decrease because the area will become undesirable due to noise
levels.

RESPONSE: The increase in noise levels is not expected to adversely
affect property values in the area.

270 1 ISSUE: Why is the rest of Montana not given a chance to testify at a
convenient location?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

270 2 ISSUE: Will the program replace 10 Minuteman for 1 MX?

RESPONSE: Issues regarding strategic policy are beyond the scope of this
EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

270 3 ISSUE: Why does the Air Force mislead the public by telling them that
MX history began in 1983, with the Scowcroft Commission Report?

RESPONSE: The date is mentioned in connection with the history of the
Rail Garrison basing mode, not of the missile itself. That history can
reasonably be said to begin with the Scowcroft Commission.

270 4 ISSUE: How much will the transient population increase in Cascade
County, Montana with the announcement of adoption of these nuclear
programs?

RESPONSE: During the construction phase, fewer than 30 immigrants and
their dependents are projected to be unsuccessful job seekers. This
estimate is based on similar military construction programs.
ISSUE: Who will assist construction workers to relocate after the project is completed?

RESPONSE: Construction is carried out by private contractors. They assume the responsibility for personnel buildup and phase down.

ISSUE: Will outside businesses refuse to locate here if the military presence is increased?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 91.

ISSUE: What are the psychological effects on us and our children with nuclear warheads located right here in town?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: What happens if an aircraft flying nuclear warheads in and out of Malmstrom AFB, Montana crashes either onbase or offbase on approach?

RESPONSE: The Air Force has contingency plans to handle any emergency which might arise from the transport of nuclear weapons. During all forms of warhead transport, safety measures are designed to prevent any accident from causing the weapon to detonate.

ISSUE: Is there a limit on mitigation monies available for the Great Falls, Montana school district?

RESPONSE: The impacts are not sufficient in magnitude to trigger Office of Economic Adjustment educational assistance funds. Therefore, no mitigation funds are available.

ISSUE: How will the socioeconomic pattern in Great Falls, Montana change; that is, what will be the effects on average age and income during construction and during deployment?

RESPONSE: Construction worker wages are estimated at about $29,900 while military wages during operations would be about $17,400. Per capita personal income would remain essentially unchanged at $12,300. Military personnel are expected to be slightly younger than the average in the county. However, because of the relatively small size of the program, the demographic make-up of the county would remain essentially unchanged.

ISSUE: What will prevent a boom and bust cycle locally and/or nationally?

RESPONSE: Because the project is small, as major defense projects go, no great boom is expected. Therefore, no bust is expected. On the contrary, operations income will likely serve as a stabilizing impact.

ISSUE: Has the Air Force studied previous boom and bust cycles, such as at Glasgow, Montana?

RESPONSE: Yes, the Air Force looked at large numbers of boom/bust articles and other studies. According to standing definitions, no boom/bust is expected.
ISSUE: Will homes along rail rights-of-way be subject to unannounced searches and observation?

RESPONSE: No.

ISSUE: Will plainclothes or secret agents be stationed at intervals along the tracks where the MX might travel?

RESPONSE: No.

ISSUE: Will we still be able to carry arms, as guaranteed by the Constitution, along affected lines?

RESPONSE: Yes.

ISSUE: During serious arms reduction negotiations, why even consider building additional nuclear systems?

RESPONSE: Issues regarding strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Could tourists start regarding Great Falls, Montana as "Nuclear City?"

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 4.

ISSUE: Since MX missiles are theoretically mobile, why aren't there more hearings throughout the state?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: What law or regulation states that the Air Force can use the first portion of the program for their own promotion, leaving the citizens to a time-limited second position?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 39, Comment i.

ISSUE: What visual markings will distinguish a training train?

RESPONSE: The training trains would resemble existing railroad equipment as much as possible. The final design may be influenced by the results of arms control talks.

ISSUE: Since we cannot safely store nuclear wastes at the Hanford Reservation in Washington state and at the Savannah River station in Georgia, how do we rationalize adding more tonnage to those ecological messes?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 30.

ISSUE: What would happen if 1 of the 10 bombs within the MX missile detonates; if all 10 detonate; if all 8 to 12 missiles detonate?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 45.

ISSUE: How many tons of common metals (iron, steel, etc.), precious metals (platinum, gold, silver, etc.), and other products (vinyl, pipe, caulking, lumber, etc.) will be consumed in production and deployment?
RESPONSE: Major construction materials consist of about 7,600 tons of structure steel, 294 tons of reinforcing steel, 45,000 square feet of metal siding, 542,000 pounds of miscellaneous metal, 300 tons of asphalt, 57,000 square feet of plywood, and 540,000 board feet of lumber.

270 24 ISSUE: Other than the Cuban Missile Crisis of nearly 30 years ago, what examples of international tension would cause MX trains to be dispersed?

RESPONSE: Another more recent event that might have caused a higher authority to order dispersal of the trains is the 1973 Middle East War.

270 25 ISSUE: Will civilian train crews and/or civilian railroad dispatchers be inducted into the military during MX rail dispersal?

RESPONSE: No.

270 26 ISSUE: Can MX be launched from inside the garrison?

RESPONSE: Yes.

270 27 ISSUE: If long-range area reduction negotiations succeed, thereby reducing long-range ICBMs by 50 percent, will the MX be scrapped?

RESPONSE: Issues regarding strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

270 28 ISSUE: MX and Midgetman nuclear systems are called "deterrent" in nature by the Air Force. Will they be firing on empty Soviet silos as logic dictates, or will they be used as a first-strike weapons?

RESPONSE: Issues regarding strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

270 29 ISSUE: Will current Minuteman missiles be rendered obsolete one-for-one with replacement of either MX or Midgetman?

RESPONSE: Issues regarding strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

270 30 ISSUE: Why does the Air Force call a nuclear delivery and explosive system "Peacekeeper" while the current defense appropriation bill still refers to the same system as MX?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

270 31 ISSUE: Under the "No Alternative" choice, the Air Force has not outlined the national and local benefits of building neither MX or Midgetman, thus leaving the money in the private sector. Why not?

RESPONSE: Not building either system would not necessarily have the effect of "leaving the money in the private sector." Also see response to Document 37, Comment 15.

270 32 ISSUE: Is it possible that the Secretary of Interior or Agriculture could order the launch of the MX or Midgetman?
RESPONSE: Issues related to Presidential succession are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

270 33 ISSUE: What will prevent an accidental launch because of computer error?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

270 34 ISSUE: Section 4.9 of the Draft EIS deals exclusively with Malmstrom AFB. Yet, on Page 4.9-29 (first paragraph) the Draft EIS mistakenly refers to the "Cheyenne area" while on page 4.9-66 the Draft EIS twice mistakenly refers to "Grand Forks AFB". What assurances do we have that Air Force training manuals are prepared any more accurately?

RESPONSE: The errors identified and others in the document have been corrected in the Final EIS.

271 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper missiles being deployed at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan. Requests that there be no action regarding the Final EIS and existing Peacekeeper missiles be taken apart and made useless.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

272 1 ISSUE: Letter transmits document number 7.

RESPONSE: Noted.

273 1 ISSUE: The fascists' won World War II by manipulation of our government.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

273 2 ISSUE: The MX invites disaster to our nation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

273 3 ISSUE: Scientists and Congress did not have full access of actual amounts of fallout in the 1959 hearings.

RESPONSE: Noted.

273 4 ISSUE: Radiation causes "race poisoning" and has resulted in an AIDS epidemic. Do the Russians love their babies? How many genetically afflicted children are enough?

RESPONSE: There is no generally accepted evidence that radiation causes "race poisoning" or played any part in the AIDS epidemic. Any genetically affected children are too many; the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system is not expected to cause any genetic afflictions.

273 5 ISSUE: In commentor's opinion, human bodies are piling up as a result of radiation and few believe it.

RESPONSE: Exposure to radiation does cause an increased likelihood of cancer in humans. The average annual radiation dose to individuals in the
United States is 210 millirems, mostly from natural background radioactivity and medical applications. The increased risk of cancer as a result of exposure to that amount of radiation is approximately .002 percent. A person in the fallout cloud of a worst-case radiation release from a Peacekeeper weapon would receive a radiation dose of approximately 600 millirems, causing an increased cancer risk of .006 percent. Also see response to Document 7, Comment 3.

273 6 ISSUE: Commentor urges the government to take a more rational approach to protection; we cannot afford the Rail Garrison and its inherent risks.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

274 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Whiteman AFB, Missouri. Whiteman is an integral part of the community with an excellent relationship between base personnel and Warrensburg.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

275 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison; nuclear war is immoral and a different way of spending the billions of dollars should be found.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

276 1 ISSUE: Commentor requests that the No Action Alternative be chosen. Nuclear weapons should not be deployed in Michigan or anywhere else.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

277 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the MX missiles being located at Fairchild AFB, Washington because they are environmental hazards to the entire world.

RESPONSE: Noted.

278 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Rail Garrison program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming because the program is vitally important to the security and defense of our country, significant economic impacts, and community support.

RESPONSE: Noted.

279 1 ISSUE: Commentor requests that no action be taken in Michigan because of the safety of our citizens.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

280 1 ISSUE: Concerned that the military will increase its claims on the national railroad system and significantly restrict a portion of it.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 76.

281 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because of community support, little adverse impacts, and increased employment.
282 1 ISSUE: Resolution in full support of the project at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

283 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because of existing rail lines, lower cost in North Dakota, minimal environmental impact, and favorable economic impact.

RESPONSE: Noted.

284 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Grand Forks, North Dakota because the system is affordable, Grand Fork's excellent rail network, minimal environmental impact, and positive economic impact.

RESPONSE: Noted

285 1 ISSUE: Will the MX project necessitate a new rail line in Grand Forks, North Dakota which will cut through American Indian burial grounds?

RESPONSE: Construction of a possible second rail line is not a part of the Proposed Action or alternatives, and it was not analyzed in detail. EIS Section 4.7.14 is intended simply to identify major concerns requiring further analysis should a second rail line be considered in the future. In that event, more detailed studies would be conducted including archeological survey and Native American consultation. The Air Force has been a leader in the involvement of Native Americans in planning at the regional and national level. It is Air Force policy to work directly with civil and traditional leaders of tribal groups to avoid all sensitive sites to the extent possible. If burials cannot be avoided, or are encountered accidentally during construction, they would be reburied or otherwise treated in accordance with the wishes and customs of the appropriate tribes (see EIS Sections 1.8 and 4.7.14). Also see responses to Document 7, Comment 5 and Document 50, Comments 15.

286 1 ISSUE: Opposed to the MX missile system at Dyess AFB, Texas because Abilene is already burdened with the B-1 bomber which has not lived up to its reputation as a plane or an economic boom.

RESPONSE: Noted.

287 1 ISSUE: Why were most of the issues raised during scoping not addressed in the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: The EIS covers all issues that are within the scope of the EIS whether identified at scoping meetings, in public comments to the Draft EIS, or at any other time. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 53.

287 2 ISSUE: Requests extending deadline for filing written comments until at least 45 days after the Draft EIS and information references have been sent.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 50, Comments 1 and 2.
ISSUE: Public hearings should provide more comment time and hearings should be held in all communities with populations greater than 50,000 within 5 miles of MX train rail lines.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 6.

ISSUE: The means of transportation and routes to be used in transporting the MX missiles and their warheads from Wyoming to Missouri must be considered in the EIS.

RESPONSE: Missiles will be transported by rail and the warheads will be transported by military airlift. The safety considerations of these transport modes and routes are analyzed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

ISSUE: The risk and consequences of radiation leakage during transportation must be considered in the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: The issue is treated in EIS Sections 5.2.2.3 and 5.3.2.

ISSUE: The risk and consequences of accidental or intentional detonation of nuclear warheads during transport of weapon system from Wyoming to Missouri needs to be addressed in the EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 45.

ISSUE: The risk and consequences of accidental or intentional ignition of the rocket fuel for the missiles during transport must be addressed in the EIS.

RESPONSE: See EIS Sections 5.3.1.4 and 5.4.

ISSUE: Why were the risk and consequences of accidental detonation of one or more of the warheads while they are in storage not considered in the EIS?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 45.

ISSUE: The risk and consequences of the accidental ignition of the missile fuel while the stages are in storage needs to be addressed.

RESPONSE: An accidental, inadvertent, or deliberate (without emergency war orders) launch or detonation of the missile or components while on alert, in transit, or in storage is virtually impossible. In the unlikely event of such an accident, the risk and consequences would be no greater than those described in the EIS. Also see EIS Sections 5.1.1.2 and 5.1.4.

ISSUE: Why were the risk and consequences of the accidental launching of a missile while on alert not considered in the EIS?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 9.

ISSUE: What are the risk and consequences of sabotage of the missiles at Whiteman AFB, Missouri?

RESPONSE: The probability of such an event is estimated to be extremely remote because the garrison at Whiteman AFB will be well guarded. Therefore, adding in the risk of such an occurrence would not change the risk reported in Chapter 5 of the EIS.
287 12 ISSUE: What are the consequences of having the warheads in storage at Whiteman AFB, Missouri fall into the hands of terrorists either through terrorism or subversion by employees?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 45.

287 13 ISSUE: What are the risks and consequences of an accident caused by earthquakes, tornados, flooding or other natural disasters while the system is in the garrisons?

RESPONSE: These are addressed in EIS Section 5.2.3.

287 14 ISSUE: Why are the consequences of Soviet nuclear attack on Whiteman AFB, Missouri not addressed in the EIS?

RESPONSE: Consequences of an enemy attack are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

287 15 ISSUE: Why is the increased risk of nuclear war and the consequences thereof due to the deployment of Rail Garrison not addressed in the EIS?

RESPONSE: The issue of increased risk of nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

287 16 ISSUE: What are the transportation risks due to the tremendous size of the missile car?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

287 17 ISSUE: What are the transportation risks due to the age and strength of rail lines and bridges?

RESPONSE: Peacekeeper trains will not impose greater loads on rails and bridges than some current commercial traffic. The Federal Railway Administration statistics used to calculate the accident rate for the safety analysis includes accidents from all causes, including those due to rail or bridge failure. The rail safety analysis in the EIS thus reflects the possibility of accidents due to age and strength of rail lines and bridges. Also see response to Document 24, Comment 2.

287 18 ISSUE: What are the transportation risks due to the lack of familiarity of Air Force train operators with the railroad lines that they will be traveling on?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 4.

287 19 ISSUE: What are the risks of an accident caused by blizzard, thunderstorm, flooding, earthquake, tornado, or other natural disaster during transport of the missiles?

RESPONSE: These are addressed in EIS Section 5.2.3. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 66.

287 20 ISSUE: The outsized nature of the missile launch car makes it easy to identify while on the national rail network. What are the risks of sabotage while being transported?
RESPONSE: This is discussed in EIS Section 5.1.6. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 74.

287 21 ISSUE: Does the Safety section consider the effects on the area rail lines and bridges due to the movement of Peacekeeper missiles over them?

RESPONSE: Yes. Also see responses to Document 24, Comment 2 and Document 287, Comment 17.

287 22 ISSUE: What are the consequences of the accidental ignition or firing of the missile due to a rail accident?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 9.

287 23 ISSUE: What are the consequences of an accidental detonation of a warhead due to a rail accident?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 9.

287 24 ISSUE: What are the plans for evacuation of area communities in case of an accident involving a train carrying missiles?

RESPONSE: This is discussed in EIS Section 5.5. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.

287 25 ISSUE: What are the health and economic costs to residents who would be evacuated in case of an accident?

RESPONSE: In the unlikely event of an accident which requires evacuation of residents, requests for compensation for personal injuries, damage, or loss will be evaluated in accordance with Air Force regulations. There are no particular anticipated health effects on persons who have been evacuated in a timely manner.

287 26 ISSUE: Certainly, even in times of peace, the system must be tested on actual railroad tracks. This will expose communities along the railroad tracks to the numerous risks associated with movement of live missiles.

RESPONSE: There will be no system testing involving movement of "live missiles" on the national rail network. Peacekeeper trains with "live missiles" will be on the public tracks infrequently if ever and, then, only when directed to disperse by a higher authority in time of national need. The training trains without the missiles or nuclear warheads would travel to the garrison installations to conduct dispersal training exercises. Occasionally, components of the Peacekeeper train, including missiles without the warheads, may have to be moved to the main operating base at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming or depot facilities for major repair and maintenance.

287 27 ISSUE: What are the risks and consequences of a preemptive Soviet nuclear attack caused by the dispersal of the Rail Garrison system being seen as a threatening act by the Soviets?

RESPONSE: Issues of a nuclear attack are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: What are the risks and consequences of a nuclear warhead, from a Rail Garrison train that is dispersed in a time of national need, falling into the hands of terrorists?

RESPONSE: The probability of such an event is estimated to be extremely remote because both the trains and garrisons will be well guarded and the effort and time required to remove a warhead from the missile is beyond the capability of a terrorist group. Therefore, adding in the risk of such an occurrence would not change the risk reported in the EIS. If terrorists, or anyone for that matter, were able to obtain a warhead, the security and safety devices on the weapon would prevent any nuclear detonation. The consequences of any use they might make of the hazardous material in the weapon would not likely be any greater than those described in Section 5.4 of the EIS. Also see response to Document 34, Comment 17.

ISSUE: What are the risks and consequences of using Air Force personnel to operate the MX rail cars while they are carrying warheads?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 15, Comments 4 and 5.

ISSUE: What are the risks and consequences of a Soviet attack on the Rail Garrison system following dispersal of the system in a time of national need?

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What is the impact of an electromagnetic pulse on the Rail Garrison system?

RESPONSE: The system is designed to be resistant to electromagnetic pulse. Issues of operational capabilities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Why were the risks of accident and damage inherent to the launching of missiles from a rail car not considered in the EIS?

RESPONSE: The issue of operational launch of a missile is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The EIS should consider the specific economic consequences of the waste of $20 billion of the money of U.S. taxpayers for the deployment of the MX missile.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The EIS needs to address the tremendous strain on schools, hospitals, police forces, and utilities from the sudden influx of personnel to construct Rail Garrison at Whiteman, AFB, Missouri.

RESPONSE: Impacts of the Proposed Action on schools and public services are discussed in EIS Section 4.11.1.3, and impacts on utilities in EIS Section 4.11.2.3.
ISSUE: The EIS needs to address the damage to the local economy caused by the sudden departure of workers after the completion of the garrisons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

ISSUE: The EIS doesn't address the severe economic adverse impacts which will affect Warrensburg, Missouri such as increased unemployment, and a higher inflation rate.

RESPONSE: No measurable changes in the local unemployment or inflation rates are expected in Warrensburg as a result of this program.

ISSUE: Adverse secondary effects at Warrensburg, Missouri need to be addressed, such as higher crime rate, poorer public facilities (schools and hospitals) and a lower standard of living.

RESPONSE: Potential impacts on employment and income, public services, and education are presented in Section 4.11.1 of the EIS.

ISSUE: The Rail Garrison system is a first-strike weapon and greatly increases the risk of nuclear war. The EIS should discuss this as one of the consequences of deployment.

RESPONSE: Issues of increased risk of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The United States already has more than sufficient nuclear arms to deter Soviet attack, no additional weapons are needed. The Air Force has no good reason to increase the risk of nuclear war nor endanger the United States by putting MX missiles on railcars at Whiteman, AFB, Missouri.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The EIS should consider the use of Trident II missiles as an alternative to the Proposed Action. This would be a much better, safer and cheaper method.

RESPONSE: Consideration of alternative strategic systems is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The EIS should consider as an alternative to the Proposed Action the deployment of nonfirst-strike weapons which are lighter, smaller and less expensive.

RESPONSE: Consideration of alternative strategic systems is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Adequate public notice for the public scoping meetings was not given. The Federal Register was the only notice given and that notice did not give the date, time, or location of the hearings.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 52.

ISSUE: The Air Force did not provide the public with sufficient information to evaluate the proposal prior to scoping.
RESPONSE: The purpose of scoping is to identify issues to be addressed in the EIS. Handouts were distributed to the public at the meetings. Inputs have been accepted since the Notice of Intent verbally or in writing.

ISSUE: The scoping hearings for the program were inadequate. People wishing to speak should be given at least 10 minutes each and at least 6 hours should be given to public comment.

RESPONSE: Public scoping meetings were held in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508) and Air Force Regulation 19-2. Those unable to speak at the meetings were encouraged to submit written input, which received the same consideration as spoken comments. The purpose of scoping is to identify issues to be covered by the EIS. The Final EIS covers all issues that are within the scope of the EIS, whether identified at scoping meetings, in public comments to the Draft EIS, or at any other time.

ISSUE: Adequate public notice of the hearings was not given. The Air Force should take out advertisements in the newspapers and radio and TV stations in each community.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 9.

ISSUE: Written information needs to be provided to the public more than 30 days prior to the public hearings to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS is deficient because it does not state the weight of each component to be carried on the missile launch car, i.e., the car itself, the canister, the launching apparatus, the hoisting apparatus, and all other materials on the car.

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper train is adequately described in Section 1.3.2 of the EIS.

ISSUE: It is my understanding that the Air Force is considering launching the MX missiles not from the rail cars but from stationary, permanent missile silos that it plans to build at various points along the rail lines that the MX rail cars would travel. The Draft EIS for the proposed MX Rail Garrison does not consider any of the numerous and substantial peacetime environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance and use of stationary missile silos for launching of the MX missile.

RESPONSE: The Proposed Action does not include use of missile silos of any kind.

ISSUE: The majority of the weight of the missile launch car will be concentrated at one end. The EIS should discuss the risks associated with this uneven weight distribution.

RESPONSE: Initial concept designs for the missile launch car do not project an uneven weight distribution for the launch car. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 74.
ISSUE: The center of gravity of the missile launch car will be dangerously high. The EIS should discuss the risks associated with this condition.

RESPONSE: The center of gravity for Peacekeeper Rail Garrison cars will not be dangerously high. Also see responses to Document 33, Comment 74 and Document 287, Comment 17.

ISSUE: The EIS needs to address the interaction of length, weight, center of gravity and how they affect the stability of the car and the risks associated with this.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 74 and Document 287, Comment 17.

ISSUE: Since the Air Force doesn't know the final design of the missile launch car, it might be substantially larger than is discussed in the Draft EIS. The EIS should consider the greater risks inherent in any greater length, width, weight, etc.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 74 and Document 287, Comment 17.

ISSUE: The American Association of Railroads designates any car more than 12 feet wide as a "wide load," and provides that all adjacent tracks must be cleared to avoid accidents. The EIS should discuss the impact of this on system safety and security.

RESPONSE: It is not anticipated that all adjacent tracks must be cleared; see EIS Sections 1.3 and 5.1.5. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 74.

ISSUE: It is unlikely that military operations will have significant experience on train operation. The EIS must consider the increased risk of accidents due to the low level of experience of Air Force operators.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 15, Comments 4 and 5.

ISSUE: The "Unauthorized Access" section of the Draft EIS does not adequately address terrorism and sabotage. The environmental consequences of these acts should be addressed specifically.

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy and enemy threat assessment are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: In order to interface with the commercial railway system, the Air Force will need to communicate its intentions. How will terrorists be prevented from following these communications and waiting to ambush Rail Garrison trains?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 34, Comment 17.

ISSUE: The EIS should discuss the environmental impact of the safety measures that the Air Force will take to avoid sabotage and terrorist attacks.
ISSUE: The EIS should deal with the public interface problems associated with acts of civil disobedience directed toward Rail Garrison. Congress specifically wanted the Air Force to address this.

RESPONSE: The unpredictability of Peacekeeper train movements for mainline training or dispersal will make holding of vigils by potential demonstrators on the track off the base difficult. Therefore, no civil disturbance of substantial scale or duration is anticipated. If such a disturbance should occur, federal, military, and civil law enforcement agencies have the responsibility and capability to maintain order. While the offbase tracks will not be secured by military personnel, the trains will be. The security personnel on the trains will safeguard them. In the event that individuals were to interfere with train operations, security measures could be taken including detention of those responsible for criminal offenses against the trains or crews. Such detainees would be turned over promptly to appropriate civil authorities. The measures to assure maintenance of order and the security of the train are not anticipated to cause significant environmental impacts.

ISSUE: On June 17, 1966, a United States plane crashed in Spain while carrying nuclear missiles and one missile was missing for several months. The EIS should consider the risk and consequences of having a warhead missing for several days, weeks or months.

RESPONSE: The probability of a crash involving an Air Force C-141B aircraft transporting a reentry system (RS) is very unlikely (see EIS Section 5.3.2). Moreover, in the event of a crash, the probability of a reentry vehicle (RV) and its attendant warhead being separated from the RS and lost is even more unlikely. However, in the extremely unlikely event that a warhead would be further separated from a RV, and could not be located and was "leaking" radiation, it would be quickly located by radiation detectors. If no radiation was escaping, the only consequence during the time it was temporarily missing would be that a potentially large area might be cordoned off while the crews searched for it.

ISSUE: Army documents that are incorporated into the EIS by reference should be made available to the public and an additional 45 days provided for written comments on the Draft EIS after providing this material.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 50, Comments 1 and 2.

ISSUE: The EIS should state what criteria will be used and what tests will be run by the Air Force Inspection and Safety Center and the Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board for certification and siting approval of facilities.

RESPONSE: See the discussion in Section 5.1 of the EIS. The criteria and other details of the procedures used are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The EIS should discuss the consequence of sabotage by Air Force personnel.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 28.
287 63 ISSUE: The EIS should consider the risk of accident due to problems with communications between Air Force and civilian train controllers.

RESPONSE: The means of communication between Peacekeeper trains and civilian train controllers are described in EIS Section 5.2.1.1. Communications between Peacekeeper trains and certain controllers will be as efficient, or more efficient, than communication between the controller and commercial trains. The Federal Railway Administration rail accident data used to predict accidents and calculate risk in the EIS safety analysis includes accidents caused by miscommunication. The safety analysis in the EIS therefore includes the risk of accidents due to Peacekeeper trains to train controller communication problems.

287 64 ISSUE: Trains would be dispersed in times of "national need." The term "national need" is not defined anywhere in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 98.

287 65 ISSUE: The EIS should approximate both the frequency and duration of the "times of national need" or there is no way for the public to evaluate the risk of an accident.

RESPONSE: Any approximation of frequency or duration of the strategic dispersal of the system would be speculative. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis and 1973 Middle East War are examples of the magnitude of crisis constituting national need. A four week long dispersal was assumed for the safety analysis reported in the EIS.

287 66 ISSUE: The EIS should evaluate the risk of sabotage during the 20 hrs/day that the train is not moving while it is dispersed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

287 67 ISSUE: The propellants used by the Air Force must be stored under carefully controlled environmental conditions. The EIS should deal with the risk and consequences should the fuels be allowed to freeze or overheat.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 40.

287 68 ISSUE: Was the collision analysis performed with computer simulation or through the use of actual railcars?

RESPONSE: The collision analysis reported in the EIS Safety Chapter 5 was done by engineering analysis based on the design of the missile launch car and design and test data on actual Peacekeeper missiles and launch canisters. Also see response to Document 119, Comment 8.

287 69 ISSUE: The Draft EIS says the reentry vehicle will not likely be breached in a fire. The EIS should quantify the risk so the danger can be evaluated.

RESPONSE: Fire resistance tests of the reentry vehicle are not sufficient to quantify that risk in isolation. The probabilistic risk assessment summarized in EIS Section 5.3 includes a conservative estimate of the probability that radioactive material would be released. That assessment takes into account the possibility of release from various causes including fire, crash, puncture, and impact. The probability of release is not broken down by cause.
ISSUE: The Draft EIS says the pressure of a fire would likely cause the reentry vehicle (RV) to be expelled from the fire. The EIS then should evaluate the risk that one or more nuclear warheads would not be found for several days.

RESPONSE: The statement that an RV would likely be expelled from a propellant fire is not in the Final EIS. That might happen, but it is not certain how often it would happen. The probability of radioactive material dispersal would be less if it were expelled. Because the probability of an RV being expelled could not be determined, the reduction in total risk expected to result was not subtracted from the total risk, making the analysis conservative.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS makes the false assumption that rail accidents are equally likely to occur in urban, suburban and rural communities. Rail accidents are more likely to occur in areas of high population density.

RESPONSE: For the safety analyses, rail accidents were assumed to occur in each of the three population density areas in proportion to the amount of track in each of those areas. That assumption takes into account the fact that track density, i.e., amount of track per square mile, is higher in urban areas than suburban or rural areas. The fact that urban-area accidents generally occur at lower speeds and are less severe tends to balance out any greater frequency of accidents in urban areas. The method used in the EIS is considered to be reasonable.

ISSUE: What was the upper limit of exposure and how many people will be exposed to adversely affecting radiation doses in a mishap?

RESPONSE: The estimated upper limit of exposure is 0.6. The latent cancer rate estimated to result from that level of exposure is 2 persons per million exposed.

ISSUE: The EIS should take into account that air transportation accidents are much more likely to occur in urban and suburban areas (near runways) than in rural areas.

RESPONSE: Calculating air transportation risk as proportional to the quantity of travel in each of the population zones is a reasonable balancing of frequency and severity factors. More accidents occur in or near runways, which are near population centers generally, but those accidents are usually less severe in terms of impact speed, crush, and puncture forces, etc., than those that occur in rural areas.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not seriously consider the problems caused by the secondary fires caused by the burning missile propellants.

RESPONSE: The probability that the missile propellant would explode in a manner that would expel burning chunks of propellant is expected to be very small. Tests have shown that it will burn in place rather than explode under the conditions likely to occur in a rail accident. The likelihood of secondary fires and their environmental and human health effects would vary greatly depending on the location of an accident. A description of the possible scattering of burning chunks of propellant is included in Chapter 5 of the EIS.
The EIS does not deal with the fact that firefighters are not equipped or trained to deal with fires involving the chemicals used as propellants for the Peacekeeper missile.

**RESPONSE:** In the unlikely event of a mishap, the Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency would respond by deploying teams specially trained and equipped to deal with any contingency. Until such response forces arrive at the scene, the train commander or other designated crew members will maintain control of the accident scene. Local firefighters and other first responders will be appropriately directed in their response efforts. Such direction will include information about the type and nature of the chemicals involved and the best way of dealing with the situation on an interim basis while the response team is in transit (Also see EIS Section 5.5).

The EIS should seriously consider the consequences of fouling individuals' and communities' water systems with propellants after a spill.

**RESPONSE:** This issue is discussed in EIS Section 5.4.

The EIS assumes a constant movement of the MMH plume. A heavy gas may settle in one area at higher concentrations. The EIS should consider this risk.

**RESPONSE:** The assessment of the risk posed by gas which is heavier than air is based on meteorological conditions which would cause the more serious consequences. It would accumulate in low terrain at higher concentrations, but over a smaller area, potentially affecting fewer people. The assumption used in the EIS is therefore considered more indicative of the magnitude of the risk than the assumption suggested in the comment.

What are the long-term toxic effects of MMH exposures?

**RESPONSE:** Hydrazine compounds are hepatotoxic and would affect normal liver functions. MMH is also a suspect human carcinogen (see EIS Section 5.4.2.1).

What are the short-term effects of MMH exposure?

**RESPONSE:** Short-term effects: if inhaled, the vapor causes local irritation of the respiratory tract, followed by systemic effects. Systemic effects at 30 ppm would involve the central nervous system and cause tremors. In addition, MMH can penetrate skin, causing systemic effects similar to those produced when MMH is inhaled (see EIS Section 5.4.2.1).

Nitrogen tetroxide is heavier than air and heavy concentrations would be trapped in valleys, trenches and other low-lying areas. The EIS should consider this problem.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 287, Comment 77.

How will local firefighting teams be informed of the risk of the chemicals involved in a Peacekeeper accident?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 287, Comment 75.
ISSUE: How would individuals be kept from approaching the accident site?

RESPONSE: Security and safety cordons would be established as soon as possible. Local law enforcement agencies are likely to be the first responders and will act to protect the public in this circumstance the same ways they would in other situations. Military response units assume responsibility as soon as they arrive.

ISSUE: What are the increased risks and consequences of secondary fires and other secondary consequences due to the fact that rescue personnel will not be able to approach the site of the accident for a significant amount of time?

RESPONSE: The increase in risks and consequences which may result from rescue personnel not being able to approach the accident site for a significant amount of time were not calculated separately. However, the potential severity of an accident and the reasonably expected consequences were considered in the calculation of risk in Section 5.3 of the EIS and description of consequences in EIS Section 5.4.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS says there is "virtually no possibility of a nuclear detonation." The EIS should quantify this statement.

RESPONSE: Minimum design standards for United States warheads require that the probability of a nuclear detonation be less than one in one billion under normal circumstances and less than one in one billion over the service of life of a weapon and less than one in one million per exposure to an abnormal environment (for example, an accident).

ISSUE: The EIS should state what fraction of the nuclear material would be disbursed in particles small enough to be inhaled and lodged in lungs. The Final EIS should define distance of contamination. EIS Section 5.4.4.1 implies that it would be an eight square mile area.

RESPONSE: The analysis of the risks associated with the potential for release of radioactive materials required consideration of classified information. In order to produce an unclassified discussion of that risk, some details of the calculations had to be deleted. The "respirable fraction" is one of the deleted details but will be included in the classified annex.

ISSUE: The EIS says no significant long-term impacts result from radioactive materials disbursed by an explosion. Define long-term impacts.

RESPONSE: The long-term impacts of radioactive material contamination are possible human exposure and a risk of latent cancer resulting from that. The section containing the quoted statement has been rewritten in EIS Section 5.4.4.

ISSUE: What are the short-term impacts created by the dispersal of radioactive materials in an explosion?

RESPONSE: Short-term impacts are discussed in EIS Section 5.4.4.
ISSUE: The EIS says surface water contaminated by radioactive particles may pose a limited risk to biota. This risk should be quantified for the EIS to be accurate.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 84.

ISSUE: The EIS should consider the cost of removing and destroying radioactive food after an accident.

RESPONSE: It is difficult to speculate on the cost of hypothetical contamination. The Air Force would be responsible for those costs in the event contamination occurs.

ISSUE: The EIS should consider the cumulative effect of exposure to radiation from radioactive food along with exposure from other potential sources of radiation.

RESPONSE: Impacts discussed in EIS Section 5.4.4 are cumulative.

ISSUE: Even if there was no radiation leak, the loss to farmers from dropping prices caused by fear of contamination could reach tens of millions of dollars. The EIS should consider the economic impact of perceived radiation contamination.

RESPONSE: Radiation is very easy to detect. Screening farm products for contamination would be easy and inexpensive. Unreasonable fear of contamination is not expected to be widespread enough to affect crop values.

ISSUE: The EIS should examine how long it would take an "advance contamination survey party" to reach the scene of a derailment.

RESPONSE: The response time would vary greatly, depending on the location. The Nuclear Accident Response Procedures manual estimates (for planning purposes only) that the advance team will determine whether contamination is present approximately 2 hours after the National Military Command Center is notified of an accident.

ISSUE: The EIS should state how people will know to contact Chemtrec in case of an emergency and how to find the Chemtrec telephone number.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 75.

ISSUE: The Air Force should seriously consider the economic effects spending these billions of dollars on education, health or retiring the national debt.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The EIS should consider the vastly decreased property values for land near Rail Garrisons and missile rail lines.

RESPONSE: No adverse impacts on land values are projected to result from the program. See individual Housing sections for each location in Chapter 4.
ISSUE: The EIS should provide the average and median duration of jobs that will be created as a result of Rail Garrison.

RESPONSE: Program-related construction jobs could continue over a 3-year period although based on past programs, most would have a duration between 6 and 18 months. The duration of program-related jobs during the construction phase is dependent upon the private companies who are awarded construction contracts. Jobs related to the operations of the program would have no limitations on duration.

ISSUE: The EIS should list the specific job categories that will be created by Rail Garrison deployment.

RESPONSE: Virtually all types of building trades and crafts will be required during the construction phase of the program. Operations requirements for civilian employees will be primarily in administration and services.

ISSUE: The EIS should list the average and median hourly wage the Air Force plans to pay workers.

RESPONSE: Average construction wages based on a cross-sector of trades and crafts is about $29,100 annually. Average nonconstruction civilian wages are about $23,900 annually. Also see response to Document 50, Comment 8.

ISSUE: The EIS should state the amount of work (in dollars) that will be done by out-of-state contractors and their employees.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 98.

ISSUE: The EIS should list the amount of jobs, expressed as percentage, numbers and dollars, that will be filled by military personnel at Whiteman AFB, Missouri.

RESPONSE: During the peak construction year, 89 jobs, or 20 percent of the program, will be military. The average annual salary for these positions is about $19,000. During operations, 281 jobs, or 83 percent of the program, will be military with an average annual salary of $17,400.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Little Rock, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas from a military and economical standpoint.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

292 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

293 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

294 1 ISSUE: Concerned about the poor quality of tracks in Montana which is evidenced by numerous train derailments. Statistics on number of deaths, injuries, property loss, and income loss need to be studied.

RESPONSE: Safety is paramount, the Air Force will not use unsafe tracks. Also see response to Document 15, Comment 3.

294 2 ISSUE: Commentor states that none of the concerns from the Great Falls, Montana scoping hearing were addressed in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

294 3 ISSUE: What would be the effects of an atomic explosion? There is no proposal to protect the civilian population in the event of such an occurrence.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 21, Comment 1.

294 4 ISSUE: The Final EIS should include a breakdown of all income coming from services provided by the Air Force and money for services provided locally in Great Falls, Montana by outside contractors.

RESPONSE: The increase in personal income due to the program represents the earnings which would go to all program-related employees (direct civilian workers, military personnel, and the secondary jobholders) in the Great Falls area. Money provided for services by outside contractors is not included in these estimates.

294 5 ISSUE: The Final EIS should include the cost of housing provided by the Air Force in Great Falls, Montana.

RESPONSE: Current projections of housing vacancies and potential new construction in Great Falls suggests that the Air Force would not have to provide any additional units through its housing programs (see EIS Section 4.9.1.3).

294 6 ISSUE: The Final EIS should include actual contributions made to Great Falls, Montana by the Air Force to offset the direct costs of implementation of the program.

RESPONSE: Costs of implementation of the program are borne by all taxpayers nationwide and not just by residents of Great Falls. Economic contributions to the Great Falls area are presented in EIS Section 4.9.1.3.
ISSUE: All data both pro and con should be included in the Final EIS so that the figures can be verified.

RESPONSE: The Final EIS was prepared in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act.

ISSUE: The safety record at Malmstrom AFB, Montana should be exposed to facilitate the accuracy of the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: The issue of Malmstrom AFB's safety record is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not address the sabotage issue and other issues including the safety of communities through which these trains must pass.

RESPONSE: The available information on the issue indicates that the probability that sabotage would be attempted and would result in a missile propellant fire or explosion is extremely small. Because there is no relevant pattern of sabotage from which to generalize, the probability estimate is necessarily qualitative. However, the consequences of a propellant fire or explosion and other mishaps are described in the EIS and no evidence suggests the consequences would be any greater in an instance of sabotage than described for the accidental occurrence of those events. Also see response to Document 37, Comment 7.

ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with statement made at Great Falls, Montana public hearing that trains at no time would be going anywhere near rail switching systems.

RESPONSE: The response provided at the public hearing stated that it would be very unlikely that the Peacekeeper trains would be in a transfer yard for a length of time if the system were ever deployed.

ISSUE: Commentor states that the 30 mph speed limit for the trains is unrealistic and misleading.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor states that because the system is stationary it is an attempt to violate treaties that are in place or are being negotiated.

RESPONSE: Violations of treaties are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because there would not be any adverse effect on the environment or the community.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Has the communication system that is dependent upon Montana Power Company been adequately examined?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program will increase Montana Power's peak demand for electricity by less than one percent. The program will have no effect on the existing communication system.
296  ISSUE: In the event of an emergency with a minimum amount of warning, would not the rail-based missile in the garrisons be more apt to be destroyed rather than in individual silos?

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

297  ISSUE: Commentor supports deployment of Peacekeeper missile at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because of economic opportunities.

RESPONSE: Noted.

298  ISSUE: If a nuclear attack can happen in only a few minutes, how would the MX Rail be useful if it is to be taken out of garrison and that takes 4-6 hours?

RESPONSE: Operational details involving no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

298  ISSUE: Doesn't arming the rail in a need situation promote a first-strike attitude?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

298  ISSUE: Does not storage of the MX and other nuclear weapons create a target for the enemy to aim at?

RESPONSE: Issues of enemy targeting are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

298  ISSUE: What other economic carrots with job potential are being offered to devastated farm communities besides weapon involvement?

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

299  ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

300  ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper missile at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because a strong defense means a peaceful coexistence with our world neighbors.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

301  ISSUE: During a national crisis when the Peacekeeper train would be on the passenger track, there would likely be much heavier use of the railroad by those hoping to escape the area.

RESPONSE: Railroad dispatchers control traffic on the rail network. In a time of national need, Peacekeeper trains will receive top priority.

301  ISSUE: Concerned that a vulnerable (faulty) track will be used as a launch pad.
RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

302  1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and submitted newspaper article on a train derailment.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

303  1 ISSUE: Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas, and sees no negative environmental matters. The program would be a great addition to the community.

RESPONSE: Noted.

304  1 ISSUE: Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison deployment in Jacksonville, Arkansas. Issues have been discussed satisfactorily and it is apparent that environmental impact will be minimal. The economic impact will be beneficial to the community.

RESPONSE: Noted.

305  1 ISSUE: Commentor supports no action and that no nuclear weapons be deployed in Michigan or anywhere.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

306  1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to nuclear weapons. Whatever needs to be done can be done by agreement, if the motives on both sides are equal. Also submitted newspaper article on United States inspection at Soviet sites.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

306  2 ISSUE: Commentor asks what publication discusses the Soviet rejection of limiting their mobile trains and truck missiles.

RESPONSE: Such limits are being discussed under the START talks between the United States and the Soviet Union.

306  3 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison because of the economics involved.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

307  1 ISSUE: The Minot schools welcome the opportunity to meet the needs of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

308  1 ISSUE: Define national need, so we can understand what circumstances Rail Garrison would be activated beyond the base.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 98.

308  2 ISSUE: Where can a citizen obtain copies of the Draft EIS supplementary documents.
No supplementing documents have been prepared in support of the Draft EIS. Also see response to Document 50, Comment 2.

308 3 ISSUE: Railroads should be addressed in the transportation section for F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: Discussion of railroads in the F.E. Warren, AFB area are addressed in EIS Section 4.1.2.

308 4 ISSUE: No county officials in the Panhandle received any word on potential basing of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

RESPONSE: Only those counties impacted by the potential deployment were notified of the project.

309 1 ISSUE: Commentor in total support of the Peacekeeper system at Little Rock, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

310 1 ISSUE: What is the life expectancy of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 61.

310 2 ISSUE: What is to be done with the radioactive wastes when the life of the system is over?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 63 and Document 50, Comment 30.

310 3 ISSUE: This system is based on the idea of a winnable nuclear war. There are many scientists who believe that there is no such thing and that nuclear war - even on a small scale would lead to a nuclear winter. How do you respond to this?

RESPONSE: The issue of increased risk of nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

310 4 ISSUE: What is the definition of a "Peacekeeper" nuclear weapon?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper missile is described in EIS Chapter 1.

310 5 ISSUE: Who will be responsible for cleanup of contamination in case of a derailment or some other devastating accident?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 84.

310 6 ISSUE: How can you be sure that your moving missile launcher will act as planned when Murphy's Law is always at work, especially where moving parts are involved?

RESPONSE: Measures that will be taken to ensure safe operation are described in EIS Chapter 5. Issues concerning system reliability are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
311 1 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not properly address the No Action Alternative other than the statement made in the Draft EIS. "No Action" and spending the money in education or leaving it in the civilian economy should be analyzed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 31.

311 2 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper anywhere because the money would be better spent on education and a more productive economy.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

312 1 ISSUE: Comment made that the economic benefits in Grand Forks, North Dakota will not be evenly distributed, such as retail business and service sectors. There are no benefits for government employees or retired people.

RESPONSE: Economic benefits would be experienced primarily in the construction, transportation services, and trade sectors, however, all sectors may experience some program-related activity.

312 2 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to adequately discuss the economic impacts of the No Action Alternative.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 31.

312 3 ISSUE: Will the system make us safer? Will it destabilize the dynamic balance we have with the Soviets and will it encourage them to react with a "hair trigger" in times of crisis.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

313 1 ISSUE: There is no justifiable military need for building mobile Peacekeeper missiles. It will add to the defense of the United States, but it will escalate the arms race.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

314 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports implementation of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota and recognizes the attendant responsibilities of the surrounding communities to the logistics, operations, and increased labor force in support thereof.

RESPONSE: Noted.

315 1 ISSUE: Hearing notice fails to conform to Air Force Department of Defense (DOD) Regulation 989.15 (b) (2).

RESPONSE: A review of the DOD regulation indices reveals no reference to DOD Regulation Section 989.15(b)(2). Air Force regulations are not enumerated in this manner.

315 2 ISSUE: The EIS is not widely available.

RESPONSE: The Draft EIS was sent to everyone who either attended a scoping meeting and filled out a card requesting one, or sent a letter to the Air Force. Copies were also sent to selected libraries.
315 3 ISSUE: Public hearings are not being held at a sufficient number of locations.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

315 4 ISSUE: Time between distribution of the Draft EIS and hearing was not sufficient for adequate preparation of a critique.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

315 5 ISSUE: Supporting documents (to Draft EIS) were not provided when requested, which made it impossible to analyze data properly.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 308, Comment 2.

315 6 ISSUE: The Air Force has not released transcripts of the scoping meetings when requested to do so.

RESPONSE: Publication of scoping meeting transcripts is not required. Transcripts of hearings for the Draft EIS will be published in Volume II of the EIS.

315 7 ISSUE: Three hours is not sufficient for this meeting given the fact that the Air Force uses up part of that time for their presentation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

315 8 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to adequately present the alternatives, including the No Action Alternative.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

315 9 ISSUE: The Draft EIS has not included the impact of building an ABM system to protect the MX.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 6.

315 10 ISSUE: Concerned about baseline analysis for Grand Forks, North Dakota. The Draft EIS is flawed because all demographic projections are based on an influx of 1,004 people for the Over-the-Horizon program.

RESPONSE: Should the Over-the-Horizon radar program not be deployed, the availability of housing, public services, classroom space, and local government finances would be larger than stated in the Draft EIS. As a result, impacts would be lower than presented in the Draft EIS.

315 11 ISSUE: The Air Force has not considered the extent of which the proposed project is controversial.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 104, Comment 3.

315 12 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to address the degree to which this action establishes a precedent for future actions.

RESPONSE: The degree to which the Proposed Action and alternatives may have established a precedent for future actions with significant effects or representing a decision in principle about a future consideration
was considered according to Council of Environmental Quality regulations (see EIS Chapter 3).

316 1 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to adequately address decommissioning.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

316 2 ISSUE: Relying on future improved technology for the handling and disposal of nuclear waste could pose dangers to air, water, and food products ultimately consumed by humans.

RESPONSE: Noted.

316 3 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to deploying the proposed system and states an alternative plan should be completed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

317 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison because it increases the likelihood of nuclear confrontation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

318 1 ISSUE: Is Rail Garrison spending an effective creator of jobs compared with alternative ways of using government monies?

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

318 2 ISSUE: Will Rail Garrison spending create the kinds of jobs most needed and most helpful in developing a vital economy?

RESPONSE: Analysis of the impact of government spending is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

318 3 ISSUE: Will Rail Garrison spending represent an efficient or equitable use of government resources?

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

319 1 ISSUE: Commentor suggests we concentrate on promoting international understanding and solving our serious environmental problems rather than military buildup.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

320 1 ISSUE: Resolution for the record from the City of East Grand Forks, Minnesota in support of Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota chosen as a site of the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

321 1 ISSUE: The State of Missouri Federal Assistance Clearinghouse in cooperation with interested state and local agencies had no comments or recommendations to offer.
RESPONSE: Noted.

322 1 ISSUE: The submitted comments are an exact copy of a major portion of Document 287.

RESPONSE: See Document 287, Comments 47 through 100.

323 1 ISSUE: The U.S. Bureau of the Census July 1, 1984 population for the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming was 50,935.

RESPONSE: Noted.

324 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the EIS and the selection of Minot AFB, North Dakota for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

325 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports Rail Garrison because it is what is best for the nation and has minimal impacts on Minot, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: Noted.

326 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison because it is a vital part of our nation and would also be an asset to Jacksonville, Arkansas and the surrounding communities.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

327 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper at Jacksonville, Arkansas if approved by Congress.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

328 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system in Jacksonville, Arkansas. No adverse environmental problems have been noted over the 21 years of the Titan missile and the same would be the case for this system.

RESPONSE: Noted.

329 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Peacekeeper missile at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

330 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison because the dollars are better spent on food, health care, education, and shelter for each United States citizen.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

330 2 ISSUE: What is the breakdown of new civilian jobs versus new military jobs in the Bossier-Shreveport, Louisiana area?

RESPONSE: In the peak year of construction activities related to the Proposed Action, civilian jobs (including secondary jobs) would number 691 and military jobs would be 110. During each year of operations, civilian
jobs would number 219 and military jobs would number 353 (see EIS Section 4.3.1.3).

**ISSUE:** Which jobs (quantity) will give job placement to citizens presently living in Shreveport-Bossier, Louisiana both during construction and operation of the garrison?

**RESPONSE:** During peak construction activities for the Proposed Action, approximately 580 local hires out of 801 total (civilian and military) jobs created are projected. During operations, 174 local hires are projected out of 572 total jobs created (see EIS Section 4.3.1.3).

**ISSUE:** What training will be necessary to work at the site in Louisiana (i.e., those with "hi-tech" backgrounds or blue collar workers)?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 50, Comment 9.

**ISSUE:** How many new military personnel will be imported to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana?

**RESPONSE:** Military personnel would number 110 during the peak construction year and 353 during operations and would all be inmigrants.

**ISSUE:** In the event of a derailment or any kind of accident, the impact would affect thousands, even millions of people and other environmental life in an area at least 50 to 100 miles from Whiteman AFB, Missouri. This was not addressed in the EIS.

**RESPONSE:** Safety concerns are addressed in EIS Chapter 5.

**ISSUE:** Commentor disappointed that no one cares if the MX is deployed at Whiteman AFB, Missouri if wildlife habitats will be destroyed.

**RESPONSE:** Impacts on biological resources at Whiteman AFB are discussed in Section 4.11.6.3 of the EIS.

**ISSUE:** Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. All environmental issues have been addressed with no adverse impacts.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

**ISSUE:** The proposed system should not be developed and deployed because it is a first-strike weapon and therefore destabilizing, the United States already has enough nuclear weapons; the nuclear weapons violate international law; and the promotion of the system by the Air Force is more an effort to preserve and enhance Air Force jobs and promotions in an interservice rivalry with the Navy than a genuine concern about national security.

**RESPONSE:** Preservation and enhancement of Air Force jobs are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Commentor in full support of Peacekeeper deployment at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison because the dollars spent on this system could be spent in a more productive way.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Comment for the record in full support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The proposed system should not be developed and deployed because it is a first-strike weapon and therefore destabilizing; the United States already has enough nuclear weapons; the nuclear weapons violate international law; and the promotion of the system by the Air Force is more an effort to preserve and enhance Air Force jobs and promotions in an interservice rivalry with the Navy than a genuine concern about national security.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 3, Comment 1 and Document 34, Comment 22.

ISSUE: The Final EIS should discuss the relative events of this system and previously proposed basing modes that were rejected and should show how the system conforms to the spirit of the INF treaty.

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: The EIS should discuss the environmental impacts of producing the material for the Peacekeeper missiles.

RESPONSE: The production of material for the Peacekeeper missile is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The EIS should discuss the environmental impacts of the intentional use of nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: The issue of intentional use of nuclear weapons is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because of additional local jobs in Jacksonville.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: The Rail Garrison basing mode is destabilizing.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The lag time of four to six hours before the missiles are well spread out makes this basing system very vulnerable to "surprise" attack.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Using public train tracks poses major logistical problems if the military works in concert with civilian railroad workers, then Soviet intelligence could fairly easily infiltrate the system.
RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of the EIS.

339 4 ISSUE: If the military operates the train alone, there is a likelihood of confusion and possible accidents in the event of nuclear war.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

339 5 ISSUE: Train tracks are susceptible to natural damages and sabotage.

RESPONSE: Natural damages are addressed in EIS Section 5.2.3. Also see response to Document 6, Comment 2.

339 6 ISSUE: Having the missiles continuously riding public tracks increases all dangers.

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper trains would be dispersed onto the national rail network only during times of national need.

339 7 ISSUE: It makes no sense to spend more money on the Peacekeeper when United States arms control policy is focused on eliminating long-range nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

340 1 ISSUE: The Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality states that permits to construct must be obtained for certain types of sediment control structures, and water and sewer line extensions.

RESPONSE: A discussion held with personnel from the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality determined that no special construction permit was required with respect to water quality. If constructed, water and sewer line permits would be obtained. Estimates of construction-induced sedimentation from the proposed Rail Garrison sites are provided in Section 4.2 of the EIS.

340 2 ISSUE: Statements regarding erosion and water quality are confusing, if not contradictory. Terms such as "minor" and "short-term impact" are used to describe water quality, while Draft EIS Page 2-8 indicates that impacts from soil erosion would be significant.

RESPONSE: Significant soil erosion impacts do not necessarily result in significant water quality impacts, particularly if the site is remote from a water body or drained by a highly intermittent stream, as is the case for the north garrison site at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

340 3 ISSUE: Concerned about leaving 102.4 acres barren of vegetation during the life of the program.

RESPONSE: For the program, some land will be permanently disturbed by the construction of facilities. Land that is temporarily disturbed during the construction phase will be revegetated to the extent feasible.

340 4 ISSUE: Additional information should be provided to substantiate statements regarding erosion and water quality and to quantify any impacts. Mitigation and control measures should be identified.
RESPONSE: Estimates of construction-induced sedimentation from the proposed Rail Garrison sites are provided in EIS Sections 4.2.8 to 4.12.8. At F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming a detention pond is recommended to control potentially significant increases in storm runoff and sedimentation in the Dry Creek drainage if concurrent deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and Small ICBM programs occur. In addition, EIS Chapter 4 summarizes a number of construction practices that would be incorporated into the environmental plans developed by the contractors selected to construct the various portions of the Rail Garrison program. These include the best management practices for avoiding soil erosion, for soil stabilization, and revegetation (EIS Chapter 4 and Section 4.2.7.5).

ISSUE: At the public hearing, not one person, agency, or group presented a serious, logical, and realistic argument against the establishment of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison in the state or specifically located at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.
RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS did not appear to have any adverse impacts caused by deployment of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. Although subjective and important, the relationship between the base and the City of Jacksonville was not touched upon.
RESPONSE: In every resource area, a Region of Influence was addressed as to where impacts are likely to occur. In most cases, the affected area would be the base and local community, such as Jacksonville.

ISSUE: Commentor supports Peacekeeper at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because it would be beneficial to the base and the City of Jacksonville.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Jacksonville, Arkansas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Final EIS should address potential hazards such as a missile propellant fire or explosion which could result from sabotage and the precautions being taken to prevent such an incident.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: The psychological impact of the deployment of the system, and the resulting economic impact should be addressed in the Final EIS. The psychological impact could include discouraging people or businesses from locating in the area, causing an economic impact.
RESPONSE: Available evidence on the issue indicates that there is a net positive economic impact as a result of deployment of a missile system in an area. The purely psychological effects of deployment are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: The Final EIS should address the impact of decommissioning and removing the system from the deployment installations.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

345 1 ISSUE: Commentor objects to nuclear warhead weapons passing through any city with the danger of rail accidents.

RESPONSE: Noted.

345 2 ISSUE: Commentor skeptical of the purpose of this mobile basing to shield the locations and keep it unknown.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

345 3 ISSUE: Doubling the number of Peacekeeper missiles is counter to Congressional approval and counter to the weapons reduction efforts being pursued by the administration.

RESPONSE: The purpose and need of the program are discussed in EIS Section 1.1.

345 4 ISSUE: Commentor supports the No Action Alternative.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

346 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. All aspects pro and con of the proposed program were covered at length and in detail.

RESPONSE: Noted.

347 1 ISSUE: With the sophisticated intelligence technologies today, commentor questions the effectiveness of the system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

347 2 ISSUE: In the event of a train wreck, how will plutonium leaks be minimized and what kind of test will be performed to study this problem for safe missile transportation?

RESPONSE: The design and construction of the reentry vehicle, reentry system, launch cannister and missile launch car ensure that the probability of release of radioactive material is minimal. Inspections and tests of those components, to ensure compliance with design requirements, will precede deployment of the system.

347 3 ISSUE: It appears there are insurmountable security problems and environmental risks which threaten the well-being of people who live near rail lines.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

348 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the Rail Garrison program in Grand Forks, North Dakota or anywhere in the United States.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

349 1 ISSUE: Commentor critical of civic leaders ability to speak at public hearings and commentor not able to speak.
**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

**ISSUE:** The environment will be rubbled if the missile accidentally explodes.

**RESPONSE:** The likelihood and consequences of such accidents are discussed in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the EIS.

**ISSUE:** The rails in the Abilene, Texas area are not the best, creating an unsafe situation.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 24, Comment 2.

**ISSUE:** Commentor in full support of this mission.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Commentor suggests other public hearing locations be set up so they can attend and voice their concern.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

**ISSUE:** Commentor's opinion is that housing Peacekeepers on trains on their tracks is inappropriate and impractical.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Why do we need more missiles?

**RESPONSE:** Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Commentor heartily endorses and supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison basing at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Minot AFB, North Dakota because of favorable response from the people of the area, and the fact that the EIS shows no problem with the environment.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

**ISSUE:** Commentor supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project at Minot AFB, North Dakota because of the positive economic impact in the Minot area and no damage to the environment.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

**ISSUE:** Commentor protests the 3-minute time limitation for individuals to testify and closing the hearing at 10 P.M., even when more people wanted to speak.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

**ISSUE:** Commentor stated both Peacekeeper and Small ICBM are redundant, destabilizing, and expensive and would like both projects stopped.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

356 1 ISSUE: Sending the trains on regular train tracks through highly populated areas of the western states puts too many people at risk.

RESPONSE: Noted.

356 2 ISSUE: Sending trains on regular train tracks conceivably leaves it more open to terrorist attack.

RESPONSE: See response Document 6, Comment 2.

356 3 ISSUE: The project was inadequately publicized, not giving the general public or any concerned groups opportunity to submit comments before a decision is made.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 9.

357 1 ISSUE: The system does not make one feel any safer from the Russians and there are more important ways to spend the money.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

358 1 ISSUE: Concerned about transporting of nuclear weapons near population centers.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 7.

358 2 ISSUE: Shouldn't the United States wait for the outcome of current arms control talks before building a new missile?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

359 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Spokane, Washington or anywhere else.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

360 1 ISSUE: The availability of the Draft EIS was not well advertised.

RESPONSE: The filing of the Draft EIS was released to national and local media outlets. Also see response to Document 315, Comment 2.

360 2 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program because warheads on trains would pass through or near major cities, or on passenger trains.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 7.

361 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan. The community and Michigan need the program and Wurtsmith is a perfect location.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

362 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Rail Garrison program at Minot AFB, North Dakota to help the theme of deterrence. The base plays an important role in the economy and community of Minot.
RESPONSE: Noted.

363 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because over the long term, Little Rock AFB would be the most economical compared with other locations studied.

RESPONSE: Noted.

364 1 ISSUE: Commentor protests the 3-minute time limit for verbal comment and the location of the meeting in Medical Lake, Washington.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 53 and Document 34, Comment 11.

364 2 ISSUE: The money spent for Rail Garrison is better spent on satellites and launch vehicles to enhance security.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

364 3 ISSUE: Rail accidents are very common in the Spokane, Washington area. The potential for rail accidents will certainly increase during times of national need because of increased auto traffic and general nervousness. This can be addressed and not just dismissed as "no information available."

RESPONSE: Risk assessments for rail accidents involving the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system are discussed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

364 4 ISSUE: Many times drug or alcohol abuse is the cause of rail accidents.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 4.

364 5 ISSUE: It is stated in Chapter 5 that plutonium "dust" on clothing or even skin results in contamination and does not result in biological harm. That is not correct. It should read "will most likely result in plutonium being inhaled and ingested."

RESPONSE: The discussion referred to was intended to explain the difference between contamination by radioactive materials (specifically alpha-emitters) and exposure to radiation. The discussion has been rewritten in EIS Chapter 5 to remove any implication that contamination is not a serious concern.

364 6 ISSUE: "Cleanup of dispersed plutonium by recognized means" glosses over a serious problem. A quantity such as might be in a special weapon could ruin an entire city such as Spokane, Washington.

RESPONSE: The commitment to clean up any radioactive material contamination was not meant as a glossing over of the problem. The means used to cleanup dispersed radioactive material would vary from site to site depending on the conditions encountered. Previous dispersals of weapon grade plutonium have been cleaned up by the Department of Defense. Future dispersals would be also. Though a dispersal in a city like Spokane would be time consuming, it is not thought to be impossible.
364 7 ISSUE: The "plutonium dust" referred to in the Draft EIS is most likely plutonium dioxide.

RESPONSE: The Final EIS has been revised to read "plutonium dioxide dust."

364 8 ISSUE: The Draft EIS is seriously lacking in details regarding how an accident involving a plutonium warhead fire could be handled. What about the training of local police, fire, and other emergency teams?

RESPONSE: A discussion of accident response and cleanup is in EIS Section 5.5. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.

364 9 ISSUE: Should residents of the area have radioactivity monitors?

RESPONSE: Public announcement of an accident and potential hazard would, in almost all cases, precede the spread of any radioactivity. Privately owned monitoring equipment is therefore not expected to be of any use.

364 10 ISSUE: How will residents be told to evacuate, and where should they go?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

364 11 ISSUE: We have uranium mines and thorium deposits in the Spokane, Washington area. Portable detectors such as those used by radiation monitoring personnel cannot tell the difference among these radionuclides. If a detector goes off the scale at the site of an accident, how will anyone know whether it is plutonium? Are you going to do a survey of rail routes to locate naturally occurring alpha emitters?

RESPONSE: A plutonium spill or dispersal would be characterized by a very high radioactivity level at the source and diminishing levels at increasing distance. Naturally occurring radiation would be more uniformly radioactive over a larger area. If any doubt persists, samples can be tested chemically usually within a number of hours.

365 1 ISSUE: Commentor states the MX system is a first-strike weapon aimed at targets in the Soviet Union and is not a deterrent weapon. It is morally and psychologically not justified and endangers the Spokane area. Commentor opposed to deployment anywhere.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 3, Comment 1 and Document 5, Comment 14.

366 1 ISSUE: Hearings were held only adjacent to the bases being considered for garrison construction, despite the fact that this missile system will be mobile and traversing many other states and regions during normal operation and in time of national need.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

366 2 ISSUE: In the areas where public hearings weren't held, state and local officials were not informed of the proposal or of the Draft EIS process and were not provided with copies of the Draft EIS.
RESPONSE: Copies of the Draft EIS were sent to the Governor's offices, as well as the State Clearinghouses in each state affected by the program. Also see responses to Document 34, Comment 11 and Document 315, Comment 2.

366 3 ISSUE: Insufficient time was provided at those public hearings which were held for input from citizens in the affected areas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

366 4 ISSUE: At the public hearings, the Air Force representative spoke for two hours leaving only one hour for questions and comments from the public audience.

RESPONSE: At each of the 11 public hearings, an Air Force representative used the first hour of the hearing to present to those in attendance a summary of the program and the findings of the Draft EIS. The remaining two hours were used to solicit questions and comments from the public audience on the environmental adequacy and accuracy of the Draft EIS. During this period, Air Force representatives provided responses to specific questions or comments, if requested, or corrected factually incorrect statements.

366 5 ISSUE: Wartime and psychological impacts must be considered in the EIS process.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

366 6 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to meet the standard of adequacy in its discussion of the No Action Alternative.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

366 7 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not address the national economic impacts of the No Action Alternative. How many jobs would be created if $10 - $15 billion was spent on other public works projects, rail systems, or education?

RESPONSE: The revised cost estimate is $10 to $12 billion. See response to Document 270, Comment 31.

366 8 ISSUE: Why haven't any of the other MX basing modes under active consideration been chosen?

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

366 9 ISSUE: Why doesn't the Draft EIS discuss the reasons that the Rail Garrison system was rejected in previous years and whether those reasons still include significant environmental impacts?

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

366 10 ISSUE: The Proposed Action fails to specify whether 50 MX missiles would be the ones currently deployed in silos at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming or whether 50 additional missiles would be deployed on trains.
RESPONSE: New missiles would be manufactured for the Proposed Action. The Alternative Action would include 50 new missiles and 50 missiles removed from silos near F.E. Warren AFB.

366 11 ISSUE: If 50 additional missiles are to be deployed at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, what is the cost of procuring them and why aren't these costs included in the table on Draft EIS Page 4.1-2?

RESPONSE: Up to 8 missiles for the Proposed Action and up to 12 missiles for the Alternative Action may be deployed at F.E. Warren AFB. The production cost of the 50 Peacekeeper missiles required for the Rail Garrison program is approximately $4.3 billion. This amount is included in total program expenditures presented in Table 4.1.1-1 of the Final EIS. The 50 additional missiles required for the Alternative Action have already been procured under the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos program and no further expenditure would be required.

366 12 ISSUE: Why aren't the impacts and costs of deploying the 50 MX missiles currently in silos at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming discussed?

RESPONSE: The impacts were analyzed and documented in the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos Final EIS filed in January 1984. The effects of using these 50 missiles for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program are included in the Alternative Action discussion in EIS Section 4.2.

366 13 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to answer how this system will function and the impacts of its deployment with the general public.

RESPONSE: The operations function is described in Chapter 1; the analytical methodology in Chapter 3, and the impacts in Chapter 4 of the EIS.

366 14 ISSUE: How will the operation of this system interface with public and private use of rail lines, rights-of-way, and rail crossings during practice runs or during times of crisis?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 76.

366 15 ISSUE: What will be the cost to public and private rail users of interruptions in service?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 76.

366 16 ISSUE: Will MX trains be granted special rights-of-way privileges? Will these powers increase the possibility of collision and other accidents?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 7.

366 17 ISSUE: How will the populations living near garrisons and rail lines used by these MX trains be able to distinguish between practice runs and an actual crisis release of MX missile trains for use in nuclear war?

RESPONSE: Physically, the training train will resemble an operational train. The public probably will not be able to identify either Rail Garrison training trains or operational trains, which will look much like ordinary freight trains.
366 18 ISSUE: What dangers might armed security personnel pose to civilians living or traveling near the tracks who might be misidentified as a threat to the train?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 7, 12, and 13.

366 19 ISSUE: Will the security personnel on training trains be authorized to use force if protestors are encountered?

RESPONSE: No new or special authorization for use of force by security personnel is expected. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 45.

366 20 ISSUE: If civilian police officers are used to clear the track, how will they be compensated? Has this expenditure been calculated into the basing mode budget?

RESPONSE: It is the function of local law enforcement authorities to prevent civilians from breaking the peace or trespassing.

366 21 ISSUE: Will the trains be authorized to run over individuals intentionally blocking their path?

RESPONSE: No. The trains will not intentionally run over such individuals.

366 22 ISSUE: Will the real or perceived mobilization of MX trains trigger apprehension of a crisis on a local, national, or global scale? How will the Air Force mitigate the effects of public fear about impending attack?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

366 23 ISSUE: Will civil unrest interfere with the operation-as-designed of the MX rail system?

RESPONSE: No. Also see response to Document 50, Comment 86.

366 24 ISSUE: If MX trains are able to leave their garrison undetected and are constructed to look like civilian rail traffic, how can the civilian dispatchers responsible for clearing the rail lines be relied on to cooperate with Air Force plans?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

366 25 ISSUE: Will the dispatchers be told what they are clearing the tracks for? How can they be counted on to give the MX trains priority over civilian traffic? Will martial law be imposed during a time of crisis?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

366 26 ISSUE: How can civilians be relied on not to tell the Soviets the location of the missile trains within their jurisdiction?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.
 ISSUE: Will civilian dispatchers be required to have a security clearance, comply with random drug testing, and be screened medically and psychologically?

RESPONSE: This is still to be determined between the Air Force and the railroads.

 ISSUE: In time of national need, what measures would be taken to compel civilian dispatchers to report for work? If they do not report, what steps will the Air Force take to keep the system running? What will be the cost?

RESPONSE: Operational details involving no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

 ISSUE: What indicators and assumptions were used to generate the employment figures shown on Draft EIS Table 4.1.1.-1? These figures are completely outside the range of all reputable studies.

RESPONSE: Employment estimates were derived using a national input-output model. The model was developed by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, based on 1977 national input-output relationships among the 537 sectors identified for the United States and updated with the most recent available employment and earnings estimates (1984).

 ISSUE: Will short-term jobs really have any net positive effect on local communities or the nation as a whole? How long will these jobs last?

RESPONSE: Initial program requirements during the construction and deployment phase would provide additional employment and income over a 3 to 4 year period. Construction activity would primarily affect local communities hosting garrison bases; while research, development and production activities would involve industries throughout the United States. Operations requirements, including both direct employment and program procurement at a reduced level, would continue for the lifetime of the system. Increased direct spending would provide additional secondary employment during both program phases.

 ISSUE: Will the new jobs created by garrison construction employ those who are currently unemployed? Will the jobs be filled by local citizens or by specialists from outside the region?

RESPONSE: A mix of currently unemployed workers and specialists from outside the region is projected. On the average, approximately 70 percent of the construction labor requirement is estimated to be filled by the local labor force.

 ISSUE: After construction of the garrisons, will there be any long-term economic benefits derived from the project? If so, what are these benefits, and how long will they exist after the garrisons are completed?

RESPONSE: National economic benefits are approximately 9,000 jobs and $175 million in earnings per year projected to last over the life of the program (see EIS Section 4.1.1).
366 33 ISSUE: Will the workers be allowed to use the Air Force's BX and other facilities? If they are, how will this new economic activity impact already existing local economies?

RESPONSE: No. Onbase BX facilities are reserved for use only by military personnel and their dependents.

366 34 ISSUE: How much track renovation and new track construction will be required to implement the Rail Garrison system? How will the costs be shared?

RESPONSE: The proposal includes track renovation and construction only on tracks between the garrisons and the main line where the trains will access the rail network. The cost of that renovation and construction has not yet been determined exactly, but estimates are included in the total program cost. Also see response to Document 15, Comment 3.

366 35 ISSUE: If the Air Force plans to build more than one rail line out of each garrison, what additional rights-of-way will need to be purchased for the required track?

RESPONSE: The Dual Rail Egress described in EIS Section 1.8 is not part of the Proposed Action. It is unknown what additional rights-of-way would be required to implement more than one rail line out of each garrison because no such study has been undertaken. Before any decision is made to construct additional rail lines, appropriate environmental analyses would be prepared.

366 36 ISSUE: How does the Air Force plan to reimburse residents or owners who might be displaced from, or lose the use of, their property due to program construction?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 262, Comment 13.

366 37 ISSUE: What steps will be taken to protect ordinary citizens from MX missile train mishaps while carrying dangerous cargo? What will be the cost and how will the Air Force determine if these steps are sufficient to protect the public?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.

366 38 ISSUE: How will public cooperation be mobilized to respond to an accident or malfunction of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system? Will martial law be imposed during a time of national crisis?

RESPONSE: In the event of an accident, the public will be warned by the train crew and the early response team to stay away from any potential hazard area. Deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system would not alter the laws regarding the imposition of martial law. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.

366 39 ISSUE: In the event of a derailment caused by either a collision with another train or by sabotage, can radioactive isotopes escape from the missile warheads either as the result of the collision impact or fire?

RESPONSE: Though such an event is extremely unlikely, the safety analysis considers the possibility and, to provide a complete analysis, the EIS (Section 5.3.1) describes the environmental impacts of such an event.
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ISSUE: What provisions will be made to protect the public and the environment from an accident resulting in an explosion and/or the release of radioactivity into the environment? What is the cost of such protective steps?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 21, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will local personnel near the rail lines used by the MX missile trains be equipped to deal with hazardous waste containment and removal? What is the cost of such preparations?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 68.

ISSUE: Will each community along the proposed MX train deployment arterials have its own evacuation plan? Who is responsible for writing and giving final approval to such plans, and for coordinating the plans and responses of several different communities along the same rail line?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: What provisions will be made to secure the civilian rail bed from sabotage by terrorists or others seeking to derail civilian rail traffic? What is the cost of such preparations?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: How will MX components with dangerous explosives or radioactive materials be transported to their garrisons for final assembly? How can the Air Force assure the public that MX missiles and their components will be shipped safely to their basing location?

RESPONSE: The transportation of the missiles and reentry systems to the garrisons are described in EIS Section 5.2.1. The safety assurances the Air Force can provide are procedures and regulations designed to ensure safe deployment and operation of the system and a commitment to adhere to those procedures and regulations.

ISSUE: How will the Air Force ensure against accidents at assembly areas like the recent Morton Thiokol plant accident in Utah?

RESPONSE: The nuclear certification and safety procedures are described in Section 5.1 of the EIS.

ISSUE: What effect would an accident involving one missile have on other nearby missiles in their garrisons?

RESPONSE: Train Alert Shelters are designed to prevent an accident to one missile affecting any other missiles.

ISSUE: Would the MX missile trains be hardened against electromagnetic pulse? If so, how much would the hardening cost? If not, how will the Air Force ensure that the communications system necessary to authorize and target a missile launch will operate in the event of an atomic explosion high above the United States?

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Is the civilian rail bed that this system would incorporate strong enough to withstand the firing of missiles from trains at any point in the system? If not, what would it cost to upgrade civilian rail lines to allow missile launches?

RESPONSE: The missile launch car is equipped with stabilization outriggers, housed on the underside of the car, which would deploy and stabilize the car by distributing the weight of the car over the rails and ballast. This enables the missile to be erected and ejected from the cannister and prevents damage to the rail network.

ISSUE: The EIS must fully examine the No Action option and evaluate worst-case scenarios.

RESPONSE: Worst-case scenarios are discussed in Chapter 5 of the EIS. Also see response to Document 37, Comment 15.

ISSUE: Commentor requests an additional 30 days of the comment period because the Proposed Action is quite large and controversial.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor requests that future hearings and public notifications be conducted on a national rather than a regional level because the program is national in scope.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: The Fort Sill Apache Tribe in Apache, Oklahoma has no concerns in regard to the area around the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison site.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Comment sheet by Shoney's South, Inc. with no comment.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because the site is one of the least expensive locations, has rail lines in every direction, and can accommodate the additional people.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because the environmental consequences were adequately covered.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor opposes nuclear missiles in the Midwest or any population centers.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately address the questions raised at the scoping hearings. The Final EIS must do this.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.
2 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately address the environmental impacts of the No Action Alternative, especially the economic impact of not spending $10 - 15 Billion on the Rail Garrison MX program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 7.

3 ISSUE: There should be hearings in Colorado because MX trains and supply trains will travel through this state.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

4 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not address many possible deployment options.

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

5 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately assess the human factor in risk quantitatively and add this to a quantitative assessment of the technologic error risk.

RESPONSE: See EIS Chapter 5.

6 ISSUE: It appears the Rail Garrison MX program is being built before it has been tested.

RESPONSE: Noted.

7 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately discuss how the Rail Garrison MX would function in chill factors of 60 degrees below zero.

RESPONSE: Wind chill factors are measurements of the effect of wind on humans and are not applicable to mechanical systems.

8 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not define a "higher authority."

RESPONSE: The term higher authority is defined as the President and Secretary of Defense and their duly deputized alternates or successors.

9 ISSUE: The Draft EIS doesn't define wartime use.

RESPONSE: Wartime use would be any use of the system during a period of active hostilities.

Commentor supports the project at Minot AFB, North Dakota because of community support.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Commentor supports the project at Minot AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Commentor supports the project at Minot AFB, North Dakota because there will be no negative effect on the Minot Park District.

RESPONSE: Noted.
ISSUE: No provisions seem to be made for notifying the general populace in the event of any mishap. An independent liaison should be selected to report on problems with the health and safety aspect of the program.

RESPONSE: Existing provisions for notifying the public of hazards are adequate for any Peacekeeper Rail Garrison hazards. EIS Chapter 5 discusses safety issues.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the project at Whiteman AFB, Missouri because the location is near Kansas City; it is a duplication of other high-priced systems; arms negotiations will suffer; deterrence already exists; valuable farmland would be taken; and for moral purposes.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor feels that this project is taking a giant step backwards in arms negotiations and is financially ruining our country.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because of deterrence.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Minot AFB, North Dakota because of nuclear and economic security.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

 ISSUES: Supports the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because of no significant impacts on the local environment.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Who is in charge of informing the residents of southeast Wyoming and northern Colorado in case of an accident or incoming missiles?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force help with funding of the Laramie Civil Defense and the State Emergency Management Agency?

RESPONSE: The Air Force does not currently have such plans. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.


RESPONSE: Each is an independent agency with its unique jurisdiction and responsibilities. In the event of an emergency, they would work cooperatively. Issues of each agency's responsibility and authority would
depend on the nature of the emergency, its location, the ownership of the assets involved and other factors. Many of those issues are covered in the National Contingency Plan, which is referenced in Section 5.5.1 of the EIS.

384 4 ISSUE: Is it true that there is no working relationship between states?
RESPONSE: Whether or not there is a working relationship between states is beyond the scope of this EIS.

385 1 ISSUE: Opposed to the project at Whiteman AFB, Missouri or any other base because we are moving forward towards peace now, and it is a danger to our communities and nation.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

385 2 ISSUE: Commentor requests a thorough examination of the risk of rail accidents due to excessive weight and size of cars, and also due to sabotage.
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 6, Comment 2 and Document 33, Comment 74.

385 3 ISSUE: The Final EIS should address the psychological stress the MX would cause especially on the children.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

386 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because the area is not congested, community support, excellent schools, large labor force, community support, and an economic boost.
RESPONSE: Noted.

387 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Whiteman AFB, Missouri because of community support, a significant economic impact, available local labor force, commercial development, strong housing market, beneficial social impacts, and excellent public services.
RESPONSE: Noted.

387 2 ISSUE: The Air Force should work closely with the local emergency response teams identifying the types of hazardous materials onbase and coordinate the planning and use of the new conforming storage facility with the Whiteman Area Study Committee in Missouri.
RESPONSE: To assist local emergency response teams, the Air Force, as a matter of policy, will comply with community right-to-know laws as defined in the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 even though the law does not require such. The new conforming storage facility will be a temporary storage facility and no treatment or disposal of wastes will be associated with its operation. The siting and design has been completed and the facility is awaiting approval and funding. Discussions concerning its use should be directed to personnel at Whiteman AFB, or any other concerned base.

388 1 ISSUE: When will we have enough weapons?
ISSUE: Isn't the Rail Garrison simply a refashioning of the weapon system that was already rejected under President Carter?

RESPONSE: No. See Section 1.1 of the EIS.

ISSUE: Does not the MX Rail Garrison plan undermine the legitimate peacemaking efforts of both the United States and Soviet governments?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Isn't the Rail Garrison plan yet another step in the gradual proliferation of weapons systems which introduce the threats of accidents, the certainty of fallout, and increases international tension by making civilians and governments alike "hostages" to the nuclear powers?

RESPONSE: Issues regarding proliferation of nuclear weapons are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor wonders why scoping questions asked in Cheyenne, Wyoming were not addressed or even acknowledged in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: What, if any, effect will the public comments received at the Air Force hearings have on the Air Force's decision-making process?

RESPONSE: All comments received have been reviewed for pertinence to the analysis. If changes are appropriate, these are reflected in the EIS. The decision-makers will be aware of all comments and concerns during the selection process.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS doesn't discuss the ways in which the MX is expected to enhance America's national security, or failure to deploy it will have any impact at all on our national security.

RESPONSE: Issues of national security policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force comply with laws such as Wyoming's Industrial Siting Law or regulations that the state be notified when hazardous materials are being transported on our highways?

RESPONSE: Generally, activities undertaken by the federal government are not subject to state regulation or control unless the Congress specifically cooperates with the appropriate agencies to meet their requirements to the extent possible.

ISSUE: Commentor feels that words like "war" or "enemy" should be included in the EIS.

RESPONSE: Noted.
ISSUE: Will the 50 MX missiles based in the Rail Garrison mode be new missiles or existing ones? What is the cost?

RESPONSE: The Proposed Action assumes deployment of 50 new missiles. Under the Alternative Action, 100 missiles will be deployed. Of these, 50 missiles will be obtained from the repostured Minuteman Silos while the other 50 missiles will be new. The production cost of the 50 new missiles is approximately $4.3 billion.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not address the environmental impact of nuclear warheads dropped on cities along the MX train route.

RESPONSE: The environmental impact of nuclear warheads is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What methodology was used and what assumptions were made to generate the job estimates in the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 29.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately analyze the No Action Alternative.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not consider how many jobs could be generated by spending the $10 - $15 billion it projects as the Rail Garrison's cost on other sectors of the economy such as housing or education.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 7.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to analyze the economic impact on local communities of the boom-bust job cycle created by the MX.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

ISSUE: Does the Air Force have any plans to address the unemployment and resulting trauma the MX program can be expected to leave in its wake?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

ISSUE: In Draft EIS Section 4.10.5.3, it states that "specific Native American resources such as sacred areas have not been identified. Therefore, none would be affected by the Proposed Action." Commentor states that whether or not research has been done in the area, to state that nothing would be affected is not logical, but is rather cavalier and careless.

RESPONSE: EIS Sections 4.10.5.2 and 4.10.5.3 have been revised to reflect the results of consultation with Native American groups. Representatives of the Three Tribes (Arikara, Hidatsa, Mandan) and the Chippewa Cree were provided with project maps and invited to express concerns about potential effects on areas important for sacred or heritage reasons. The tribes did not identify any sites or sensitive areas that would be affected by the proposed project.
ISSUE: Commentor doubts the statement in Draft EIS Section 4.10.14 that "none of these streams (Little Deep Creek, Egg Creek, and an unnamed creek) requiring bridges have state-designated uses."

RESPONSE: The level of concern of state and federal agencies having jurisdiction over water resources is an important factor when considering water quality issues. This level of concern is generally reflected in the state classification of streams and the designation of beneficial uses. Some streams, however, are not classified because of their intermittent nature. The undependability of these streams to sustain adequate flows, and their poor water quality when they flow, make unclassified streams of questionable value from a water supply standpoint. The streams in question (i.e., Egg Creek, Little Deep Creek, and the unnamed creek) fall in this category. Their applicable water quality standards are the least stringent, and the text has been revised to clarify this point (see EIS Section 4.10.14.)

ISSUE: Are the people living north of the proposed garrison at Minot, North Dakota aware that 152 acres of land would be used if a second rail connector is chosen?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 35.

ISSUE: Why doesn't the Draft EIS deal with the rail hazard of heat? Excessive heat can cause rail distortion and subsequent accidents.

RESPONSE: Discussion of the issue of heat buckling of railroad track has been added to the section on natural hazards (see EIS Section 5.2.3).

ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with Draft EIS Page S-44 statement that the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota would not result in significant impacts on any resource.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor states that creating 300-400 jobs in Minot, North Dakota is not worth having something as suspect and outlandish as putting MX missiles on our nation's rails.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the project at Minot AFB, North Dakota because economically it is good for Minot but is not in the best interest of our country and world.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the project at Minot AFB, North Dakota because of fear of nuclear accidents, we already have enough deterrence and our tourism will suffer.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor is against the project at Little Rock, Arkansas and would rather see the money spent on public services.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
When based in the garrison, the MX trains would be more vulnerable to Soviet strategic warheads than they are in their current fixed silo deployment sites.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1

The Rail Garrison program would be strategically destabilizing because it is vulnerable and increases incentives for a first strike.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

The deployment sites, as well as the surrounding areas in which the missile trains would patrol, will become targets for "barrage" attacks as the Soviets saturate the areas with nuclear explosions.

**RESPONSE:** Issues of enemy targeting are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Commentor supports the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because of an able work force, adequate utilities, and available highway and rail systems.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

Commentor supports and endorses the selection of Little Rock AFB, Arkansas for the deployment of the Rail Garrison Peacekeeper missile.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Commentor opposed to the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because it is a step backward in nuclear disarmament, the system is basically obsolete, the basing site is more vulnerable, and economics should not be the reason for choosing Little Rock.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Commentor in support of the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because of economic growth.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

Commentor supports the project at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because of the economic boost to the area and no significant environmental impacts.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

Commentor requests that the Final EIS discuss in detail the impact on the Rail Garrison housing and to the rail track if an earthquake registering 6.5 to 8.5 on the Richter Scale occurred.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 50, Comment 62.

The Final EIS should discuss the probability of accidental or enemy damage to the Rail Garrison and the types of air and water pollution that could result from that damage.
RESPONSE: Probability of accidents and air and water pollution impacts due to accidents occurring during the operation of the Rail Garrison program are covered in EIS Section 5.4.

401 3 ISSUE: The Final EIS should discuss the environmental impact on the aquifer near Little Rock AFB, Arkansas for hazardous materials spills, especially the impact on the City of Jacksonville’s water wells.

RESPONSE: The probability and consequences of hazardous material releases are described in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the EIS, respectively. The analysis in those sections of the EIS shows that contamination of stream or groundwater is not a significant risk from deployment and operation of the system.

401 4 ISSUE: The Final EIS should address the effect of spilled pollutants on the area’s surface water including Bayou Meto and the Arkansas River.

RESPONSE: System operation is not expected to result in accidental pollution of the Bayou Meto, the Arkansas River, or other surface waters. The consequences of a spill or other release of hazardous material is described in Section 5.4 of the EIS.

402 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the project because placing this costly and dangerous weapon in our country will endanger our citizens by making us a target of Soviet missiles. Money would be better spent on necessities.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

403 1 ISSUE: Commentor sent article assessing the threat of Soviet power.

RESPONSE: Noted.

404 1 ISSUE: The increased chances of accidents due to the immense size and weight of the cars isn’t addressed in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

404 2 ISSUE: Will the MX cars need to be wider to accommodate the launch assembly and other needed equipment? If the cars are 12 feet wide, the tracks will need to be cleared before the train can enter the system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

404 3 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the economic impacts on Johnson County, Missouri if a nuclear accident causes a drop in agricultural sales.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 91.

404 4 ISSUE: What would be the economic impact on land values, city and county tax revenues, and school systems in Missouri if an accident happens?

RESPONSE: If there is an accident, the Air Force would be responsible for clean up and restoration of the area. No long-term economic impacts are expected.
ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the federal government will not assist in the costs associated with enforcing laws that are broken by protestors and in the prosecution of such protestors.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 10.

ISSUE: How many people will be employed to maintain security?

RESPONSE: Operational details on the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program are beyond the scope of this EIS. However, no network of secret police will be created.

ISSUE: Will trained security personnel have the right to detain and search anyone approaching the tracks as they do on Air Force installations?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 12.

ISSUE: Will security personnel be keeping local people under observation?

RESPONSE: No.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS doesn't cover the secondary effects of accident scenarios, such as when more than one missile becomes affected.

RESPONSE: The safety analysis done for the EIS assumes that if one missile burns or explodes, the other missile on the train will also burn or explode. Therefore, the environmental and human health effects are calculated for releases from both missiles. The design and spacing of the Train Alert Shelters in the garrison are such that if one missile explosion occurs, the missiles in adjacent Train Alert Shelters are not capable of being affected.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS doesn't adequately discuss the risks or consequences of sabotage, given that MX trains are easily identifiable and all tracks cannot be protected.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 17.

ISSUE: The Air Force didn't examine the secondary effects of a rail accident involving another vehicle carrying hazardous or explosive materials.

RESPONSE: The safety analysis done for the EIS took into account the accident statistics for all rail accidents occurring in the previous five years. Those statistics include the occurrence of collisions involving trains and trucks carrying hazardous cargoes. The EIS did not discuss the environmental impacts of releases of hazardous materials from those other vehicles because such collisions are extremely unlikely and including that risk to the total risk reported in the EIS would not substantially change the result. Also see response to Document 91, Comment 5.

ISSUE: The economic impact of shutting down the program after it has been built is not discussed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

ISSUE: The No Action Alternative is not adequately discussed.
ISSUE: The effects from producing the nuclear warheads, including the generation of waste, the release of radioactive materials, and the exposure of workers are not adequately addressed in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: The production of warheads for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missiles is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: There was not enough time to analyze the Draft EIS after it was released, let alone analyzing another EIS which was referenced.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The DEIS does not adequately address the question of emergency response, in particular, how long it would take emergency teams to respond. The DEIS states that a fuel fire would last for six minutes. In a small town, would public safety personnel be trained to safely minimize health and property damage, or does the Air Force plan to respond to the scene within the six minutes that the fire burns.

RESPONSE: A missile propellant fire is expected to last more than six minutes and the reference to the length of the fire is not in the EIS. However, neither local nor Air Force firefighters are expected, in most instances, to arrive at the scene of an accident before a burning missile would burn out. Air Force emergency response personnel will be dispatched to an accident as soon as possible (see EIS Section 5.5.5.1). Neither local nor Air Force personnel should attempt to extinguish such a fire because the fire could not be extinguished and approaching the fire would be dangerous.

ISSUE: If there were an accident with secondary damage, as would be likely if a train caught fire in a drought stricken area, would the Air Force pay for the secondary damage?

RESPONSE: In the unlikely event of an accident, requests for compensation for secondary damages will be evaluated in accordance with Air Force regulations.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS doesn't adequately address the economic effects of the cost of the missiles.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 390, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Is the Air Force going to purchase 50 new MX missiles, or will the ones deployed in silos in Wyoming be used?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 10.

ISSUE: What will be the economic effect of shutting down the MX silos and on the economy of Wyoming?

RESPONSE: Effects of reposturing of Peacekeeper missiles currently in Minuteman Silos for use in the Rail Garrison program are discussed under the Alternative Action at F.E. Warren AFB (see Section 4.2 of the EIS).
ISSUE: What are the environmental effects of removing and transporting the missiles from the silos?

RESPONSE: There are no environmental effects in addition to those addressed in the EIS for the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos program. Alternative Action discussion is found in EIS Section 4.2.

ISSUE: What would be the environmental effects of a failure of the heating or cooling system on the missile trains during a time of extreme weather?

RESPONSE: Such failures may impact system capability but would not have any environmental impacts.

ISSUE: Is there a possibility that the MX Rail Garrison could be later turned into a continuously mobile system? Do Air Force contingency plans include such a plan and would such a plan change the risk assessment section of the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: The Proposed Action does not include a plan for the system to be continuously mobile. If such a plan were proposed, the Air Force would accomplish appropriate environmental documentation.

ISSUE: Have studies been done to assess the impact of the vibrations and harmonics that the missiles, warheads, and fuel would be exposed to? Would this increase chances of accident or explosions? What are the effects of those variables on metal fatigue within the launcher, the rail car, and the missile itself?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 40.

ISSUE: What is the increased chance of an accident due to the lack of experience of the crew?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 15, Comments 4 and 5.

ISSUE: The discussion of the risks of air transport mishaps is inadequate in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: The probability of an accident during air transport and the effects of an accident are discussed in Section 5.3.2 of the EIS and the analysis is believed to be adequate.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not evaluate fully the risks of sabotage by Air Force personnel or the results of such sabotage.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 28.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not define well enough the criteria under which the trains would be deployed. National need is hardly adequate for the public or Congress to evaluate how often the system would leave the garrison, and there can be no effective analysis of the risk measurements that are based on numbers of rail miles traveled.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 98.
ISSUE: The population density figures average all people over a range of suburbs, urban areas, and rural areas. Since it is likely that the trains will spend more time in urban areas than in rural, and since more accidents occur in these higher density areas, the EIS should use a weighted average.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 71.

ISSUE: Radiation exposure figures should not be average but should tell how many people are exposed to lethal or harmful doses of radiation.

RESPONSE: The system will not expose anyone to a harmful dose of radiation if no severe accident occurs. In the event of a severe accident which releases radiation, the number of people who would be exposed will depend on many variables, including location, time of day, the severity of the accident, and many other circumstances that cannot be predicted. It is therefore not possible to specify how many people would be exposed. However, the average dose figure in the Draft EIS has been replaced by a maximum dose figure in the Final EIS (see Section 5.4 of the EIS).

ISSUE: The EIS must discuss the cost of any alternative use of money that would be spent on Rail Garrison.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What are the results of the investigation of building MX Rail Garrison with an ABM system? What would be the environmental impact of an ABM system?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 6.

ISSUE: The EIS must investigate a chemical accident if the air is still and allows concentration of airborne chemicals to remain high and in one area.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 77.

ISSUE: The Final EIS should quantify the risk of nuclear explosion in any potential mishap.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 45.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS says that radioactive particles would settle over a fairly small area. What is a small area?

RESPONSE: The exact reference could not be found in the Draft EIS. The dispersal of radioactive materials based on the meteorological conditions used in the safety analysis is depicted in Figure 5.3.1-5 of the Draft EIS and Figure 5.4.4-1 of the Final EIS.

ISSUE: Are there any notification procedures which will be used for deployment or transport?

RESPONSE: There will be no notification to the general public or local authorities.

ISSUE: What is the need for an additional 500 counterforce (first-strike) warheads in maintaining our deterrence?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

404 38 ISSUE: What protection is being planned against the effects of electromagnetic pulse? What are the potential costs and problems associated with such a system?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

404 39 ISSUE: What provisions are being made to comply with nuclear free zone ordinances that have been passed in areas through which trains may pass?

RESPONSE: Initial delivery of nuclear weapons or their components to F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming or movement of Peacekeeper trains on the national rail network could result in the transportation of radioactive materials through states and localities that have enacted "nuclear free zone" laws prohibiting, or otherwise regulating, the transportation of radioactive materials within their boundaries. The transportation of Peacekeeper missiles and/or their components within these jurisdictions may be inconsistent with these laws. Conversely, these laws necessarily conflict with the power granted under the Constitution to a higher authority to operate and disperse the Peacekeeper trains. Operation of the Peacekeeper system is a vital part of the national defense, which is a matter constitutionally entrusted to the authority of Congress and the President. State and local governments have no authority to enact or enforce conflicting laws. The Air Force will not comply with these laws since compliance would unduly inhibit the operational capability of the Peacekeeper system. The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA), in conjunction with Department of Transportation regulations, governs the procedures for transporting radioactive materials in the United States. Department of Defense (DOD) shipments of radioactive materials that are under escort and are for purposes of national security are specifically exempted from additional regulation under the HMTA. Additionally, the HMTA explicitly preempts all conflicting state and local statutes regarding radioactive material transportation (49 U.S.C § 1811[a]). This establishes that federal law alone regulates the transportation of radioactive materials. Therefore, any state or local statute establishing "nuclear free zones" would be unconstitutional as applied to the transportation of Peacekeeper missiles and/or their components. In transporting radioactive materials to support this program, the Air Force will either comply with the HMTA shipment and packaging regulations or meet the criteria for exemption (i.e., be escorted by personnel specifically designated by the DOD). Air Force procedures and safeguards for handling and protecting nuclear materials are at least as thorough as those required by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Energy for civilian radioactive materials. These procedures have been established in coordination with these agencies. The consequence associated with the Air Force's position not to comply with these "nuclear free zone" laws is that the public may be exposed to the transportation of radioactive materials through their communities. The significance of these events is discussed and analyzed in Chapter 5, Safety Considerations.

404 40 ISSUE: Are there any nuclear free zone ordinances along the route of the trains?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 404, Comment 39.
ISSUE: Is this the most cost-effective way to meet our security needs given that security of the trains may be a problem?

RESPONSE: Security needs of the train are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Has the cost of developing a guidance system that works been included?

RESPONSE: Issues relating to the development of the missile are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Since actual testing of missiles from trains is not projected to take place until 1991, isn't it possible that much environmental damage could be done before discovering that the system is useless?

RESPONSE: No. The Air Force has every confidence the system will perform to its design requirements.

ISSUE: Is this system necessary, given that missiles are more vulnerable than in silos for the first four to six hours.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Is this system necessary given that START negotiations would ban land-based mobile ICBMs?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Is this system necessary given that trains leaving the bases during times of high international tension could be seen as provocative?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Why is this system necessary?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Are civil defense plans along the route adequate or will they be adjusted to reflect the increased likelihood of nuclear attack?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 3, Comment 1 and Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: Does the potential for the loss of retaliatory capability due to the ease of access for sabotage make the system justifiable?

RESPONSE: EIS Section 5.1.6 discusses security measures.

ISSUE: Why is this basing method better than the other methods that have been considered and rejected such as the "Race Track."

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: What makes Whiteman AFB, Missouri such a good location?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 5.
404 52 ISSUE: How can a first-strike weapon like the MX missile build our deterrent capability?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

404 53 ISSUE: What procedures were used to notify the public of these hearings?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 9.

404 54 ISSUE: How far in advance did the Air Force know the time and date of the hearing?

RESPONSE: Approximately three weeks prior to the hearing when all pertinent travel and auditorium schedules were confirmed.

404 55 ISSUE: Can the Air Force say that the public has had an adequate amount of time to respond to the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: See Response to Document 50, Comment 1.

404 56 ISSUE: How many person-hours did the Air Force spend preparing the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: The Air Force contractor required approximately 92,000 person-hours in preparing the Draft EIS.

404 57 ISSUE: Has the public had adequate time and information to reasonably analyze the Air Force's methodology?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

404 58 ISSUE: Is the public hearing process set up to hear the concerns of the public when ordinary citizens speak after the Air Force and after elected officials?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

404 59 ISSUE: How can all of the concerns of all the citizens affected be heard with a 3-minute time limit in only one hearing of three hours?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

404 60 ISSUE: How many people at the hearings in other parts of the country didn't get a chance to speak?

RESPONSE: Of those who expressed an interest in speaking, only a few were denied due to time constraint. They were requested to send their comments in writing. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 53.

404 61 ISSUE: Why was time lost at public hearings through late starting, sound system problems, etc., taken off the public comment period?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

404 62 ISSUE: How much time at the Missouri public meeting was spent in total by the Air Force, by elected officials, and by members of the public in speaking both in the scoping and in the Draft EIS hearings?
RESPONSE: A total of six hours was spent in scoping meetings and public hearings. Two-thirds of this time was used by the public.

404 63 ISSUE: How many of the public hearings did the Air Force start late?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

404 64 ISSUE: How can the Air Force justify holding hearings, and preparing an EIS only for the area immediately surrounding Whiteman AFB, Missouri when people all along the rail line could be affected?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

404 65 ISSUE: How much time, money, and effort did the Air Force spend in preparing the Rail Garrison presentation, and what proportion of that was spent on alternative basing modes including No Action?

RESPONSE: About 800 hours of effort costing approximately $15,000 were required to prepare the Rail Garrison presentation. Including the No Action, over half of these resources were applied to the presentation of project alternatives. No time was spent on alternative basing modes which are beyond the scope of this EIS.

405 1 ISSUE: Commentor states that there is adequate housing available for the project in the Oscoda/Au Sable, Michigan area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

406 1 ISSUE: Declaration of support of the project at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

407 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program because it expands the targeting area and dramatically places more people and land at risk both in this country and in the Soviet Union.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

407 2 ISSUE: The MX is provocative in nature and representative of a threat that fosters destabilization on both sides.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

407 3 ISSUE: The MX is strategically flawed because it will take four to six hours to disperse the missile trains from their garrisons to their point of destination.

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

407 4 ISSUE: The money to be used for the MX program would be better spent on rebuilding the economies of the states where the program may go.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.
1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the project at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

1 ISSUE: The Final EIS should discuss the likelihood of earthquakes and their effects on Eaker AFB, Arkansas. Also, why locate MX missiles in an area with such a potential for catastrophe?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 7, Comment 6.

1 ISSUE: Commentor is concerned that the prehistoric sites of the Caddo Indian culture in Louisiana will be lost or damaged by MX deployment. How will the integrity of these sites be preserved?

RESPONSE: When the Draft EIS was being prepared, archaeological field work at the base was just beginning and site-specific data were not available. The probability of affecting Caddo sites was identified as an issue because a number of such sites were known to occur in the vicinity of the base. However, an archaeological survey completed in July 1988 failed to identify any prehistoric sites in the proposed impact areas. Therefore, no Caddo sites would be affected by the proposed program (see EIS Section 4.3.5.3).

2 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the American alligator in Louisiana. What will the Air Force do to protect the habitat of these species?

RESPONSE: After consulting with local U.S. Fish and Wildlife officials, it was determined that the proposed construction for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program would in no way jeopardize local alligator populations. As indicated in Appendix A of the EIS, the Air Force would take actions to mitigate any unavoidable loss of wetland habitat on Barksdale AFB if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program were implemented.

3 ISSUE: What will the Air Force do to preserve the habitats of the federally listed bald eagle and the red-cockaded woodpecker in Louisiana?

RESPONSE: Construction of facilities for the proposed program would occur in areas which are unsuitable habitat for either the red-cockaded woodpecker or the bald eagle. Therefore, the program would have no impact on these species or their respective habitats.

4 ISSUE: Does the Air Force have any proposals for alleviating the problems in traffic congestion that will occur at the main gate at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana if the MX is deployed?

RESPONSE: EIS Sections 4.3.3.2 and 4.3.3.3 have been revised to incorporate local and Air Force plans.

5 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the area near Barksdale AFB, Louisiana has overcrowded jails and needs further investigation.

RESPONSE: Local officials indicate that the jail is fairly full but not at 100 percent occupancy. A work release program has been instituted that would curtail any overcrowding problem. The population inmigration is not expected to noticeably increase demand at this facility.
ISSUE: Does the Air Force have any concerns about, or solutions to the possible layoff of 50 to 55 policemen in Bossier City, Louisiana?

RESPONSE: The police department has lost 15 officers this past year due to budgetary problems. Local officials do not feel this has affected public safety in the area, although there has been a reduction/elimination in some nonessential services previously provided. The department does not foresee any further personnel cuts in the coming fiscal year.

ISSUE: How can acts of sabotage and terrorism be prevented? Repairs to a rail system would be long and difficult especially relative to the situation of a national crisis.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: If a nuclear weapon were to detonate 200 feet in the atmosphere above Shreveport - Bossier, Louisiana, wouldn't the electromagnetic pulse cause an electricity failure throughout the area? Would the train be able to operate under these conditions?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the quality of workmanship of the MX missile at the Morton Thiokol plants. What has been done to ensure the quality of workmanship?

RESPONSE: The nuclear certification programs and policies described in Section 5.1.1 of the EIS will apply to the design and production of all critical components of the system.

ISSUE: Concerned about the quality of the guidance system. Has Northrop Corporation adhered to proper inspection schedules?

RESPONSE: There are no major technical problems with the Peacekeeper missile. Recent news stories refer to the inability of a contractor to deliver a major component of the guidance system in a timely fashion under the terms of the contract. This is being corrected. The Air Force has every confidence the missile will perform to its design requirements. Seventeen out of 17 flight tests have shown Peacekeeper to be the most accurate ICBM in history and meeting all performance requirements.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the project because it is too costly, vulnerable, and is a first-strike weapon.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor states that money would be better spent on a student exchange program between the U.S. and USSR.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Minot AFB, North Dakota and agrees with the findings of the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: Noted.
1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the deployment of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Fairchild AFB, Washington because it is environmentally unsound.

RESPONSE: Impacts of the proposed program at Fairchild AFB are described in EIS Section 4.6.

2 ISSUE: When based in garrisons, the MX trains would be more susceptible to Soviet attack.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

3 ISSUE: When dispersed out of their garrison, the MX trains would be even more vulnerable to attack resulting in easy destruction of the trains.

RESPONSE: Following direction from a higher authority to disperse, the Peacekeeper train(s) will have access to the nation's rail net. This accessibility increases the response capability of the system by enhancing dispersal flexibility; thereby complicity enemy planning activities. This decreases the vulnerability of the Peacekeeper train(s).

4 ISSUE: Fairchild AFB, Washington as well as the surrounding areas could become targets for barrage attacks.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

5 ISSUE: The missile trains may be vulnerable to sabotage and will be susceptible to accidents.

RESPONSE: Risk assessments for rail accidents involving the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system are discussed Chapter 5 of the EIS. Also see response to Document 6, Comment 2.

6 ISSUE: The risk involved in basing the MX Rail Garrison system at Fairchild AFB, Washington or anywhere else is unacceptable.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri and agrees with the findings of the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: Noted.

1 ISSUE: The sections on likelihood and consequences of mishaps involving the missile solid and liquid fuel propellant (EIS Sections 5.4.1 and 5.4.2, respectively) do not adequately explore the pathway and likelihood of the two liquid-fuel component igniting and the resulting ignition or detonation.

RESPONSE: EIS Sections 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 discuss the consequences of various events. They are not intended to present the complete analysis on those topics. The probabilistic risk assessment of the likelihood and consequences of those and other events is described in Section 5.3 of the EIS.
ISSUE: EIS Section 5.4.2.2 states that monomethyhydrazine (MMH) could explode in concentration in air as low as 2.5 percent to 4.7 percent in the presence of an ignition source. In fact, the liquid-fuel stages carry their own ignition source in the form of nitrogen tetroxide, the second element of the liquid-fuel propellant.

RESPONSE: The referenced section describes the risk involved when only MMH leaks from its containers. If MMH and nitrogen tetroxide both leaked, ignition is certain to occur, as discussed in Section 5.4.2.4 of the EIS.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately address either the impact of a liquid-fuel fire or the consequences of an explosion of the solid-fuel propellants.

RESPONSE: EIS Section 5.4 discusses the environmental and human health effects of fire and explosion scenarios. Editing done between the Draft and Final EISs should make the discussion more clear.

ISSUE: The Final EIS should discuss the risks of personal injury or death and substantial property damage posed during dispersal when the train would carry nuclear-armed, fully fueled missiles.

RESPONSE: The risks during that phase of operation are discussed in EIS Sections 5.2.2, 5.3.1, 5.3.4 and all of Section 5.4. The risks are summarized in Table 5.3.4-1 under the heading of "Strategic Dispersal."

ISSUE: The Final EIS should describe the other rail or road vehicles which might collide with a Peacekeeper train and should address the consequences of a collision with a vehicle containing flammable or explosive substances.

RESPONSE: The risk assessment conducted for the EIS considers the possibility of collision of the Peacekeeper train with the common mix of vehicles and cargo on the roads and rail network. The primary contributor to the longer fire scenarios discussed is fuel or other flammables carried on such a vehicle. The probabilistic risk assessment method does not concentrate on particular scenarios, but takes into account all causes of accidents in the years 1983 to 1987. This approach was selected rather than the "scenario analysis" approach because the former is thought to be more rigorous.

ISSUE: The Final EIS should address the impacts of an attempted terrorists attack and the consequences in the unlikely event that such an attack were successful.

RESPONSE: Security measures are expected to provide early warnings of sabotage attempts and prevent disabling of the system. If a terrorist attempt were successful, the consequences would not be greater than those described in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

ISSUE: The economic impacts of environmental and human health effects of various mishaps should be addressed in the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: Requests for compensation for damage or loss involving an Air Force activity will be evaluated in accordance with Air Force regulations.
The Final EIS should discuss the economic impact on the Cheyenne, Wyoming area of withdrawing the Peacekeeper missiles now in silos there and using them for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system because current law restricts the total number of deployed Peacekeeper missiles to 50 and the Air Force would have no choice but to use those 50 in the silos.

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 4.2.1.

What is the rationale behind deploying more nuclear warheads?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Why is the Air Force so interested in deploying the missiles on rails when the Scowcroft Report maintains Small ICBM for deploying the MX?

RESPONSE: The purpose and need for this system is described in EIS Section 1.1.

Commentor concerned that Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is vulnerable to attack from enemies of the United States.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Is this system going to increase noise levels to Cheyenne's residential areas?

RESPONSE: Noise impacts from Rail Garrison deployment at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming are discussed in EIS Section 4.2.10.3.

An in-depth analysis of the No Action Alternative is needed since the present text does not adequately address the topic.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

The EIS should compare the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program with the system that the Soviet Union has with emphasis on the rail mileage and its public status.

RESPONSE: Comparison of the system with another nation's system is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Why were public hearings not held in other areas in Wyoming and Nebraska?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

How many permanent civilian jobs will be created by the Rail Garrison project?

RESPONSE: Permanent civilian employment at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming is estimated at 53 direct workers and 182 indirect workers over the operations phase of the program.
ISSUE: Concerned about the reliability of the MX guidance system together with adequate supervision of government contractors.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 410, Comment 9.

ISSUE: What will the Air Force do about metal fatigue in the MX missiles currently on-line in Wyoming? How does the Air Force plan to improve the shell of the missile or the defective parts?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper missile was designed for use in a mobile basing mode involving storage and transport of the missile in a horizontal position. No modification of the missile is necessary for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system.

ISSUE: Safety was briefly discussed at the public hearing with the history of past nuclear accidents. How can the Air Force be so confident about the safety of the MX when there are numerous problems with the missile such as the guidance system and metal fatigue?

RESPONSE: See EIS Chapter 5. Also see response to Document 410, Comment 9.

ISSUE: Where will the nuclear waste be disposed of for the Rail Garrison project in Wyoming?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 30.

ISSUE: Commentor believes there is no need to deploy Peacekeeper in mobile or fixed basing mode as there are plenty of missiles already deployed. Recommends we direct valuable resources toward nuclear disarmament and peaceful resolution while working on utilizing what is already available to its maximum benefit.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How would missile trains operate? Would missile trains have priority over the traffic? How would MX rail operations affect railroad operations?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 76.

ISSUE: Because MX rail cars will be wider than 9 feet, the Air Force will have to announce its path in order to clear rails. What are the security implications of this?

RESPONSE: See Section 1.3.2 of the EIS.

ISSUE: Will the MX train comply with the rule of 500,000 pounds? Can the tracks on which the train will ride support this weight?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the center of balance on the MX train in light of 45 mph winds in Wyoming.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

1-187
1 ISSUE: Questions mailed after the public scoping meeting in Cheyenne, Wyoming were only superficially or generally addressed in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

2 ISSUE: Will the Air Force ensure that city, county, and state governments in Wyoming will not have to pay for increased service demands due to this program?

RESPONSE: Program-related spending by Air Force contractors as well as direct program employees is projected to generate sufficient revenues to meet the required outlays for the increased service demands. While the Air Force cannot ensure this, monitoring surveys conducted for the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos program indicated that service demands, and subsequent expenditures, would be negligible.

3 ISSUE: Will existing employers in Cheyenne, Wyoming close up shop due to this program? How many jobs will be lost?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 91.

4 ISSUE: What will construction and operations noise levels be in residential areas in Cheyenne, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: Noise impacts from Rail Garrison deployment at F.E. Warren AFB are discussed in EIS Section 4.2.10.3.

5 ISSUE: Moral and ethical concerns should be addressed in the EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

1 ISSUE: Clerk of Laramie County disagrees with public finance baseline projections for Laramie County.

RESPONSE: EIS Section 4.2.1.2 has been revised.

1 ISSUE: Commentor maintains the language in the Draft EIS is misleading, e.g., Peacekeeper for MX; reentry vehicle for nuclear warhead and guidance system, and mishap for accidents.

RESPONSE: The document is not intended to be misleading. The missile was named "Peacekeeper" by President Reagan (see response to Document 37, Comment 1). The term reentry vehicle has a specific meaning and is thought to be an adequately descriptive name. It would be inaccurate to call it a warhead; it would be cumbersome to name all the things it contains every time reference was made to it. The word mishap was intended to encompass either rail incidents or accidents, as defined by the Federal Railway Administration (see EIS Section 5.2.1.1).

2 ISSUE: How can Great Falls, Montana officials maintain this system will create jobs and lower unemployment in Great Falls?

RESPONSE: A secondary benefit of the program is in fact the creation of jobs and lowering of unemployment rates in the region (see EIS Section 4.9.1).
ISSUE: The figure of student-teacher ratio of 21:1 in the Great Falls, Montana school system is highly inaccurate.

RESPONSE: For the 1987-1988 school year, Great Falls School District No. 1 (an elementary level district) had an overall pupil-to-teacher ratio of 21.5 to 1. These numbers were based on school district data showing enrollment and teachers at the elementary level by grade and by school, and are, therefore, reflective of existing conditions in the district.

ISSUE: Commentor does not want to submit Montana to irreparable harm by putting additional missiles here.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The money spent on the rail-based MX is better spent on such things as farmers, unemployed, schools, the hungry, etc. The priorities of the citizens are not reflected in the continuing arms buildup.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor questions our capability technologically to handle a crisis situation.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 45 and 97.

ISSUE: Commentor questions our capability from a human standpoint to handle a crisis situation.

RESPONSE: Every attempt will be made to conduct training in a realistic environment. However, our training trains will not carry real missiles or explosives. Training will be conducted on the rail network with the least interference possible. Simulators and occasional high priority training may be used to supplement this training program, if this is required to maintain the necessary levels of proficiency. Also see response to Document 15, Comment 4.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the rail-based MX because it is unsafe, destabilizing, and dangerous game playing when the opportunity is ripe for arms reduction. Our security will not be enhanced by more weapons but by fewer and a new approaches to international and fiscal situations.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The MX is a first-strike weapon. What is the Soviet response to this threat?

RESPONSE: The issue of a Soviet response is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see responses to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How does this program protect our freedom?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Does the MX ensure continued flow of profits to defense contractors?
RESPONSE: The issues of potential defense procurement of contracts, and/or taxes, and fraud associated with contractors is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

421 4 ISSUE: Commentor makes statement that history teaches that those who prepare for war end up having a war.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

422 1 ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to provide adequate details to allow a reviewer the opportunity to fully and critically evaluate and test the conclusions presented.

RESPONSE: The Draft EIS presents a description of the research methods and data used to produce its conclusions of significant environmental issues. Specific omissions of information noted in comments regarding the Draft EIS have been included in the Final EIS.

422 2 ISSUE: Commentor questions the use of 1985 traffic data to determine current baseline conditions of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: The latest traffic report available from the Wyoming Highway Department provides 1985 counts of traffic volumes along Cheyenne roads.

422 3 ISSUE: Commentor states that reserve funds (in most cases) are not available to finance program-related public expenditures in Cheyenne, Wyoming as assumed in the EIS.

RESPONSE: EIS Section 4.2.1 has been revised to reflect current information.

422 4 ISSUE: The geologically significant impact of erosion and insignificant impacts on water and air are at odds with each other.

RESPONSE: Significant local erosion impacts do not necessarily result in significant water quality impacts, particularly if the site is remote from a water body or drained by a highly intermittent stream, as is the case at the two alternative garrison sites at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming (see EIS Sections 4.2.6 and 4.2.8).

422 5 ISSUE: The Air Force must work directly with the local government entities in Cheyenne, Wyoming to address their concerns and develop appropriate and necessary mitigation measures to mitigate the negative program impacts.

RESPONSE: The Air Force will work with local government entities in Cheyenne, as appropriate, to address their concerns and develop necessary mitigation measures to mitigate identified negative program impacts.

423 1 ISSUE: How can security be maintained over hundreds of thousands of miles of track without revoking the Constitution?

RESPONSE: Due to the mobility and random nature of the movements during dispersal, terrorists would find it very difficult to attack the system. Also see response to Document 287, Comment 58.
ISSUE: How many H-Bombs will land at Cheyenne Airport?
RESPONSE: All Peacekeeper reentry systems will be transported through the Cheyenne, Wyoming Airport (see Sections 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 of the EIS).

ISSUE: Commentor questions survivability of the system. Commentor does not believe that the Soviets would be so stupid as to warn us.
RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Money could be better spent in other ways.
RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How many missiles will be deployed at how many bases?
RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5.

ISSUE: Commentor questions safety.
RESPONSE: EIS Chapter 5 addresses safety concerns associated with the system.

ISSUE: State of North Dakota requests that projections of tax revenues be included in the Final EIS. This would allow for impacts to be effectively studied.
RESPONSE: Direct tax receipts such as property taxes are not expected to be affected by project activities. Other nontax revenues such as charges for service, redistributed state-collected revenues (gasoline excise taxes and cigarette excise taxes, as examples), fines, and fees, however, are expected to increase as population in the areas increases. Revenue from these sources would be sufficient to meet the estimate increases in expenditures in the jurisdictions.

ISSUE: State of North Dakota suggests that maintaining ratios of government employees to population will not account for increased expenditures in social services.
RESPONSE: Most human services and other family-related services are provided to military personnel by the Air Force at each installation. Monitoring of these types of service demands from community-based service agencies, for both military and civilian program-related personnel, during the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming indicates no significant increases in demand would be expected for locally provided human services.

ISSUE: Reliance on school district reserve funds at Grand Forks and Minot, North Dakota is questionable at this time. Consideration of Department of Defense financial aid to school districts should be addressed.
RESPONSE: Text has been revised to reflect current information (see EIS Sections 4.7.1.3. and 4.10.1.3).
ISSUE: Wastewater treatment facilities at Grand Forks AFB and Minot AFB, North Dakota should be adequate and efforts should be increased to mitigate any impact associated with base operations so as to minimize any pollution which may occur.

RESPONSE: Currently, both bases are evaluating the ability of their wastewater systems to adequately process their flows. Based on the results of this analysis, the Air Force will schedule the improvements that are necessary to maintain the quality of their discharge.

ISSUE: Both existing and planned rail spurs adjacent to Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota (planned to cross U.S. 2) should be consolidated into one. Crossing maintenance should be the responsibility of the Air Force. Also, the program should include grade separation and emergency vehicle provision to remedy traffic blockages.

RESPONSE: The existing spur is in poor condition both on and offbase and would not provide an efficient route to the proposed garrison site. An at-grade crossing for the new rail spur will be constructed at U.S. 2 and appropriate warning devices such as flashing lights and gates will be provided. Traffic blockages are not expected to be a problem (see EIS Section 4.7.3.3).

ISSUE: The Draft EIS judgment of cultural sites at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota is premature until the results of the cultural resource survey has been reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

RESPONSE: In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, cultural resources surveys have been completed for the proposed program areas at both Grand Forks AFB and Minot AFB. Preliminary drafts of both cultural resources reports were sent to the North Dakota SHPO for review. Verbal agreement with the EIS findings has been given by the SHPO.

ISSUE: The EIS needs to consider the issue of the benefits of widespread dispersion of missile capabilities.

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What is the Air Force policy regarding protestors interfering with the training trains during the performance of their duties?

RESPONSE: The Air Force will cooperate with local law enforcement authorities to resolve any difficulties that may occur.

ISSUE: Commentor dislikes the name "Peacekeeper."

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

ISSUE: One's environment is placed in jeopardy when the community in which he lives is bristling with missiles.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
3 ISSUE: Jobs should never be considered as a reason for creating Rail Garrison. Tax dollars are better used to clean up the environment for new roads, parks, education, etc.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper and the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Also submitted a local newspaper article.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

1 ISSUE: How much more survivable is this Rail Garrison concept than the current basing mode?

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

2 ISSUE: Why has the high-density population adjacent to F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming been minimized in the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: The map used is the latest available (1978) U.S. Geological Survey of the Cheyenne/F.E. Warren AFB area and is not intended to be a current land use map. The northern half of the Western Hills subdivision (adjacent to the base) was developed after 1978. The purpose of these figures is to show the proposed locations of various project facilities. When the area north of the Western Hills subdivision is built out, the homes closest to the proposed garrison would be about 3,750 feet away. This would be about 300 feet outside the explosive safety zone (see EIS Section 4.2.4.2).

3 ISSUE: An old map (more than 5 years old) has been used in Figures S-5, S-19, and 4.2-3. It is the same old map in each case. This map leaves off the entire northern half of the Western Hills subdivision which is a half mile, with at least 20 streets of high-density single family housing and multiple family townhouses all excluded. This entire subdivision is within the city limits.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 427, Comment 2.

4 ISSUE: Why is there no Department of Defense proposed explosive safety zone at the Cheyenne, Wyoming Municipal Airport?

RESPONSE: An explosive safety zone is the prescribed safety zone or required safe distance between places where explosives (including rocket propellants) are stored or processed and other specified locations, such as inhabited buildings, public traffic routes, recreational areas, utilities, petroleum storage facilities, and storage or processing facilities for other explosives. The Cheyenne Municipal Airport will not store or process any explosives.

5 ISSUE: What is the increased safety risk to Cheyenne, Wyoming with F.E. Warren AFB as the Main Operating Base (MOB)?

RESPONSE: F.E. Warren AFB was identified as the MOB for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program because the facilities at the base are designed to handle 100 Peacekeeper missiles. For over 25 years, F.E. Warren AFB has handled missiles without a major accident involving propellants, stages, reentry vehicles or reentry systems. It is anticipated
that this excellent safety record will continue for the life of the system. However, if an accident were to occur, the environmental consequences and human health effects would not be worse than those described in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

427 6 ISSUE: What would the economic impact be of the derailment of a Peacekeeper train that interferes with regular train traffic?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper train will follow the standard operational procedures of regular rail travel. In the unlikely event of a derailment, the problem would be corrected as quickly as possible resulting in a minimum of interference with regularly scheduled rail traffic.

428 1 ISSUE: How will North Dakota transport grain and coal by rail if the ICBM is dispersed on the main lines? Will new sidings be built?

RESPONSE: Peacekeeper trains are not anticipated to disrupt commercial rail schedules, especially since the trains would remain in the garrisons except during periods of national need, and would then represent only 25 of thousands of trains. New sidings are not anticipated to be needed. For movements in an emergency, appropriate procedures and protocols are being developed with the rail industry.

428 2 ISSUE: What local area problems would occur when the ICBM is fired from the site?

RESPONSE: The impacts of the intentional use of the missile are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

428 3 ISSUE: Will the Air Force or federal government upgrade the rural rail system in North Dakota to support the trains?

RESPONSE: The main line track will not be upgraded. The rail spur connecting the garrison with the existing commercial rail system at Minot AFB would be upgraded to meet design requirements and a new spur would be constructed at Grand Forks AFB.

428 4 ISSUE: What will be the reaction to the Rail Garrison as it sits on the siding by or near any small town? Would it be fenced off to keep security tight? How long will it sit or would it be moved from site to site?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper trains would remain in the garrisons unless directed to disperse by a higher authority in time of national need. Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

428 5 ISSUE: In regard to sidings, would any location know they could be a possible site for ICBM Rail Garrison train location?

RESPONSE: Every accessible location would be a possible site.

429 1 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately address prevention of "heat buckling" of railroad tracks. Notes potential for derailment.

RESPONSE: A discussion of "heat buckling" of railroad track has been added to the EIS Section 5.2.3 on natural hazards.
ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not identify specific evacuation plans in case of hazardous material accidents and explosions.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: Commentor questions the basis for the identification of minimal health risks. What are cancer and other health-related impacts on employees preparing warhead materials?

RESPONSE: Health risks associated with the production of warheads are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor questions the utility of painting the Missile Assembly Building (MAB) blue at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: The MAB will be painted a pale blue so it blends in better visually with the background mountain viewscape on the horizon.

ISSUE: How will the Air Force prevent sabotage of the railways and the MX train?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: How much more radioactive pollution will be emitted directly into our environment as a direct result of the process of producing the missiles?

RESPONSE: The production of warheads for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missiles is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How many truckloads containing radioactive materials will be on our highways each day, and how many days will they continue to be on our highways if the proposed Rail Garrison project is passed by Congress? How many ships and airplanes will be carrying radioactive materials related to the Rail Garrison project; and for how many days?

RESPONSE: The movement of nuclear components in support of the Peacekeeper mission is detailed in the EIS. Ships will not be used for the movement of warheads in support of the program. Aircraft will be used to transport the nuclear components between the manufacturer and Cheyenne. The only other airlift requirement will be for maintenance of the reentry system between F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming and the selected garrison bases.

ISSUE: What precautions will be implemented to ensure the public safety in preventing accidents on the highways, on airplanes, and on vessels (carrying radioactive materials) and how much do these precautions cost?

RESPONSE: As with all weapon systems, public safety is a primary concern. This concern includes all aspects of the operation, both on and off the Air Force bases. The details of the Safety Program are described in Section 5.1 of the EIS.

ISSUE: What are your plans for restoring the wildlife and plant life that is killed as a result of radioactive accidents or emissions from nuclear facilities?
RESPONSE: The probabilities of such events are extremely small as described in Chapter 5 of the EIS. If such an event occurred, the removal of contaminated soil would be required. Specific plans for restoration would be prepared as necessary.

429 10 ISSUE: How much money per person is the Air Force willing to pay to compensate employees and public citizens that become contaminated or experience radiation poisoning due to accidents related to the Rail Garrison project?

RESPONSE: Requests for compensation for damage or loss involving an Air Force activity will be evaluated in accordance with Air Force regulations.

429 11 ISSUE: How will you compensate our allies if our missiles hit their countries rather than the Soviet Union?

RESPONSE: The issue of intentional use is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

429 12 ISSUE: How much money for the Rail Garrison project will be diverted illegally into funds to support the Contras in Nicaragua?

RESPONSE: None.

429 13 ISSUE: How much does each car on the train weigh and will our current rails be able to carry that enormous weight?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

429 14 ISSUE: How much ground damage will result from a launch? Will it leave the train derailed? If so, how long will it take to put it back on the track, and at what cost? What is the potential for train crew casualties as a result of a launch?

RESPONSE: The issue of intentional use is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

429 15 ISSUE: Are the O-rings on the missiles the same type made by Morton Thiokol that were found defective in the Challenger mishap? If so, what measures will be taken to ensure safe launches in subzero weather?

RESPONSE: There are no joints within the stages of the Peacekeeper missile, so a mishap similar to the one which caused the Challenger disaster could not happen to a Peacekeeper missile. Nevertheless, while testing has not been completed, it will include testing in extreme environmental conditions.

429 16 ISSUE: In order to help prevent accidents, what measures will the Air Force take to ensure that no Air Force or other railroad personnel will be on drugs either legal or illegal?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 4.

429 17 ISSUE: How long will the shifts be?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 100.
ISSUE: What are the specific health conditions you look for in your personnel to ensure they are fit for this type of duty?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 4.

ISSUE: How young will the personnel be who are Air Force or railroad personnel? What training will they have?

RESPONSE: Program operations will be provided by a hierarchy of fully capable and trained Air Force personnel directed by a higher authority. Regardless of age, each individual assigned will be knowledgeable of his or her responsibilities and duties, and will carry them out as ordered. Also see EIS Section 1.4.6.

ISSUE: How will the Air Force prevent other commercial and passenger trains from colliding with the garrison trains?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 5.

ISSUE: How often will practice runs of the trains take place each month, and at what cost?

RESPONSE: The training trains will be scheduled to visit each base once during each quarter of the year. The cost is included in the annual operational budget of about $225 million annually.

ISSUE: What would be the impact of a tornado hitting the garrison?

RESPONSE: The effects of natural catastrophies such as tornadoes, floods, and earthquakes striking the missiles and garrison are discussed in EIS Section 5.2.3.

ISSUE: What would be the impact of an earthquake in Cheyenne, Wyoming?

RESPONSE: No active or inactive faults have been identified in the Region of Influence for the proposed program at F.E. Warren AFB. The Wheatland-Whalen Fault Zone is located 40 miles north of the installation and has been determined to be an inactive fault. Consequently, surface fault rupture and other effects of an earthquake are not considered a likely event at F.E. Warren AFB. The installation is also located in a generally low risk seismic region. The effects of an earthquake are addressed under EIS Sections 3.9.4 and 5.2.3.

ISSUE: What would be the impact of small missile rockets from close range by saboteurs?

RESPONSE: Security measures are expected to provide early warning of sabotage attempts and prevent disabling of the system. If a sabotage attempt were successful, the consequences would not be greater than those described in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

ISSUE: What would be the impact of ice and snow covered tracks?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.
ISSUE: What would be the impact of a head-on collision with another very heavy train going at a fast speed?

RESPONSE: Worst-case scenarios are discussed in EIS Chapter 5.

ISSUE: After a catastrophe, what compensation will be allowed?

RESPONSE: Requests for compensation for damage or loss involving an Air Force activity will be evaluated in accordance with Air Force regulations.

ISSUE: How much fraud and deception is the Air Force and administration anticipating from each defense contractor associated with the Rail Garrison project?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How much will each defense contractor pay in taxes as a result of their involvement in the Rail Garrison project? How much will they receive in tax rebates and profits?

RESPONSE: These issues are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How much will the program cost the United States over the next seven years?

RESPONSE: The entire system would cost between $10 and $12 billion over the life of the system.

ISSUE: After the Air Force receives the order to launch, how long will it take before the missile is actually launched?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: How long will it take the MX-launched missiles on the trains to reach their targets, that is, if they hit their intended targets?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What precautions will the Air Force take to prevent radar jamming devices from interfering with the communication systems between the control centers and the trains?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: What extra precautions will be taken to ensure that wildlife such as rodents or weeds, etc. will not cause a malfunction in the operation of the train to prevent it from moving?

RESPONSE: None. Peacekeeper trains will undergo regular maintenance and system inspections.
ISSUE: What other specific basing modes have been addressed and why were they rejected?

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: Why do we need more missiles?

RESPONSE: The purpose and need of the system are described in EIS Section 1.1.

ISSUE: Will there be an independent commission appointed to investigate all the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) concerns (i.e., in addition to the Air Force study)?

RESPONSE: No. This document has been prepared by an independent contractor, Tetra Tech, Inc., in compliance with the Council of Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508) implementing NEPA.

ISSUE: How well protected will the garrison igloos be? How much will it cost to build these igloos underground? What could a tornado do to them?

RESPONSE: EIS Section 1.3.5 discusses igloo construction. EIS Section 5.2.3 discusses the effects of a natural catastrophe on the system. At this time, there are no plans to construct the igloos underground.

ISSUE: What would be the effect on the ozone layer if 12,000 United States and 11,000 Soviet missiles were to be launched? Would any life on earth exist after such an exchange?

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will there be restricted air space over the garrison? If a commercial or passenger plane went over these areas, would they be shot down?

RESPONSE: The garrison will not change any currently imposed air space restrictions at any selected garrison installation. Planes are not shot down if they enter restricted air space.

ISSUE: What is the estimated economic impact in terms of jobs on each of the 11 planned sites? What will the Air Force do to accommodate all the extra strain put on each location - education, medical, commercial?

RESPONSE: Discussion of socioeconomic impacts such as jobs and public services at each location are described in EIS Sections 4.2.1 to 4.12.1.

ISSUE: After a flashflood, what would be the impact of having the trains with their computers soaked? After a flood will the tracks be useable?

RESPONSE: Impacts of flooding on the system are discussed in EIS Chapter 5.

ISSUE: When will the administration move away from a policy of mutually assured destruction and toward a policy of peace?
Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** What will be done with nuclear wastes that are produced as a result of the production process of the MX missiles? How much will it cost to clean up sites after the missiles are made? Where will nuclear wastes be disposed of?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 5, Comment 2.

**ISSUE:** Commentor supports the No Action Alternative.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Commentor questions the ability to move the trains from their silos within the delivery time of enemy missiles.

**RESPONSE:** This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Commentor questions development and effectiveness of electromagnetic pulse technology and acknowledges that the subject is beyond the scope of this EIS.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

**ISSUE:** Commentor states that Blytheville, Arkansas is in the path of the New Madrid Fault.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 7, Comment 6.

**ISSUE:** Commentor supports the No Action Alternative for reasons such as disarmament talks with USSR, the economy has borne the burden of military spending, the Trident II should be able to point out some serious citizen dissent, and the nation's rail system is deficient and poses a safety hazard.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Will this system become obsolete before it is finished?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 33, Comment 61.

**ISSUE:** In the event of an attack, can the trains and Rail Garrison system as a whole respond quickly enough especially if the trains are in the Train Alert Shelters?

**RESPONSE:** Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

**ISSUE:** What will be the Final EIS cost?

**RESPONSE:** The entire EIS process and associated hearings will cost approximately $9 million.

**ISSUE:** Expand on the Federal Emergency Management Agency evacuation plans covering the consequences of accidents or nuclear war.
ISSUE: What is the impact of a No Action Alternative?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: What is the impact of not building the missile at all?

RESPONSE: The scope of an EIS as defined by law and the Council of Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508) include the physical environment, safety and socioeconomic issues, which are included in this EIS. Other issues suggested by the comment are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 37, Comment 15.

ISSUE: Are responses to our concerns going to be provided?

RESPONSE: As part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Process, public comments received during the public comment period will be responded to and will be shown in EIS, Volume II.

ISSUE: What is the procedure for submitting additional written comments and questions?

RESPONSE: For questions about the program write to:
  Director of Public Affairs
  Headquarters
  Ballistic Missile Office
  Norton AFB, CA 92409-6468
  (714) 382-6631

For comments:
  Director, Programs and Environmental Division
  AFRCE-BMS/DEP
  Norton AFB, CA 92409-6448

ISSUE: Why is only one hearing scheduled in Cheyenne?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: Who was chosen to write the EIS and how was the selection process conducted?

RESPONSE: The Air Force has a contract with Tetra Tech, Inc. to help prepare this document. Air Force contracts are awarded through a federally mandated contracting process that is designed to ensure that the federal government meets its requirements for the program in addition to encouraging a competitive selection process. Tetra Tech, Inc. was selected from a number of qualified firms competing in this process. The contractor was selected in 1985 to provide environmental support for new missile programs. Both the Air Force and Tetra Tech, Inc. recognize the benefit of using local expertise. Tetra Tech, Inc. is using local subcontractors in the candidate deployment locations to accomplish
cultural studies and other analyses, thereby benefiting from local knowledge and expertise.

436 6 ISSUE: Is the hearing being recorded and can anyone record the hearings?
RESPONSE: All of the scoping meetings and public hearings were recorded. They could have been recorded by any who wish to do so.

436 7 ISSUE: An inadequate number of scoping hearings were held among communities along the tracks.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 51.

436 8 ISSUE: Do you intend to fully address citizens' concerns for the environment in the Draft EIS?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 436, Comment 2.

436 9 ISSUE: Do you intend to limit the definition of the words "Environmental Impact?"
RESPONSE: Environmental impacts as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR §§ 1500-1508) were used as the basis for this analysis.

436 10 ISSUE: Do you intend to consider all other basing modes including other methods of deterring aggression?
RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

436 11 ISSUE: How long can the arms race go on before there is a nuclear incident?
RESPONSE: The issue of an arms race is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 12 ISSUE: How often will the trains be undeployable due to nearby train wrecks, mechanical failures, blizzards, tornadoes, floods, and earthquakes?
RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper trains would only be dispersed during times of national need. The likelihood that such events would make the system undeployable cannot be predicted with any certainty. However, even with such occurrences, the geographical separation of the proposed garrison installations are not likely to make the entire system undeployable. These concerns are addressed in Safety Section 5 of the EIS.

436 13 ISSUE: How will the Rail Garrison affect the proposed SDI system.
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 14 ISSUE: How will deployment in the time of "international tension" affect the Soviet government?
RESPONSE: Issues of international relations are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
436 15 ISSUE: Why is this basing mode superior?
RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

436 16 ISSUE: Has the Air Force abandoned the "survivability concept" by placing so many eggs in one basket?
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 17 ISSUE: What testing has been done on the MX in deployment mode in Wyoming winter conditions?
RESPONSE: The testing program is incomplete at this time but will include testing in extreme environmental conditions.

436 18 ISSUE: Has the MX ever been put on the table in Geneva? What cheaper and more environmentally sound bargaining chips have been explored?
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 19 ISSUE: How can you propose that the Peacekeeper is a deterrent?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 20 ISSUE: Who is the higher authority? Who will authorize firing the missile?
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 97 and 99.

436 21 ISSUE: Why is Rail Garrison so near an earthquake fault in Cheyenne, Wyoming?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 429, Comment 23.

436 22 ISSUE: What additional security measures will be taken to prevent sabotage or acts of terrorists?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

436 23 ISSUE: What is the likelihood of train wrecks and what would be their impact?
RESPONSE: Chapter 5 of the EIS analyzes the risk of derailment or collisions.

436 24 ISSUE: What are the chances of radioactive material escaping in the event of tornado, flood, fire, or earthquake?
RESPONSE: The occurrence of these natural disasters and the potential environmental effects on the project have been addressed as a separate issue in Safety under EIS Section 5.2.3.

436 25 ISSUE: What are the chances of accidental ignition of the propellant fuel?
RESPONSE: See Section 5.3 of the EIS.
436 26 ISSUE: How much will these additional warheads increase the chances of accidents and injuries and radioactive incidents at Rocky Flat, Amarillo, and other production plants?

RESPONSE: The production of warheads for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missiles is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 27 ISSUE: How much will these additional trains increase chances of accidents at the missile assembly plants?

RESPONSE: The production of warheads for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missiles is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 28 ISSUE: What could be the impacts on nearby states of various kinds of accidents?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 21, Comment 1.

436 29 ISSUE: How is the first stage joined to the second stage? Has it been tested in Wyoming blizzard conditions? Who makes this joint?

RESPONSE: The stages are joined by mechanical connections. There are no joints within the stages of the Peacekeeper missile. While testing has not been completed, it will include testing in extreme environmental conditions.

436 30 ISSUE: What is the possibility of accidental launch?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 48.

436 31 ISSUE: How will the warheads be transported and handled? What additional risks will be incurred transporting missiles from Cheyenne, Wyoming to Rail Garrison bases?

RESPONSE: The warheads would be transported from F.E. Warren AFB to the selected garrison bases via air transport. Risks incurred in the transport of missiles are addressed in the Safety section (Chapter 5) of the EIS.

436 32 ISSUE: Is it wise to make Cheyenne, Wyoming or any populated area a target?

RESPONSE: Issues of enemy targeting are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 33 ISSUE: Could the force of a collision derailment, heat from fire and explosions, or bridge collapse cause detonation of either the warhead or propellant?

RESPONSE: See EIS Chapter 5.

436 34 ISSUE: Is a radiation leak possible and have wind and soil contamination and cleanup been studied?

RESPONSE: These issues are addressed in EIS Chapter 5.
ISSUE: What is the maximum explosion of all trains?
RESPONSE: Details regarding the net explosive weight of each component of the Peacekeeper missile can be found in EIS Table 5.1.1-1 (see EIS Section 5.1).

ISSUE: How will supplies be delivered from Cheyenne, Wyoming to the other bases?
RESPONSE: Through existing supply channels.

ISSUE: Will emergency training, notification, and medical care be provided to communities through which the train travels?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: How will periodic adjustment of the guidance system be handled in transit on a railroad bed?
RESPONSE: Operational details of the system which are not related to environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: How raw will the parts that are to be assembled at the assembly building be? What possible effect would fire, flood, tornado, wind, or an earthquake have on this?
RESPONSE: Warheads arrive completely assembled at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming. Effects of natural disasters on the final assembly are discussed in EIS Section 5.2.3.

ISSUE: Are the assembly building complex and Rail Garrison far enough from Western Hills, Wyoming (high school, junior high, and populated area)?
RESPONSE: Air Force explosives safety standards (Air Force Regulation 127-10) are applied to the explosives safety zone boundaries of both the Rail Garrison and Missile Assembly Building (MAB). The F.E. Warren AFB south site option for the Rail Garrison is located in an area less populated than the north site option. The MAB would be located at the same site as shown in EIS Figure 4.2-1 and addressed in EIS Section 4.2. The consequences of the most severe credible mishap involving a Peacekeeper missile or component is addressed in EIS Chapter 5, Safety Considerations.

ISSUE: Will existing rail bridges be able to sustain the load of a Peacekeeper train?
RESPONSE: The missile launch cars would be heavier than most standard cars used in commercial service, but would be designed for compatibility with the operating parameters (weight and geometry) of the national rail network. Existing rail bridges would therefore be able to sustain the load of the Peacekeeper train.

ISSUE: Who dispatches and controls rail traffic?
RESPONSE: Railroad company dispatchers monitor and control rail traffic including movement of the Peacekeeper and training trains.
ISSUE: How will the Peacekeeper trains interact when they encounter a commercial train? Are the rail yards capable of supporting the Peacekeeper trains?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 76.

ISSUE: Will the rail tracks be checked for damage by the training trains?

RESPONSE: Changes in the operational availability of the track are generally relayed by the trains to the dispatchers who then relay them to other trains which would use the track. If the training trains encounter any problems with the track, information would be relayed to the dispatcher. Also see response to Document 15, Comment 3.

ISSUE: Who will be responsible for the integrity of the track and railroad?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.

ISSUE: How fail-safe are the technologies used for this system?

RESPONSE: EIS Section 1.4.7 discusses the testing of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system.

ISSUE: Will the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program use the guidance system from the MX that has been cited as being faulty?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 410, Comment 10.

ISSUE: What is the statistical likelihood of a ground-level nuclear detonation in Cheyenne and what are the immediate and long-term effects.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 21, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What would be the effect of a solid fuel fire?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 5.4.1.

ISSUE: What will be the effect of sabotage and the fear of sabotage?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 6, Comment 2 and Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: What hazardous materials (other than nuclear and solid fuel) will be present and what will be the greatest effect on Cheyenne, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: F.E. Warren AFB has been a Main Operating Base for strategic systems for over 30 years. The safe operation of strategic defense systems is as important today as it has been. No new hazardous materials will be introduced with the Peacekeeper. In addition to diesel fuel, the maintenance of rail cars will generate small amounts of solvents, waste oils and lubricants, hydraulic fluids, and battery acid. All hazardous material will be disposed of according to regulation and they will represent no danger to the residents of Cheyenne.

ISSUE: In commentor's opinion, the issues of competence, law, and concern for our welfare are suspect because of rudimentary design flaws and the history of our government and military to deny hazards.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 53 ISSUE: Could an accidental burn cause a disastrous prairie fire?

RESPONSE: The possibility of a disasterous fire resulting from an accident involving a Peacekeeper train would be the same as that involving a standard train.

436 54 ISSUE: Could a launch impair the rails or bed?


436 55 ISSUE: What is the relationship between the Air Force and the railroads? How are interests and schedules going to be coordinated?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 3.

436 56 ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of a first strike by the Soviets on the trains in a garrison?

RESPONSE: The environmental impact of a Soviet first strike is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 57 ISSUE: Will nuclear materials be transported on public highways?

RESPONSE: If direct air transport to garrison facilities is not possible, highway transport in secure convoys would be required.

436 58 ISSUE: What are the actual chances of nuclear material being released in vehicle accidents and of vehicles carrying nuclear material being involved in accidents.

RESPONSE: EIS Chapter 5 addresses safety concerns of nuclear material release.

436 59 ISSUE: Why is the Air Force returning to a mobile system, when in 1984 during Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos, they decided that option was safer?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 60 ISSUE: Disproportionate demands for different human services in Cheyenne, Wyoming should be calculated.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 424, Comment 2.

436 61 ISSUE: What psychological effects can be expected in various age groups; in neighborhoods of close proximity?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

436 62 ISSUE: How will the view from the Western Hills subdivision in Wyoming be affected?

RESPONSE: The Train Alert Shelters would be located about 4,900 feet from the closest Western Hill subdivision house, and would be hidden by
the rolling terrain in that area. A portion of the Missile Assembly Building (MAB) would reach heights of 140 feet, but it would be located about 8,400 feet (1.6 miles) from the Western Hills subdivision (one key observation point) and 10,600 feet from I-25 (the other key observation point). Without intervening higher land (that would block the view), the MAB could be seen from the back of about ten Western Hills residences and would be seen to rise about 1.3 degrees above the horizon. However, for the most part, intervening topography would preclude views of the MAB from the east base boundary. The light color of the MAB would tend to make it less visible to viewers. Night lighting would be similar to that presently found at the base Weapons Storage Area.

**ISSUE:** How close will the building and rail lines be to existing housing in Cheyenne, Wyoming?

**RESPONSE:** A partially developed Read Tracts subdivision located on Wrangler, Powell, and Laughlin Roads between Interstate 25 and the eastern base boundary would be about 3,750 feet away from the Train Alert Shelters. Since the main line of the Burlington Northern Railroad is located within the City of Cheyenne, existing housing could be within 100 feet to 200 feet from the existing track. The rail spur for the north site option would be constructed within the boundaries of F.E. Warren AFB. The closest offbase housing to this new track would be an isolated residence 3,800 feet west of the track. The nearest subdivision (on Wrangler and Laughlin Roads) would be the Read Tracts 4,500 feet east of the spur track (see EIS Section 4.2.4.3).

**ISSUE:** Will the historic train depot in Cheyenne, Wyoming be affected?

**RESPONSE:** The Union Pacific train depot in downtown Cheyenne will not be affected.

**ISSUE:** Will historic buildings at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming be affected?

**RESPONSE:** No historic buildings at F.E. Warren AFB are scheduled for alteration or modification.

**ISSUE:** The impact of living in fear of a nuclear war or accident on children should be addressed.

**RESPONSE:** The issue of nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 5, Comment 14.

**ISSUE:** Programs to prevent personal, family, and social disruptions should be recommended and funded.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

**ISSUE:** Will there be any additional off-limit areas at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming? If so, where will they be and how large?

**RESPONSE:** Off-limit areas are presented on maps in the chapters describing impacts on each candidate base.

**ISSUE:** Will there be any effects on the local media and their access to information?
RESPONSE: There will be no changes in Air Force policy regarding the media and access to information as a result of deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system.

436 70 ISSUE: When the trains are at the garrison or deployed, how will additional security measures impinge on existing human rights? Will individuals be subject to additional scrutiny by intelligence agencies?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 7 through 16.

436 71 ISSUE: What corporations will benefit from Rail Garrison and how much?

RESPONSE: The issue of corporate profits is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 72 ISSUE: How will property values be affected in Western Hills and other neighborhoods in Cheyenne, Wyoming?

RESPONSE: Analysis of this type of activity has found that the additional demand for housing has either encouraged the additional construction of housing, has raised the prices of existing housing, or has been a beneficial impact by taking otherwise unoccupied homes. No adverse effects on property values is expected.

436 73 ISSUE: How would a treaty reducing strategic weapons affect the Rail Garrison?

RESPONSE: Issues regarding theoretical treaties are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436 74 ISSUE: What will be the completed costs of the project?

RESPONSE: The entire system is expected to cost between $10 billion and $12 billion.

436 75 ISSUE: What will be the annual costs of maintenance and operations?

RESPONSE: Approximately $200 million (1986 dollars) is currently budgeted for annual maintenance and operations of the system.

436 76 ISSUE: What will be the costs of the EIS process including the scoping hearings?

RESPONSE: The entire EIS process and associated hearings will cost approximately $9 million.

436 77 ISSUE: When will the system become obsolete? Will it be obsolete before it is built?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 61.

436 78 ISSUE: What will be the social and economic impacts on the Cheyenne, Wyoming area if the President is successful of ridding the world of nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: Discussion of nuclear strategy is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: What happened to the funds promised in the last EIS for the first 50 MX missiles?

RESPONSE: What funds were "promised" in the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos EIS cannot be determined without more information from the commentor. The "first 50 missiles" have been deployed in Minuteman silos. The Air Force has expended considerable sums to mitigate the socioeconomic impacts, for example on schools and other public facilities in the Cheyenne area.

ISSUE: Is there some tactical advantage to siting the system in Wyoming?

RESPONSE: F.E. Warren AFB has been chosen as the Main Operating Base because of the already available resources such as existing technical facilities, manpower, and equipment for the Peacekeeper system.

ISSUE: How many engineers and scientists from the project could be working on other programs to benefit our economy?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Air Force must consider the impact of reduced funding for agriculture, infrastructure, Environmental Protection Agency, and other programs as a result of the funding of this program.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How many miles of new track will be laid? Where? How many miles will be upgraded? Where? Where will gravel come from?

RESPONSE: New rail spurs to connect the Rail Garrison with existing rail lines will be constructed. Some existing rail lines between the base and the main rail line which are in poor condition would either be upgraded or reconstructed. These are indicated at each base as part of program requirements. No new tracks would be constructed offbase at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming for the north site option. New track for the south site option will be land acquired by the Air Force for this purpose. Necessary aggregate will come from adequate local supplies.

ISSUE: Where will the trains go?

RESPONSE: The initial delivery of trains to the garrison and maintenance activities would involve a rail network passing through 24 states, while training and operations movements would utilize rail lines throughout the contiguous United States.

ISSUE: How large will the project be?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.3.

ISSUE: How large will the "off-limits" perimeter be?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 436, Comment 68.
436  ISSUE: Is there need for an ABM system to protect this project? If so, what will those impacts be?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 6.

436  ISSUE: How can we get an independent assessment of the guidance system reliability?

RESPONSE: There is no current plan for an independent assessment of the system. Such an assessment could be done if directed by the President, Congress, or other competent authority.

436  ISSUE: Why isn't this hearing being conducted by an independent agency?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 27.

436  ISSUE: The hearing is premature. The Secretary of Defense has not decided between Rail Garrison and Midgetman systems.

RESPONSE: Public hearings on the Draft EIS was held in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508). Also see Section 1.1 of the EIS.

436  ISSUE: Commentor feels that building of more megatonage than earth can survive is a crime against humanity.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436  ISSUE: Have launch control officers been educated about their duty to disobey unlawful orders under the Nuremburg principles?

RESPONSE: The issue of officer education is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436  ISSUE: What will be the environmental impacts if the missiles are fired and exploded as they were designed to do?

RESPONSE: The issue of intentional use of the system is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436  ISSUE: Is building even more nuclear weapons an act of terrorism?

RESPONSE: No.

436  ISSUE: How expendable is the human race?

RESPONSE: The issue of impacts due to nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436  ISSUE: Will building more nuclear arms promote an environment less decent and loving?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

436  ISSUE: How can we justify these weapons in terms of democratic principles?
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What will be the environmental impact of not deploying the system?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

ISSUE: Wider public participation is needed. This would include more public hearings throughout the nation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: There was insufficient time for public participation at the public hearings.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: What plans does the Air Force have for dealing with civil disobedience?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system proposal does not include plans for any change to laws, regulations, or policies with regards to civil disobedience. Also see response to Document 50, Comment 86.

ISSUE: Will martial law be imposed in time of "national need?"

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system proposal does not include plans to impose martial law.

ISSUE: What standards of deadly force will be allowed for security guards in order to protect nonviolent protestors and ordinary citizens who may be misconstrued as interfering with MX operations?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison does not include any plans for change to statute, regulations and policies regarding use of deadly force by security personnel. Also see response to Document 50, Comment 86.

ISSUE: When civil disobedience and other protests occur, how will local communities be trained or supported in dealing with such acts in an appropriate and legal manner? What will be the costs of such training?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 86.

ISSUE: Commentator disturbed by the incorrect instructions by the Air Force in hearings that "wartime effects" and "psychological impact" of Rail Garrison deployment were "beyond the scope" of the hearings.

RESPONSE: The information given at the hearings was correct. Comments on those topics were permitted, but those topics are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see responses to Document 3, Comment 1 and Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: How will citizens be notified if nuclear war is imminent? How will panic be avoided? And conversely, how will a "garrison mentality" be avoided in which anyone who disapproves of, is afraid of, or takes political action against MX rail-based missiles is seen as subversive or dangerous?
RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system proposal does not include any plan to change the way the public is notified of world conditions. That and the other issues raised in the comments are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.

437 9 ISSUE: How will civilian dispatchers and Air Force train operators communicate?

RESPONSE: Peacekeeper trains will communicate with dispatchers by the same means as commercial traffic. See EIS Section 5.1.3 for details.

437 10 ISSUE: How will the Air Force ensure that its train operators are both adequately trained and experienced engineers since MX rail can pose serious problems in weight, wide loads, and high centers-of-gravity?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 5.1.2. Also see responses to Document 15, Comment 5 and Document 33, Comment 74.

437 11 ISSUE: The problem of adequate security for MX rail cars and the prevention of sabotage whether by terrorists, foreign agents, disgruntled employees, or violent protestors in time of "national need" is not adequately considered. What security measures will be taken? What is their cost?

RESPONSE: Security measures have been considered carefully. Details are not reported in the EIS because they would not have a significant impact on the environment. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 7.

437 12 ISSUE: The Draft EIS acknowledges that monomethylhydrazine (MMH) and nitrogen tetroxide "ignite spontaneously on contact with each other" (pp. 5-35). If these two chemicals do ignite, the Draft EIS acknowledges that the heat "could involve the adjacent solid propellants and cause them to ignite or explode." Why is such an event judged "extremely unlikely?"

RESPONSE: The tanks are designed to withstand forces greater than those imposed by any reasonable accident which may involve the Peacekeeper Missile Launch Car. Although the series of events necessary to cause the liquid propellants to leak are very unlikely, a complete environmental analysis of the environmental and human health effects are described in EIS Section 5.4.

437 13 ISSUE: What is the qualitative risk that "a propellant fire would not likely last [long enough] to breach the reentry vehicle (RV) and begin aerosolization of plutonium" especially when such a fire would "likely cause the RV to be expelled."

RESPONSE: The method used to calculate the probability of radioactive material release and the consequences of a release is probabilistic risk assessment. It is generally thought to be more rigorous than a scenario analysis approach. It does not, however, produce a "qualitative risk that a propellant fire would likely last long enough to breach the RV and begin aerosolization of plutonium." It does include an estimate, based on historical data and engineering judgment of the likelihood of dispersal of radioactive materials. The results of that analysis are reported in Section 5.3 of the EIS.
ISSUE: Why is the possibility of serious secondary fires and toxic spills not sufficiently explored? What are the hazards for local citizens? For firefighters?

RESPONSE: The possibilities of those events and the consequences have been revised in Section 5.4 of the EIS.

ISSUE: What are the consequences of disbursement of radioactive materials, especially in light of the health, social, and economic consequences of previous disbursements such as the B-52 accident in Rota, Spain where local farmers were seriously impacted and top soil had to be removed and shipped to the United States?

RESPONSE: The probability and consequences of dispersal of radioactive materials is adequately discussed in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the EIS.

ISSUE: A serious defect of the Air Force Draft EIS is that it does not adequately portray the functioning of the MX rail-based system, nor does it sufficiently explore other strategic options including No Action, single warhead missiles, and sea-based alternatives.

RESPONSE: The issues of system operational requirements and of other strategic options are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 37, Comment 15.

ISSUE: The launching procedures for the MX are not adequately described. Is the civilian rail bed adequate at all places to sustain missile launches? If not, how will it be reinforced and what will be the costs?

RESPONSE: The issue of system operational requirements are beyond the scope of the EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: If the MX is not to be launched from rail cars, what alternatives, such as permanent silos built along rail lines, are being considered? If such a rail/silo system is chosen, will the Air Force hold additional hearings as required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality, and Department of Defense regulations?

RESPONSE: A rail/silo system is not proposed.

ISSUE: How will the MX rail system operate in a nuclear war environment since its design is ostensibly for the purpose of responding to an enemy strategic nuclear attack?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will the MX missile trains be hardened against electromagnetic pulse resulting from high attitude nuclear bursts?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 287, Comment 31.

ISSUE: How will central authorities communicate with rail cars and launch offices under attack?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: What is the environmental impact of not deploying MX?

RESPONSE: If the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is not deployed, activities at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming and the other candidate Air Force installations would continue to support existing and other proposed missions.

ISSUE: What are the environmental impacts of alternative deployment methods, such as, but not limited to, the 30-plus basing modes examined over the past 25 years?

RESPONSE: The issue of analyzing alternative deployment methods is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Exact questions as shown in Document 33.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 3 through 22.

ISSUE: To protect against sabotage or terrorist attack, will the Air Force be required to fire on anyone who comes near the tracks as the MX railcars pass?

RESPONSE: No. See response to Document 33, Comment 7.

ISSUE: Will landowners adjacent to the tracks be required to remove trees and other things that might provide cover for attackers?

RESPONSE: No. Railways rights-of-way are the responsibility of individual railroad companies. The security provisions for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system will not cause disruption of the lives of those living near the garrisons or the rail lines that the system might use.

ISSUE: Exact questions as shown in Document 33.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 23 through 30.

ISSUE: Exact questions as shown in Document 33.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 51 through 57.

ISSUE: In EIS Section 5.4, it states that all light structures within 1,000 feet of the blast would be destroyed. The potential for human casualties is ignored. What is the environmental impact of such a mishap?

RESPONSE: The first mention of blast damage to structure is in EIS Section 5.4.1.1. That same paragraph discusses the distances for human fatality and injury. The section has been rearranged and revised for the Final EIS.

ISSUE: Draft EIS Page 5-29 states nitrous oxide and hydrochlorine acid gas concentrations up to 66 miles away from the attack would create potentially lethal exposures. What is the true environmental impact of such an event occurring in heavily populated areas?

RESPONSE: If there were a release in a heavily populated area, the consequences would be more serious than for a similar event in a sparsely
populated area. The population densities in all areas through which a Peacekeeper train might travel were considered in the risk analysis performed by Sandia National Laboratories and summarized in EIS Section 5.3.1.4.

438 10 ISSUE: Exact questions as shown in Document 33.
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 58 through 69.

438 11 ISSUE: Exact questions as shown in Document 33.
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 31 through 50.

438 12 ISSUE: Exact questions as shown in Document 33.
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 70 through 75.

438 13 ISSUE: Considering the high number of derailments caused by substandard track in Arkansas, why does the Draft EIS not include plans for replacing existing rails?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 2.

438 14 ISSUE: Exact questions as shown in Document 33.
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 76 through 105.

438 15 ISSUE: What endangered species are threatened throughout Arkansas by low-level radiation?
RESPONSE: Since the risk of low-level radiation exposure is negligible, there is no threat to endangered species.

438 16 ISSUE: Are there any plans to recreate any lost wetlands in Arkansas?
RESPONSE: The proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program would not affect any wetlands on Little Rock AFB and would affect only 0.1 acre of nonforested wetland on Eaker AFB. Therefore, there are no plans to recreate wetlands. See Section 4.5.6.3, Table 4.5.6-2, Section 4.8.6.3, and Table 4.8.6-2 in the EIS.

438 17 ISSUE: Are there any plans to recreate lost endangered species habitat in Arkansas?
RESPONSE: Locating the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at either Little Rock or Eaker AFBs would not affect any federally listed species; therefore, there are no plans to recreate any endangered species habitat. See Section 4.5.6.3, Table 4.5.6-1, Section 4.8.6.3, and Table 4.8.6-1 in the EIS.

438 18 ISSUE: Will the deployment of MX impact or interact with existing environmental problems on the Air Force bases and along the proposed train routes? What would the interactive environment be?
RESPONSE: Deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program on the proposed air bases would have some cumulative effects with existing environmental problems. The extent of these cumulative impacts onbase
and along the rail lines would be dependent upon the amount of new
disturbance generated by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.
Potential cumulative impacts were evaluated for all bases but were only
discussed in the EIS when there were known future military programs
proposed for the base.

438 19 ISSUE: Will new warheads be produced for use in the missiles and if so,
how will the radioactive waste be dealt with at all stages of the fuel
cycle?

RESPONSE: The issue of warhead production and disposing of radioactive
waste is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3,
Comment 1.

438 20 ISSUE: How many jobs would be created if $10 to $15 billion was spent on
education?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 7.

438 21 ISSUE: How many jobs on the average would be created if the money
remained in the civilian economy rather than being taxed for use by the
military?

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this
EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

438 22 ISSUE: The Reagan Administration was known to have had at least four
MX basing modes under active consideration prior to selecting the Rail
Garrison option in December 1986. Why haven't any of those alternatives
been included in the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: Comparison of other basing modes is beyond the scope of this
EIS.

438 23 ISSUE: The alternative of dismantling the 50 silo-based MX missiles
currently deployed should be included. Such an option might make sense
as the reductions being pursued in the President's START negotiations.

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS.
Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

438 24 ISSUE: Descriptions of the Proposed Action fail to specify whether its
50 MX missiles would be the ones currently deployed in silos at F.E.
Warren AFB, Wyoming or whether these would be 50 new missiles. If new
missiles are involved, why aren't these costs included in EIS Table 4.1-2
(Rail Garrison Expenditures)? If missiles are to be taken from silos, why
isn't the impact of this included when discussing F.E. Warren AFB
(including the silo operation jobs lost)?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 390, Comment 1.

438 25 ISSUE: Under purpose and need, the Air Force implies that the Proposed
Action will enhance deterrence. According to the Congressional Budget
Office (November 1987), after a surprise attack, 3,700 nuclear weapons
would endure while 8,200 nuclear weapons would remain if there was
sufficient warning. Doesn't this constitute sufficient military strength?
**RESPONSE:** Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

438 26 **ISSUE:** The trains will have "appropriately armed" security personnel. What dangers might this pose to civilians living or traveling near the tracks who might be misidentified as a threat to the train? Will the security personnel on training trains be authorized to use force (or make arrests) if protestors are encountered? Will the trains be authorized to run over protestors?

**RESPONSE:** See responses to Document 33, Comment 8 and Document 366, Comment 19.

438 27 **ISSUE:** Each base is to have a 400-foot-long attached shelter which would house supplemental railcars. What is the purpose of these cars? Is the purchase price included in the overall costs? How many cars will fit inside the shelter?

**RESPONSE:** The supplemental cars would help the train look more like commercial trains. The design of the cars is not final, but a cost estimate was included in the analysis. How many will fit into the shelter will depend on the final design, but would be approximately six cars to eight cars.

438 28 **ISSUE:** Considering what has happened in the past, why should citizens believe the MX Rail Garrison testing and manufacturing will be conducted any better?

**RESPONSE:** Issues of system development are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

438 29 **ISSUE:** It seems that while the MX trains might be completely tested before they are deployed, the missiles they carry will not.

**RESPONSE:** The Peacekeeper missile has been successfully flight tested 17 out of 17 times. The Air Force has every confidence in the system.

438 30 **ISSUE:** If the enemy must use more weapons to destroy the MX trains, isn't this just another way of saying that towns and cities along the MX train route could expect to become targets in a nuclear war?

**RESPONSE:** Issues involving enemy targeting strategy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

438 31 **ISSUE:** If civilian dispatchers know the precise location of MX trains, why couldn't enemy intelligence gain access to this information, thereby defeating the whole purpose of the basing mode?

**RESPONSE:** Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

438 32 **ISSUE:** Isn't it likely that MX trains will be granted special rights-of-way privileges or other extraordinary powers that would increase the possibility of collision and other accidents?
RESPONSE: No. Priorities will be preestablished with the rail industry. The Peacekeeper and training trains will follow standard railroad industry operating rules and commercial practices and would not purposely cause disruption to other rail or road traffic.

438 33 ISSUE: Will measures such as security clearance, random drug testing, and medical and psychological measuring be imposed on the civil dispatchers?

RESPONSE: The Air Force does not have the authority to impose those measures.

438 34 ISSUE: In a crisis which would trigger deployment of the MX train, what measures would be taken to compel the civilian dispatcher to show up for work rather than stay at home with their families?

RESPONSE: Operational details involving no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

438 35 ISSUE: EIS Table 4.1.1-1 includes statistics representing the Air Force's claims for the national impact on employment (direct, indirect, and induced) of Rail Garrison expenditures. The employment projections amount to a claim over 52,000 jobs (man-years) per billion dollars spent. Such a claim is completely outside the range of all reputable studies on this kind of spending (too high by at least 50-100%). What indicators and assumptions were used to generate these employment figures?

RESPONSE: National economic impacts have been updated in Section 1.1.1 of the EIS. EIS Section 1.3.1 discusses methods for assessing national economic impacts.

438 36 ISSUE: An indication that the employment estimates in EIS Table 4.1.1-1 are in error is the lack of fluctuation in the jobs per billion ratio (obtained by dividing the employment number by the actual dollars spent). The table indicates that in Fiscal Year 1989, nearly all the money from the program will go towards research and development, while by Fiscal Year 1992, nearly all Rail Garrison money will go towards operations. These very different types of spending would not generate similar jobs per billion ratios in a well-done economic analysis. Again, what indicators and assumptions were used to generate these employment figures?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 438, Comment 35.

438 37 ISSUE: The Draft EIS forecasts that jobs created by the program would go "from nearly 40,000 in FY 1989 to nearly 148,000 in FY 1991, and then decline sharply to 13,000 by FY 1993 and just under 12,000 in FY 1994 and beyond." This indicates that the Rail Garrison program would have an extreme "boom-bust" effect on the economy. While the employment figures are highly suspect, this basic boom-bust pattern is likely to be correct. Will such short-term jobs really have any net positive effect on local communities, or the nation as a whole?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

439 1 ISSUE: Concerned about the routes to be used by the missile train in populated areas because of the potential hazards and dangers.
440 1 ISSUE: Frequent reports of train wrecks show that rail transportation is not safe enough to consider putting Peacekeeper missiles on trains.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 7.

441 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the Rail Garrison program at Grand Forks, AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 1.

442 1 ISSUE: The program at Minot AFB, North Dakota will generate enough revenue to cover any additional financial outlays.

RESPONSE: Noted.

442 2 ISSUE: Minot, North Dakota has the housing available now and in 1990 when the program begins.

RESPONSE: Noted.

442 3 ISSUE: The project located adjacent to the northwestern end of Minot AFB, North Dakota will not require the dislocation of a single inhabited dwelling.

RESPONSE: Noted.

443 1 ISSUE: The Final EIS should consider the psychological consequences of deploying the MX Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

444 1 ISSUE: If the Region of Influence for employment and income includes two counties in Wyoming and two counties in Colorado, why weren't more hearings held?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

444 2 ISSUE: Safety concerns, Wyoming weather, human error, and/or sabotage have been addressed inadequately. The Challenger and Chernobyl are examples of disasters that shouldn't have happened.

RESPONSE: It is obvious from the very nature of the Shuttle rocket motor and the design and procedures of the Chernobyl plant that those operations were many times more hazardous than the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system. The safety analysis for this program was done by Sandia National Laboratories, a leader in transportation safety analysis, especially nuclear materials transport. The estimates in Chapter 5 are reasonable.

444 3 ISSUE: No provisions have been made for human services including the mental health of school age children who now list the fear of nuclear destruction as their number one concern.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.
444 4 ISSUE: Concerns are magnified on a national level, where the public has to pay for further research and documentation of a project they, through Congress, have already rejected.

RESPONSE: Noted.

444 5 ISSUE: Commentor supports the No Action Alternative.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

445 1 ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with EIS Figure 2.2-1 that there would be no short-term effects on utilities, air quality and noise. States that there might be long-term noise impacts if engines are run continuously.

RESPONSE: There would be some short-term impacts on utilities but they are considered negligible. Blank boxes in EIS Figure 2.2-1 do not mean "no impacts." The EIS has been revised to show short-term air quality impacts at base property lines. These are greater than the impacts reported in the Draft EIS. Short-term noise impacts related to construction activities will be negligible because of large distances from construction areas to sensitive receptors. Locomotives will not be run continuously. They will be run occasionally for maintenance purposes; therefore, long-term impacts from locomotive noise will be negligible.

445 2 ISSUE: The Draft EIS in Chapter 2, Pages 2-1 through 2-10, assume that the only impact would be on the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming and ignores the impact on rural areas.

RESPONSE: Analysis summarized in Chapter 2 were for those communities and areas proposed to receive significant impacts. Impacts of lesser extent and/or indirect to various resources and locations within the study areas are covered in Chapter 4 of the EIS.

445 3 ISSUE: If deployment at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming is approved by Congress, will there be another round of hearings?

RESPONSE: No.

445 4 ISSUE: Mention is made of other classified options for F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming. How will the public concern about impacts be ascertained?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 3.

445 5 ISSUE: The number of train trips on Draft EIS Page 2-2 compared to trips on a national network does not apply to individual bases. There needs to be a comparison of local traffic to missile traffic.

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper and training trains could travel on any of the rail routes of the national rail network. Deployment and maintenance activities of the program would involve a rail network passing through 24 states, while training and operations could utilize rail lines throughout the country. Potential rail impacts are therefore evaluated on a national basis (see EIS Section 4.1).

445 6 ISSUE: The EIS should have an analysis of the likelihood of accidents and sabotage. The plan for securing an area in the event of an accident or breakdown was also not addressed.
ISSUE: After reading EIS Section 5, commentor felt the dangers of this weapon system were being underestimated. Further, the assumption that local authorities would be able to handle any accident are grossly underestimated. There is no oversight agency in Wyoming (or possibly no communication) to protect the citizens in the event of a potentially dangerous situation.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: The map on Draft EIS Page S-5 shows the Missile Assembly Building (MAB) between two public water aquifers into Cheyenne, Wyoming. Why is there not a danger to local water supply through explosion or chemical leak?

RESPONSE: Roundtop Reservoir is located just west of F.E. Warren AFB. It is situated outside the explosive safety zone of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program and would not be affected by an accident. The two aqueducts indicated on EIS Figure S-5 are actually buried pipelines. These would not be subject to contamination due to a leak or spill. The pipeline lies 1,100 feet south and 650 feet north of the MAB site. They are buried at least three feet to four feet deep and are located outside the required safety distance for buried utility lines (176 ft).

ISSUE: Commentor feels there are other less costly alternatives with a less destabilizing threat which can lead to greater national security.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are outside the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to deploying MX Rail Garrison or any mode in Montana because Montana already has enough war weapons and power; Montana is already a number one target. With more missiles, it will only make that fact more true.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The project in Montana would create few jobs and would become a "boom and bust" leaving no money and unemployment.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

ISSUE: Having more military growth in Montana will not appeal to tourists.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The money spent on where to put the missiles could be better spent to help the sick and the poor.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the Rail Garrison program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.
ISSUE: Commentor urges that No Action Alternative be taken at Whiteman AFB, Missouri.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How does the Air Force plan to remove all birds from Whiteman AFB, Missouri to reduce bird air strike hazards?

RESPONSE: The Air Force has no plans to remove all birds from Whiteman AFB. However, to reduce the potential for collisions between greater prairie chickens and aircraft, Whiteman AFB removed all prairie chickens from the base in early 1988 according to procedures established by the Missouri Department of Conservation.

ISSUE: Commentor states that the proposed construction of the project at Whiteman AFB, Missouri includes placement of culverts, diversions, and destruction of three springheads in undisturbed wetlands. States it is totally impractical to build on a floodplain.

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program will involve channeling a small, intermittent stream around the perimeter or underneath the garrison site. A biological survey of the garrison site revealed no springs. The commentor may be referring to an existing base project to channelize Long Branch Creek.

ISSUE: The Final EIS must discuss in detail the impact on the Rail Garrison housing and to the rail track if an earthquake registering 6.5 to 8.5 on the Richter Scale occurs at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 62.

ISSUE: The Final EIS should describe air and water pollution which might result from sabotage, especially the impact on the water supply for the City of Jacksonville, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: The possibility of a significant hazardous material release at any site is extremely low. However, the environmental impact of hazardous material releases, whether from an accident or sabotage, are described in Section 5.4 of the EIS. That generalized description can be overlaid on the Jacksonville area or any other site to assess the impacts on that particular area.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the system for reasons such as religious beliefs, against nuclear, conventional, biological, chemical, incendiary, economical, and psychological war toys and the destruction if used.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately address the increased security provisions for Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and the disruption of lives of local residents they will cause.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 7 and 13.
ISSUE: Will there be an increase in commuter traffic at the north gate of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming?

RESPONSE: The north gate is only used for the movement of the stage transporter, transportation of horses to and from the stables occasionally, and for morning and evening commuting. This could also be used for moving Peacekeeper materials and equipment. However, the increase would be minimal.

ISSUE: Will there be an increase in secured transporting of missiles, missile parts, and military goods at the north gate of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: The north gate could also be used for moving Peacekeeper parts and equipment. The increase is expected to be minimal. EIS Section 4.2.3.3 states that other gates (not only the north gate) could be used for the program.

ISSUE: Consideration needs to be given to the potential for traffic conflicts at the north gate of F.E. Warren, AFB, Wyoming, particularly because of the limited access to Western Hills from the rest of the city.

RESPONSE: The north gate is presently available to vehicular traffic as an access route to the base because of the construction activity near the south gate. Once the south gate is opened, traffic along the north gate would be reduced.

ISSUE: Would interruptions to vehicular flow along public roads because of railroad crossings at the south site be reduced if the Missile Assembly Building (MAB) and/or other Rail Garrison facilities were located on the south site in closer proximity to the train shelters?

RESPONSE: Yes, however, construction of the MAB and/or other facilities on the south site would require greater land area and increase the cost of the program.

ISSUE: What will the at-grade crossing impacts be if the north site of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming is chosen?

RESPONSE: Because the rail spur for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program would connect to existing lines onbase, interruptions to vehicular traffic would occur along existing at-grade crossings onbase. As stated in the EIS, the trains would only move out of the garrison when necessary, and interruptions to vehicular traffic at at-grade rail crossings would be minimal. Also see response to Document 50, Comment 73.

ISSUE: The transportation impacts for both alternatives at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming should be identified and a comparison should be made.

RESPONSE: Transportation impacts for both alternatives at F.E. Warren AFB are discussed in EIS Section 4.2.3.3.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not address future plans for lands north and west of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming. How will the proposed restrictive easement affect these plans?
RESPONSE: About 160 acres of the school property (located north of the base) would lie within the inhabited building restrictive easement. This land would be treated no differently than private land within the easement. Current uses (grazing and an uninhabited building) could continue without restriction. Air Force Regulation 127-100 would preclude from the restrictive easement any future structure designed for human occupation (on a permanent basis), gathering places for outdoor recreation (such as athletic fields or stadiums), overhead powerlines of 69 KV or more, and nonmilitary runways.

ISSUE: What is the likelihood that explosive safety zones at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming will be expanded after the Final EIS is completed? How much extra distance, for the two sites under construction, is available should the zones have to be expanded?

RESPONSE: No easement expansion is anticipated. If such expansion were contemplated, it could be moved about 1,700 feet west, 300 feet east, and 1,000 feet northeast before the easement would encroach on an inhabited building.

ISSUE: If the Missile Assembly Building (MAB) will be considerably taller than other base buildings and if it will be visible from area residences, mitigation measures should be addressed in the Final EIS. Lighting and visual impacts during dark hours should also be addressed.

RESPONSE: The text of the EIS has been amended to briefly discuss this concern. The MAB would reach heights of approximately 140 feet, but it would be located about 8,400 feet (1.6 miles) from the Western Hills subdivision (one key observation point, and 10,600 feet from I-25 the other key observation point). Without intervening higher land (that would block the view), the MAB could be seen from the back of about ten Western Hills residences. However, for the most part, intervening topography would preclude views of the MAB from the east base boundary. The light color of the MAB would tend to make it less visible to viewers. Night lighting would be similar to that presently found at the base Weapons Storage Area.

ISSUE: There are several locations in the northern portion of Cheyenne, Wyoming that are prone to flooding during heavy stormwater runoff situations. How will these be affected by the project? The stormwater runoff impacts for each of the two alternative sites should be identified and a comparison should be made.

RESPONSE: Areas along Dry Creek in northern Cheyenne are prone to flooding. The proposed north garrison site is located in the drainage immediately north of Dry Creek and would therefore not affect the current flood problems along Dry Creek. The stormwater runoff analysis of a 2-year storm event indicates that runoff from the north site would boost peak runoff by about 15 cfs, at Interstate 25. The south garrison site would not increase existing peak flows in Clear Creek. Other program components consist of isolated buildings which would have a very small effect on stormwater flows in adjacent, natural channels.

ISSUE: What provisions will be made to assure watering for fugitive dust?

RESPONSE: Dust control measures will be required and specified in the construction contracts.
ISSUE: Will the Cheyenne, Wyoming area's customary northwest winds focus the dust in some areas and reduce it in others?

RESPONSE: The prevailing wind direction at F.E. Warren AFB is west to west-northwest. The wind blows about one-third of the time from these directions. Average wind speed from these directions is about 14 mph. Because of these relatively high wind speeds, the dust will be well dispersed as it moves downwind. By the time it reaches the residential areas east of the base (approximately 5,000 feet from the Train Alert Shelter construction area), the dust would be well dispersed and below ambient air quality standards. Although the transport of dust in an easterly direction will occur one-third of the time, the reduced dust concentrations will have little impact on downwind receptors.

ISSUE: Fugitive dust impacts for both alternative sites at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming should be identified and a comparison should be made.

RESPONSE: The fugitive dust impacts at both the north and south sites will be low. The nearest residential areas are about 5,000 feet from the Train Alert Shelter at either site.

ISSUE: The noises associated with the operation of a railroad yard should be addressed, such as the rearrangement of cars and other movements made in the yard. How frequent will such noises occur? Where and at what level will these noises be heard if the north site or south site is selected?

RESPONSE: The operation of the Peacekeeper trains will be minimal and will be confined to the base. They will be parked in Train Alert Shelters on the base. The trains are kept assembled and ready to move on short notice. Thus, a conventional railroad yard is not required for the Proposed Action and typical railroad yard noise would be minimal or nonexistent at either site.

ISSUE: The Air Force needs to address how the deployment of Small ICBMs might affect the advantages of one Cheyenne, Wyoming site over the other.

RESPONSE: The Air Force has considered the advantages of collocating Small ICBMs at the Rail Garrison locations under consideration. There are advantages in siting these systems on the south F.E. Warren AFB alternative; however, the advantages of siting on north F.E. Warren AFB far outweighed the south alternative.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force know whether Small ICBMs are to be deployed at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming before the site selection for the Rail Garrison is made?

RESPONSE: The Rail Garrison basing decision for deploying Peacekeeper missiles directs that F.E. Warren AFB will be the system's Main Operating Base. The Minuteman silo basing decision for deploying the Small ICBM on Hardened Mobile Launchers at Malmstrom AFB, Montana is only indirectly tied to the Rail Garrison basing requirements at F.E. Warren AFB. The decision to collocate the Small ICBM basing option with Rail Garrison facilities at F.E. Warren AFB is only an indirect issue to the Peacekeeper basing decision under consideration.
ISSUE: The consequences of solid propellant explosion and radioactive materials release should be analyzed and compared for the alternative garrison sites at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: The analyses done of the hazardous material spread in the event of an accident were not done on a site-specific basis. The meteorological conditions, for example, used to estimate the consequences were those which gave the worst-case results. The prevailing winds in the Cheyenne area are much stronger than the winds used in the example. The result would be that in Cheyenne, dispersal would be faster and the impact would be less than in the generalized scenarios in the EIS.

ISSUE: The possibilities of intentional and accidental damage to railroad tracks should be addressed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.

ISSUE: Consideration should be given to routing missiles (for maintenance, training, or in times of national need) over tracks located as far as possible from inhabited areas.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: There is no demonstration that large reserve funding levels in Cheyenne, Wyoming the County, and School District Number One are actually available. Rail Garrison impacts should be mitigated by the Air Force not through local government budgets.

RESPONSE: EIS Sections 4.2.1.3 and 4.2.1.4 have been revised to reflect updated information on the availability of reserve funding levels.

ISSUE: How does the Air Force propose to avoid overbuilding in Wyoming so that vacancy rates do not soar once construction is completed?

RESPONSE: The Air Force will provide information on program housing requirements to the private housing industry so that an appropriate response to increased demands can be made.

ISSUE: Demands for rental units in the Cheyenne, Wyoming area are not completely assessed. Demand should be tied to location and affordability. Are units available in locations and at costs commensurate with demand?

RESPONSE: Discussions with real estate market representatives and local officials indicate a sufficient supply of rental units is available to meet program-related demands without any adverse market impacts.

ISSUE: While the program-related increase in demand for solid waste disposal in Cheyenne, Wyoming may be small, the Air Force has a responsibility to assure that adequate solid waste facilities are available to manage project impacts. Cheyenne's ability to locate, permit, and develop a new landfill by the 1992 deadline should also be assessed.

RESPONSE: Program-related solid waste will be collected by a private contractor and transported to the existing landfill or to the waste disposal
facility developed by the city to replace the landfill. To the extent feasible, the Air Force will cooperate with other agencies in developing this facility.

**452 25 ISSUE:** What systems are proposed to monitor impacts, coordinate mitigation with local governmental bodies, address unforeseen problems, and assure that expected impacts are not significantly greater than expected?

**RESPONSE:** A monitoring program designed to track key project and community indicators will be implemented, as necessary, to assure the identification and mitigation of unforeseen impacts.

**453 1 ISSUE:** The general public was given insufficient time to prepare for the Draft EIS hearings. The Draft EIS was not received by private citizens until approximately three weeks before the scheduled hearing, although government agencies reportedly had the document weeks ahead of that time.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

**453 2 ISSUE:** A Draft EIS hearing should be held in Laramie, Wyoming. It is unfair to expect people in Laramie to drive 45 miles to attend a hearing. We would be directly impacted by the movement of trains on the rails of Wyoming as well as by any accidents associated with the MX program, and our community deserves to have a hearing scheduled to allow concerned residents to ask questions and voice their concerns.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

**453 3 ISSUE:** The No Action Alternative needs to be more thoroughly addressed in the Final EIS. Specifically, the impacts of using MX Rail Garrison funds elsewhere in our society should be considered. The United States is a debtor nation, and the Final EIS should look at whether our national security environment would be better enhanced by using these funds to reduce the national debt -- or to feed the hungry, house the homeless, eradicate illiteracy, and provide health care to our people.

**RESPONSE:** The issue of budgetary priorities is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

**453 4 ISSUE:** I would like to see the accident issue considered in greater depth, using real rail accidents as possible scenarios and determining whether or not such disasters could be avoided in the MX program and what would happen if they were not. The recent heat buckling of rails is one type of incident that comes to mind. How can the Air Force assure that maintenance of hundreds of thousands of miles of track can be adequate? What about the human error factor that could result in an accidental launch: how can the public be sure that personnel are trained to eliminate such risks, when we have too many tragic accidents demonstrating otherwise?

**RESPONSE:** The safety analysis done by Sandia National Laboratories for this system considered all types of accidents reported to the Federal Railway Administration and the probability of such accidents. The plans for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system include many precautions for avoiding accidents, including monitoring track conditions and eliminating human error. Also see response to Document 15, Comment 3.
ISSUE: The Final EIS should address the wartime effects of the system.

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: National need should be more clearly defined.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 98.

ISSUE: If an explosive safety zone is needed at the siting facilities, wouldn't similar areas be required on each side of all railroad tracks proposed for the system?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 28.

ISSUE: Commentor disputes that socioeconomic impacts at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming are low and not significant. Spending $10-15 million on nuclear warheads when people go hungry and without shelter is a serious social and economic concern.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 7.

ISSUE: Mitigation measures and options should have been determined prior to issuing the Draft EIS and addressed therein for public comment.

RESPONSE: Mitigation measures have been addressed for all resources if significant impacts have been identified. In general, the Air Force, through its construction agent, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), will implement those mitigation measures directly under the control of the COE. Measures more appropriately developed and implemented by other institutions will be supported to the extent possible.

ISSUE: The Air Force always states that MX hearings are not a forum for persons to state their views on arms control. However, the Air Force never says that the hearings are not a forum for people to praise the military. The entire EIS process needs to be more sensitive to the views of all and not a rubber-stamp process for the escalation of the nuclear arms race.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about putting the State of Arkansas at a strategic target point.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What would happen to the ecological balance and how many people would be affected if a train with a missile derailed over the river in the state?

RESPONSE: With regard to the potential for stream contamination, perhaps the worst spill incident would involve diesel fuel from a locomotive reaching a stream. This is due to the large volume of material potentially involved (up to 13,000 gallons) and the mobility of the liquid, which enable it to reach a stream and be rapidly transported away from the spill site. In a flowing stream, diesel fuel could be carried many miles...
downstream from a spill. Although the fuel is not readily soluble in water, it is toxic to aquatic animals at low concentrations and could be expected to kill most organisms downstream from the spill, particularly in a small, shallow stream. After spill cleanup efforts were completed, toxic concentrations of fuel would be quickly flushed away in such an environment. Repopulation of aquatic organisms of the affected stream stretch would likely occur within a year or two following the spill for most species.

454 3 ISSUE: Who defines peacetime?
RESPONSE: Under U.S. Constitution, Section 8, Clause 11, Congress has the authority to declare war. Congress and the President exert the war power of the nation and the President has the authority to use the military and Naval forces to repel an attack. Peacetime is the absence of either a declaration of war by Congress or a Presidential determination of a need to repel an attack by a foreign power.

454 4 ISSUE: Who deems it necessary to start the MX on the rails?
RESPONSE: A higher authority which can be defined as the President and Secretary of Defense and their duly designated alternates or successors.

454 5 ISSUE: How many practice runs must it make?
RESPONSE: Two training trains without any warheads or missile propellants would travel to the garrison installations every quarter to conduct dispersal training exercises.

454 6 ISSUE: In lieu of the INF treaty, why are we doing this?
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

454 7 ISSUE: What will be done to protect the people during the four to six hours time period at deployment.
RESPONSE: No additional actions are needed to protect the United States population during dispersal of the trains in times of national need.

455 1 ISSUE: Can the existing railroad lines safely accommodate the MX cars?
RESPONSE: Yes. Also see response to Document 118, Comment 1.

455 2 ISSUE: Will the railroad lines be well maintained to assure no accidents will occur?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.

455 3 ISSUE: Will the citizens in the area that the MX passes through be affected, bothered, disrupted, or their privacy jeopardized?
RESPONSE: Transit of the Peacekeeper train will have no more impact than a commercial freight train.

456 1 ISSUE: Existing pollution at 18 onbase sites at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas are already too high, which should make the base an unlikely candidate for the project.
RESPONSE: Existing contaminated sites at the base are being evaluated by a different contractor so that cleanup activities can be completed. This program recognizes these sites and will avoid any conflict with future cleanup activities.

457 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison for reasons such as it is antithetical to national defense, threatens weaker nations, and the full scope of historical and environmental effects are inadequate.

RESPONSE: Noted.

458 1 ISSUE: It seems quite clear that the trains will be easily identifiable and are an open invitation to sabotage.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

458 2 ISSUE: The size and weight of the train will make accidents much more likely.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

459 1 ISSUE: The trains will be bigger so that they can't be hidden; the greater weight of the train will make accidents very probable and sabotage would be easier.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

460 1 ISSUE: Has the Air Force thought about the amount of rail disasters in the past few years?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 453, Comment 4.

461 1 ISSUE: The new stress and weight will be detrimental to the safety of the track.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

461 2 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about accidents caused by human error.

RESPONSE: Noted.

461 3 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to MX because of probable increased terrorism, the MX will be a prime target, and because of security problem.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

462 1 ISSUE: The making and waging of war whether it's called a police action, undercover, or for reasons of national or global security will be damaging to the environment. There should be no place for nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is not environmentally sound and system vulnerability is underestimated with warhead and propellant fuel posing enormous dangers.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor is in support of deployment at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because of the positive economic impact which the project will have in the area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor critical of civic leaders ability to speak at the public hearing and the commentor not able to speak. Also submitted newspaper article with his comment on the article.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: Commentor is in support of this deployment and is supporting and serving any Air Force program and personnel.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Disturbance to Allen Lake, Michigan should not be permitted since mitigation procedures cannot compensate for the loss.

RESPONSE: Allen Lake will not be physically disturbed by the program; however, it will receive some sediment generated by construction of a rail spur embankment 0.2 mile north. This situation will last for only a year or two until revegetation is complete.

ISSUE: Because of disturbance to Allen Lake and nearby water resources in Michigan, a second rail connector is impractical and environmentally dangerous.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 467, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The existing groundwater contamination problems in Michigan should be corrected before any new program is considered.

RESPONSE: By the end of 1989, three separate groundwater purge wells and air stripping systems will have been installed at Wurtsmith AFB to control the movement of and to decontaminate polluted plumes of groundwater underlying the base. To date, groundwater cleanup measures at the base have exceeded $8.0 million. The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program will be operated to avoid the creation of new groundwater problems at the base.

ISSUE: Where will the missiles strike?

RESPONSE: Issues regarding intentional use of the system are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The recent INF Treaty indicates that a reduction has been made so there is no apparent need for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
1 ISSUE: Commentor supports Little Rock AFB, Arkansas for the installation of the Peacekeeper mission.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program being located anywhere because of potential dangers and rail safety. Money is better spent on such things as toxic waste cleanup, reducing drug problem, and education.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

2 ISSUE: Why are such issues as the "national security policy," "psychological impact," and "morality" considered "beyond the scope" of these hearings?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 32, Comment 1 and Document 5, Comment 14.

3 ISSUE: Why hasn't the "No Action Alternative" been considered in terms of the nationwide economic impact? How many jobs would be created if over $10 billion was spent instead on education or medical science, for example? Or how many jobs would be created if the money was left in the civilian economy instead of toward taxes for military expenses?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 31.

4 ISSUE: Why were only 61 lines of text (8 of them original text) devoted to the "No Action Alternative" rather than being seriously considered and detailed in the EIS?

RESPONSE: The result of the No Action Alternative to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is that current conditions and trends will continue. Also see response to Document 37, Comment 15.

5 ISSUE: Why wasn't there a "no MX alternative" considered in the EIS?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

6 ISSUE: Will the 50 MX missiles described in the "Proposed Action" be some that are currently deployed or new missiles? If new missiles, why aren't these costs included in the expenditures table?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 390, Comment 1.

7 ISSUE: Why does the Air Force believe that we do not already have "sufficient military strength?"

RESPONSE: Issues of national defense are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

8 ISSUE: What is the danger of "appropriately armed" security personnel to civilians living or traveling near the tracks who might be misidentified as a threat? Who will be considered a threat?
ISSUE: Is the purchase price of the "supplemental railcars" included in the cost estimates?
RESPONSE: Yes.

ISSUE: Because this system is supposed to complicate the enemy's targeting task, does this mean that more towns and communities along the route could expect to be targets of an attack in a nuclear war?
RESPONSE: Issues of enemy targeting strategy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: If civilian dispatchers will know the precise location of trains, what would keep the Soviets or others from gaining this information?
RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: What would compel these civilian dispatchers and other employees to stay on the job during a crisis?
RESPONSE: The nation has continuously shown a cohesiveness (as with the Cuban Missile Crisis) when national peril is obvious and it is expected that the dispatchers would remain on the job.

ISSUE: Would the civil dispatchers also be subjected to the random drug testing, security, medical, and psychological checks discussed in the Draft EIS?
RESPONSE: The Air Force is not authorized to impose those measures.

ISSUE: Although the trains are said to move randomly throughout the United States, won't they actually be given special consideration and rights-of-way privileges thereby possibly increasing collisions and other accidents?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 438, Comment 32.

ISSUE: The employment projections amount to a claim of over 52,000 jobs per billion dollars spent. This amount is too high according to similar, reputable studies. What indicators and assumptions were used to generate these employment figures?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 438, Comment 35.

ISSUE: Job type fluctuations are indicated from year to year according to program needs (research and development and operations). Thus, spending would not generate similar jobs per billion ratio. What indicators and assumptions were used to generate these employment figures?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 438, Comment 35.

ISSUE: A boom-bust pattern is predicted in the Draft EIS with job numbers fluctuating from 40,000 to 148,000 to 13,000 and to under 12,000
in 1994 and beyond. Will these short-term jobs really have a positive effect on this community and in the nation as a whole? It has been found that a community in Michigan diversified its economic base (after losing Air Force base jobs) and achieved a stronger and more secure job market and economic stability than experienced during its dependence on military spending. Let us not be swayed by the promise of jobs and money flowing into the community before we look seriously at alternatives.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

470 1 ISSUE: The EIS glossed over the worst-case scenario of rail collision and other accidents in highly populated areas such as Whiteman AFB, Missouri and along UP tracks to St. Louis and Kansas City.

RESPONSE: The probabilistic risk analysis done for the safety chapter of the EIS takes into account accidents in highly populated areas. The results of that analysis are reported in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

470 2 ISSUE: A mobile missile system only expands the target area in the event of a first strike or a retaliation.

RESPONSE: Issues of enemy targeting are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

470 3 ISSUE: The system is destabilizing, costly, and an ineffective system for our national defense.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

471 1 ISSUE: Commentor protests the holding of only one hearing for Montana in Great Falls.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

471 2 ISSUE: Commentor protests only 22 days to review the document. The public should be given sufficient time to study it.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

471 3 ISSUE: The No Action Alternative was inadequately studied in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

471 4 ISSUE: What would be the economic impact on the Region of Influence in Great Falls/ Cascade County, Montana of injecting $92 million into the economy for community development? What would be the impact of dividing $15 billion among 11 host communities of the MX?

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

472 1 ISSUE: The EIS operates under the assumption that the warheads will not be used when in fact they will be creating a global environmental impact.

RESPONSE: Issues regarding intentional use of the system are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not include the effects to eastern Washington area from fallout and other harmful effects of detonation of a bomb in Russia creating environmental effects in the United States and its allies.

RESPONSE: The issue of fallout is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Final EIS should state the effect in the Spokane, Washington area of accidental detonation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 21, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The EIS should include psychological effects on the populace as a result of this weapon system and being a target for nuclear attack.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: The EIS is defective for failing to assess the increased potential of nuclear war due to tension and anxiety of the Russian populace toward the American populace and vice versa.

RESPONSE: The increased potential for nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will 50 new MX missiles be built?

RESPONSE: The Proposed Action assumes 50 new missiles.

ISSUE: Why aren't the costs of building the 50 new MX missiles included in the Draft EIS (pg 4.1-2)? Also new MX costs are missing from the Alternative Action proposal to deploy 100 MX on 50 trains.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 11.

ISSUE: MX relocation/silo shutdown costs are missing from the Alternative Action proposal to deploy 100 MX on 50 trains.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 404, Comment 21.

ISSUE: Won't the MX trains make nuclear targets of every town along their route?

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Isn't it possible that at some future date MX trains will be dispersed on public rail lines all the time? Why isn't this rail-mobile option even mentioned in the Draft EIS? Is the Air Force willing to state categorically that this is not being considered?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 404, Comment 23.

ISSUE: Won't MX trains be vulnerable to sabotage? Why isn't the issue of sabotage addressed in the Draft EIS? Will people with packs or briefcases be detained and searched by MX security crews?
ISSUE: Will train security personnel pose dangers to the public? MX trains will have "appropriately armed" security personnel. Will the security personnel on training trains be authorized to use force if protestors are encountered? Will trains be authorized to run over protestors? Could innocent people be hurt if they were misidentified as a threat by armed security personnel?

RESPONSE: No. See responses to Document 33, Comments 7 and 12 and Document 366, Comment 19.

ISSUE: If civilian dispatchers know the precise location of MX trains, couldn't Soviet intelligence also find out?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: Who will control the movements of the MX trains?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 78.

ISSUE: How many civilian railroad employees will know that an MX train is operating within their area of trackage?

RESPONSE: The numbers of dispatchers on duty during infrequent train movements for each railroad company is not known at this time.

ISSUE: Will civilian dispatchers have total authority over the MX train or will the train commander have special rights-of-way privileges or other extraordinary powers?

RESPONSE: It depends on the operations scenario. The missile train could be given sufficient priority to move upon the authority of, and according to, the procedures established for the train commander. In some cases, however, coordination of activity between the Air Force and rail industry may be required for the train's safe and effective movement. In all operations situations, the Air Force will select the train route. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 76.

ISSUE: How much disruption would Peacekeeper trains cause to other rail traffic and road traffic which must cross rail lines?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 76 and Document 438, Comment 32.

ISSUE: How widespread will the imposition be for railroad dispatch crews in proposed operating areas given security clearance and background checks, etc.? How much will it cost? Are these measures constitutional?

RESPONSE: The Air Force will work with the railroad to provide appropriately certified people to accomplish the required tasking. Costs are not known.

ISSUE: How thoroughly would MX trains be tested before deployment?
RESPONSE: The test program is divided into three phases: development testing, integration testing, and weapon system testing. This is addressed in Chapter 1 of the EIS.

ISSUE: It seems, while the trains might be completely tested, the missile will not.

RESPONSE: The Air Force has every confidence the missile will perform to its design requirements. Seventeen out of 17 flights tests have shown the Peacekeeper to be the most accurate ICBM in history and meeting all performance requirements.

ISSUE: How many jobs would the MX program really generate on a nationwide scale? The Draft EIS statistics on the national impact on employment (direct, indirect, and induced) Rail Garrison expenditures is highly suspect. The projected employment rate is over 52,000 jobs (man-years) per billion dollars spent, a rate completely outside the range of all reputable studies on military spending (it is too high by somewhere between 50-100% -- see, for example, the study "The Empty Pork Barrel"). What indicators and assumptions were used to generate these employment figures? What is included under the category "induced?"

RESPONSE: See response to Document 438, Comment 35.

ISSUE: An indication of sloppy employment analysis in the Draft EIS is the lack of fluctuation in the number of jobs generated per dollar spent. Even though nearly all the Fiscal Year (FY) 1989 money from the program would go towards research and development, and nearly all the FY 1992 funds would go towards operations -- employing very different types of workers -- the ratio of jobs generated remain about the same. A refined analysis would not produce such figures. What indicators and assumptions were used by the Air Force to generate these employment figures? Please be as detailed as possible.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 438, Comment 35.

ISSUE: What about the jobs that would be generated if the money was invested productively instead of squandered on weapons we don't need? The Draft EIS fails to consider the job creation potential of spending the $10 to $15 billion it projects for MX Rail Garrison on something else instead - education or low-income housing, for example. Instead of presenting real alternatives, the illusion is manufactured that the money for MX trains would appear out of thin air. Money which simply remains in the civilian economy (instead of being taxed for the military) also creates jobs, and some rough figures should be provided for comparison before MX trains are accepted as some kind of jobs miracle.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 7.

ISSUE: More attention should be given to the trauma for local economies from the "boom-bust" job cycle that would accompany the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. The Draft EIS forecasts that jobs created by the program would go "from nearly 40,000 in fiscal year (FY) 1989 to nearly 148,000 in FY 1991, and then decline sharply to 13,000 by FY 1993 and just under 12,000 in FY 1994 and beyond (nationally)." Will the benefits of mostly short-term jobs have a net positive effect or will the dislocation and transition difficulties they create tend to offset the positive benefits?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

473 20 ISSUE: Don't we already have enough nuclear weapons for deterrence? According to the Congressional Budget Office (November 1987), approximately 3,700 United States nuclear weapons would endure even the most unexpected Soviet surprise attack, while roughly 8,200 United States nuclear weapons would remain if there was enough warning time to alert our strategic forces. Doesn't this constitute "sufficient military strength?"

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

473 21 ISSUE: Why have a number of issues been declared "beyond the scope" of the hearings, including: "national security policy" (including "arms control impact" and "wartime effect"), "morality," and "psychological impact" of Rail Garrison deployment. It is my considered opinion that the No Action Alternative would be found superior to all MX deployment options in terms of these criteria, if such an analysis were included.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 3, Comment 1, Document 5, Comment 14, and Document 37, Comment 15.

473 22 ISSUE: Why are so few basing alternatives (such as carry hard, superhard silos, shallow tunnel, deep basting) not considered in the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

473 23 ISSUE: There has been some indication that the MX trains will have "supplemental" train cars attached, apparently to make it more difficult to distinguish the trains from regular rail traffic. About 60 supplemental train cars would have to be added to each MX train to approximate the length of average commercial trains. This would require roughly 240 supplemental cars at each four-MX train installation. Has adequate storage space been set aside for these extra cars? Has the cost of supplemental cars been calculated and included in the total program costs?

RESPONSE: In the current design, each Train Alert Shelter (TAS) has an attached 400 foot shelter for the supplemental cars. There would not be 60 supplemental cars, only the number which would fit in the TAS attachment. The cost of the supplemental cars was included in the cost analysis.

473 24 ISSUE: Problems continue to plague the guidance systems of the silo-based MX missiles already deployed. Shouldn't these problems be rectified before production of additional MX missiles is even considered? Will train-based MX missiles use the same guidance system or will they require an even more complicated and untested design?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 410, Comment 10 and Document 473, Comment 15.

473 25 ISSUE: Has the Air Force conducted any studies as to potential public reaction to the MX trains?
RESPONSE: As a result of the EIS scoping and public hearing process, the Air Force has received public reaction to the program. However, no studies have been conducted to determine public reaction as this is outside the scope of this EIS.

473 26 ISSUE: Who will pay the legal fees if there are protests of MX train movements? Isn't this a potential hidden cost for local communities?

RESPONSE: The issue of legal fees or other costs incurred as a result of protests is speculative and beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 10.

474 1 ISSUE: The ultimate environmental impact of using the MX missile should be addressed in the Final EIS. Also submitted a resolution on weapons of mass destruction.

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

474 2 ISSUE: In 1985, Congress voted for deployment of only 50 missiles. Why are 50 more missiles being proposed now?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.1.

474 3 ISSUE: Every opportunity that is available to educate the public about the use of nuclear weapons must be used.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

475 1 ISSUE: Commentor says the Air Force failed to consider reasonable alternatives and asks that the Air Force revise the EIS to fully analyze each alternative for location of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison facilities in the Cheyenne, Wyoming area and respond to all concerns raised by the public.

RESPONSE: The EIS analyzes alternative facility locations at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming. Responses to all comments are included in the appendix to EIS Volume 1.

475 2 ISSUE: Little information on the Missile Assembly Building (MAB) is given in the EIS, if it is in a mountain range near Cheyenne, and painted pale blue, it would look strange and affect adjacent developed areas adversely.

RESPONSE: The text of the EIS has been amended to briefly discuss this concern. The MAB would reach heights of 140 feet, but it would be located about 8,400 feet (1.6 miles) from the Western Hills subdivision (one key observation point) and 10,600 feet from I-25 (the other key observation point). With intervening higher land (that would block the view) the MAB could be seen from the back of about ten Western Hills residences and would be seen to rise about 1.3 degrees above the horizon. However, for the most part, intervening topography would prelude views of the MAB from the east base boundary. The light color of the MAB would tend to make the part extending above the nearby hills less visible against the mountain backgrounds. Night lighting would be similar to that presently found at the base Weapons Storage Area (see EIS Section 4.2.4.3).
ISSUE: There is no realistic inclusion of the human factors as assurances that MX operators will not be mentally incapacitated by drugs, depression or strain due to wartime pressures like the recent mistaken identification of a civilian plane over Iran.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 4.

ISSUE: There is no analysis of how the Air Force would counteract sabotage of Burlington Northern tracks and crossings.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: There is no explanation of how figures such as "1.3 additional deaths" were calculated. If track-related fatalities are based on percentage of Fairchild, Washington tracks vs. United States total tracks, there is little to show that such accidents as the August mishap with Amtrak derailing due to overheated rails could not happen with MX.

RESPONSE: The safety chapter has been revised and edited to provide more explanation of the calculations (see EIS Section 5.3). The possibility of derailment by heat-buckled track as occurred in August is addressed in EIS Section 5.2.3. The calculations of risk in the Draft EIS included that possibility by considering all historical accident causes in the Federal Railroad Administration accident records over a 5-year period.

ISSUE: There was no analysis of how wartime deployment on Burlington Northern tracks would not conflict with Federal Emergency Management Agency evacuation routes already in place for Spokane County in Washington.

RESPONSE: The addition of 25 trains to a country wide rail network that handles 5,000 to 7,000 train trips a day is not expected to cause any substantial interference with rail traffic at any location.

ISSUE: There was no realistic analysis of how highly flammable contents of MX containers would be handled by Fairchild AFB, Washington or local firefighters in the event of explosion.

RESPONSE: The missile propellants would burn completely in minutes and could not be extinguished by any practical means. Firefighters and others should remain clear of the area until the propellants are burned out, then fight secondary fires, which result, if any.

ISSUE: There was no regard for the close proximity to Spokane International Airport, Washington and the possibility of air crash on or near the garrison.

RESPONSE: The probability of an airplane crashing into a Peacekeeper train in the garrison or elsewhere is considered to be remote. In the event of such an unlikely occurrence, the environmental effects would be no different than those discussed in Section 5.4 of the EIS.

ISSUE: No precise break-out of economic impact in terms of specific job descriptions for civilian and military personnel is given.

RESPONSE: Direct civilian jobs during the construction period would be principally construction-related jobs. Secondary jobs would be created.
across all sectors of the local economy. Civilian jobs during operation would be principally white-collar workers. Military jobs would range from security-related positions to launch control positions.

---

476 8 ISSUE: The cost to the economy should be in the perspective of lost jobs due to the high tech percentages of dollars with every $1 billion in military expenditures.

RESPONSE: Program activities are generally considered economically beneficial in that jobs are created, not lost.

---

476 9 ISSUE: The statement that there are no uranium mines in the Fairchild AFB, Washington vicinity is inaccurate.

RESPONSE: The EIS states that mineral resources were not identified in the Region of Influence (ROI) which is approximately a 1-mile radius surrounding the base. The statements made in the EIS are accurate because uranium, precious metal, and critical/strategic material have been identified in the Spokane, Washington area but not within the ROI.

---

476 10 ISSUE: There is missing analysis of the threat of fire in this area. Note the current burning conditions and the number of acres burned in/around Spokane, Washington just this summer.

RESPONSE: The issue of an analysis of the threat of fire in the area because of current burning conditions is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

---

477 1 ISSUE: The EIS does not address the psychological and social impacts from making the Inland Empire a potential first-strike location.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

---

478 1 ISSUE: Commentor strongly urges deploying the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because the mission contributes greatly to the security of the nation, environmental impacts will be minimal, and the economic impact will be positive.

RESPONSE: Noted.

---

479 1 ISSUE: The plan is fraught with dangers to residents near the area where the trains with missiles would be moving.

RESPONSE: Noted.

---

479 2 ISSUE: Why was there no hearing in Lubbock, Texas through which the trains would move? Is one planned in the future?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

---

479 3 ISSUE: Why has your plan not been approved by Congress?

RESPONSE: The EIS is an element in the decision-making process. The President and Congress will make the final decision (see EIS Chapter 1).

---

479 4 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to development of the MX missiles and strongly urges the plan to develop and base them anywhere be abandoned.
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RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

480 1 ISSUE: The State Historical Society of North Dakota will give its review of the Draft EIS after the cultural resources surveys have been completed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 424, Comment 6.

481 1 ISSUE: The statement was made by the Air Force at a public hearing that a good deal of the technology embroiled in the Minuteman missile force was 20 to 25 years old. That is not true; the Minuteman III has been constantly upgraded. I respectfully request that when you discuss the Minuteman missile system with the public in the future, you not leave the impression that nothing has been done to modernize our ICBM forces for two decades, or more. Such unfounded assertions add undue pressure to deploy the Peacekeeper.

RESPONSE: The assertion that a good deal of the technology incorporated with the Minuteman missile system is 20 or 25 year old is not inconsistent with the fact that elements of the system have been upgraded and incorporated with very recent technology.

481 2 ISSUE: If there are plans or studies conducted or underway to "harden" the advanced train control system (ATCS) against electromagnetic pulse effects, the economic and other impacts of that program should be addressed in the EIS.

RESPONSE: The Proposed Action does not include reliance on ATCS or hardening of the system. If that is proposed later, any significant environmental impacts will be addressed in appropriate impact analysis documents.

481 3 ISSUE: Commentor asks for information on system "hardness" tests, vulnerability of the system to Soviet nuclear barrage attacks, estimates of Soviet intelligence cycle time, threat of Soviet blackjack bomber to the Rail Garrison system, what will constitute strategic warning, and other issues of nuclear weapon strategy.

RESPONSE: The issues of defense strategy and capabilities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

481 4 ISSUE: Are the costs of producing the warheads for the Peacekeeper included in the stated cost of the program? If not, what will the cost be?

RESPONSE: The costs of production of warheads are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

482 1 ISSUE: The assertions in the EIS that estimates of the consequences of radiation exposure are less precise because the health effects of radiation cannot be measured accurately and one human health effect of low doses of ionizing radiation is the very small possibility that an exposed person may develop cancer are inconsistent. How can the risk be known to be low if the effects cannot be measured accurately? What is the basis for the prediction of human health effects?

RESPONSE: The end of the first sentence quoted above should read "... health effects of radiation cannot be measured as accurately." The source

482 2 ISSUE: The Draft EIS states that in the event of dispersal of radioactive material, the public would be kept at a safe distance. How is that safe distance determined?

RESPONSE: Radiation monitoring would begin as soon as possible. A safe distance would be determined by the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and Environmental Protection Agency experts and would be at least the minimum distance required to ensure that no one was accidentally contaminated. Factors such as nature of the contamination risks and meteorological condition would be taken into account.

482 3 ISSUE: What about dispersal of radioactive materials in an area not readily accessible to Department of Defense and Environmental Protection Agency "contingency plans?"

RESPONSE: The ease, speed and cost of cleanup would be dependent on the accessibility of the site of the dispersal. The first priority will be minimizing adverse effects.

482 4 ISSUE: Commentor requests that the number of personnel treated for drug and alcohol-related causes under Air Force personnel reliability programs be provided.

RESPONSE: The requested statistics were not used in preparation of this EIS and are not available from this office. The request may be made to Headquarters, Strategic Air Command, Offutt AFB, Nebraska.

482 5 ISSUE: Nowhere in the Draft EIS is there a statement that radioactive materials could not be released as a result of sabotage or terrorist activity.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 17.

482 6 ISSUE: Given the amount of weapons grade nuclear material unaccounted for at Hanford and other production facilities, the trains could be attacked by a nuclear weapon, fired or launched outside the area of electronic surveillance.

RESPONSE: Noted.

482 7 ISSUE: Would a successful terrorist attack or sabotage at the point the train leaves the garrison prevent use of the system?

RESPONSE: No. The system is designed to allow launch of the missiles from the garrison, so there could be a delay in dispersal, but not a disabling of the missile system.

482 8 ISSUE: Every document referenced in the Draft EIS should be distributed to all persons who testified, all who have requested a copy of the Draft EIS or Final EIS, and all organizations similarly situated and that the National Environmental Policy Act process be suspended to allow each person at least 60 days to review, digest, and comment on these documents.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

482  9 ISSUE: EIS Table 4.6-1, Page 4.6-3 does not state whether the number of direct jobs is for the Region of Influence (ROI) of Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: The number of direct jobs listed in EIS Table 4.6-1 is for the ROI. These numbers correspond to the direct employment numbers listed in EIS Table 4.6-1.

482  10 ISSUE: EIS Table 4.6.1-1 does give Region of Influence (ROI) employment for the Proposed Action but not for the alternative. There are no data to substantiate figures or prove these are new, not existing jobs.

RESPONSE: EIS Tables 4.6.1-1 and 4.6.1-2, give ROI employment for the Proposed Action, and Alternative Action, respectively. Direct jobs were estimated from the Corps of Engineer estimates of the number of man years needed for program construction, and from Ballistic Missile Office and Strategic Air Command manpower estimates for system staffing. Secondary jobs were developed using employment output ratios in conjunction with regional demand changes estimated from an Input-Output model. All direct and secondary jobs would be new jobs.

482  11 ISSUE: EIS Table 4.6.1-1 shows the total of the column at the top, but not all figures are to be added, unlike EIS Table 4.6.1. Why change the methodology in consecutive tables?

RESPONSE: EIS Table 4.6.1-1 gives total program-related jobs, which are comprised of direct and secondary jobs. Direct jobs are further broken down into civilian and military categories. Local hires were put in the table to show the estimated number of jobs that would be filled by the local labor supply, and should not be added to direct and secondary jobs to arrive at total program employment. EIS Table 4.6.1 presents only direct program employment.

482  12 ISSUE: EIS Table 4.6.1-1 shows 155 secondary jobs, offering no explanation as to what type of jobs, union jobs, minimum wage jobs or part time jobs. Without clarifying information, these figures are meaningless and uninformative to the public trying to analyze the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: Indirect jobs would be created by regional demand changes brought on by direct program-related outlays for expenditures and payrolls. Indirect jobs would be created in most major sectors of the economy, though the majority would be in the construction, manufacturing, trade, and service sectors. It is expected that these jobs would receive the prevailing wage rate for each job category, some of which may be at the minimum wage.

482  13 ISSUE: Would the personal income of $23,000,000 shown in EIS Table 4.6.1-1 for 1991 and in the text be a direct result of the Proposed Action or the 'rollover' effect on the economy?

RESPONSE: Regional personal income includes wages occurring from both direct and secondary jobs.
ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not give figures estimating construction and labor costs during the construction period, with a breakdown of civilian and military labor costs. Without these figures, the socioeconomic impacts are difficult to predict.

RESPONSE: Construction costs (material and labor) at Fairchild AFB, Washington are estimated at approximately $80.3 million in constant 1986 dollars (see EIS Section 4.6). During the year of peak construction activity (1991), approximately 70 percent of the labor cost would be civilian-related.

ISSUE: No explanation is offered as to the proportional and actual decreases in secondary jobs in '92 and '93 in EIS Table 4.6.1-1.

RESPONSE: The reduction in secondary jobs between 1992 and 1993 is attributable to the phasing down of program-related construction material procurement. The reduction in the number of direct construction jobs and program-related expenditures would lead to a reduction in the number of secondary jobs.

ISSUE: The impact of the fall in average per capita income receives no mention in the Fairchild AFB, Washington section of the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: Based on current projections, baseline per capita personal income is expected to decrease from $11,533 in 1990 to $11,339 in 1995. Project impacts would not affect these projections appreciably.

ISSUE: Little mention is given to unemployment and there are no mitigation measures. While the number of persons unemployed by layoffs would be a small percentage of the Region of Influence workforce, they would constitute over 60 percent of the peak time jobs. This would create a "boom-bust" cycle.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

ISSUE: There is a serious possibility of hazardous plutonium contamination if the nuclear material were involved in an explosion or fire.

RESPONSE: See EIS Chapter 5.

ISSUE: Persons in the vicinity of the train cars would be placed at risk from low-level radiation. The health effects of low doses of radiation cannot be measured but is recognized to be a probable cause of cancer, congenital defects, and spontaneous abortions.

RESPONSE: The issue of "accident-free radiological risk" is discussed in detail in Sections 5.2 and 5.3 of the EIS.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS states that radiation monitoring of personnel will continue for the duration of the Rail Garrison program. What will be done for missile launches, train crew members and others who had been exposed after the monitoring period ends.

RESPONSE: The text referred to in the comment is misleading in the Draft EIS and has been clarified in the Final EIS. It should have and now does read "Radiation monitoring to ensure personnel protection will
continue for the duration of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program." The monitoring will be to ensure that no workers are exposed to radiation in excess of Nuclear Regulatory Commission exposure limits.

482 21 ISSUE: In the event exposure to low doses of radiation causes cancer or other radiation diseases, what assurance is there that Air Force personnel will receive compensation?

RESPONSE: The issue of compensation to be paid in the event of an accident is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

482 22 ISSUE: Why wasn't current water use data for the Fairchild AFB, Washington Region of Influence (ROI) presented under existing conditions - Major Water Users?

RESPONSE: The Tacoma Office of the U.S. Geological Survey has only recently released up-to-date data on county-level water use in Washington. This data now appears in EIS Section 4.6.7.2. These data are for 1985 and are consistent with data presented for other ROIs in the EIS.

482 23 ISSUE: What is the possibility of contamination of the Spokane Aquifer due to groundwater discharges of wastewater resulting from the project?

RESPONSE: The western boundary of the Spokane Aquifer is eight miles east of Fairchild AFB, Washington. Little or no discharge of wastewater to the Spokane Aquifer will result from the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program and the potential for contamination to the aquifer is negligible.

482 24 ISSUE: An incorrect factor was used to convert acre-ft into gallons in EIS Section 4.6.7.3.

RESPONSE: There are 7.48 gallons per cubic feet and 43,560 cubic feet per acre-ft. The product of these two factors is 325,829 gallons per acre-ft, not 328,500 as stated by the commentor. For purposes of analysis, a rounded figure of 326,000 gallons per acre-ft was used for conversion. Also, the reader should note that many of the water and wastewater numbers have been rounded but are still within one percent of the actual number.

482 25 ISSUE: Calculations performed by the commentor seem to indicate that widely varying per capita wastewater generation rates were used in the wastewater analysis conducted for Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: The 30 acre-ft/yr of program-induced wastewater at Fairchild AFB was calculated from two classes of program-induced people at the base in 1993 and onwards: daytime workers and new residents. The base has no statistics suitable for calculation of true, per capita wastewater rates. Parts of its wastewater collection system are old and suffer from considerable groundwater infiltration into the system. Thus, one cannot simply divide wastewater flows by number of users to obtain realistic per capita rates. Instead, a standard 100 gallons-per-person-per-day (gppd) was applied to the 107 new base residents while 40 gallons-per-capita-per-day was applied to the 419 new workers at the base. This calculates to about 34 acre-ft/yr in 1993, which, given the uncertainty of the projections and the per-capita rates, was rounded to the nearest ten acre-ft. As stated in EIS Section 4.6.7.3, this represents an increase
of just three percent above baseline wastewater flows at the base. Further refinement of the figures is not necessary for purposes of environmental analysis.

482 26 ISSUE: There appears to be a discrepancy between the actual amount of wastewater discharged by Fairchild AFB, Washington as stated on two successive pages of the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: Approximately 1,000 acre-ft/yr (actually about 1,008 acre-ft/yr) of wastewater is projected for the base under baseline conditions, alone. The additional 30 acre-ft/yr attributable to the program would bring the total to approximately 1,040 acre-ft/yr as stated under the impact analysis on the following page.

482 27 ISSUE: There is uncertainty concerning the actual amount of additional wastewater at Fairchild AFB, Washington which would result from the program.

RESPONSE: As stated in EIS Section 4.6.7.3, the program would result in approximately 30 acre-ft/yr of additional wastewater at the base.

482 28 ISSUE: What is the justification for consideration of wastewater impacts under a water resource discussion?

RESPONSE: In the Water Resource description section (EIS Section 3.8.1), program effects on surface and groundwater quality are presented as topics of discussion. The quality impacts of new or increased wastewater discharges are legitimate topics of a water resource impact analysis.

482 29 ISSUE: What is known about the movement and potential for contamination of treated effluent from Fairchild AFB, Washington which is disposed to the groundwater?

RESPONSE: The fate of the infiltrated effluent has not been studied. The effluent is presumed to recharge the basalt formation which underlies the disposal site. The Washington Department of Ecology has no water quality concerns associated with the disposal system. There is no possibility for the infiltrated effluent to affect the quality of the Spokane Aquifer which is located eight miles east.

482 30 ISSUE: At what point does additional effluent discharge from Fairchild AFB, Washington render the local groundwater unfit for human consumption?

RESPONSE: The existing information on the local groundwater system is not sufficient to accurately answer this question. The proposed program would generate relatively little additional wastewater (3% above existing amounts). Given the absence of existing, known problems with the disposal system, it is reasonable to conclude that the impact would be minimal.

482 31 ISSUE: Explain how the figure of 2,940 acre-ft/yr of water use at Fairchild AFB, Washington shown in EIS Figure 4.6.7-1 would remain constant, given 419 new people employed at the base.

RESPONSE: As implied in the reference to this figure in EIS Section 4.6.7.2, the numbers presented (including 2,940 acre-ft/yr) are for baseline
conditions only. EIS Table 4.6.7-1, appearing on the same page as the figure, lists increased water usage attributable to the project. Baseline-plus-program water usage at the base in 1993 can be estimated to be approximately 2,990 acre-ft/yr using the data given in the figure and the table.

482 32 ISSUE: Positive control measures to control and dispose of the toxic substances generated by the Rail Garrison program should be included in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: In compliance with federal regulations, each base has a Hazardous Waste Management Plan and a Spill Prevention and Response Plan. These plans identify the process of collecting, storing, and shipping hazardous wastes. The plans also outline the procedures necessary to respond to unplanned releases of hazardous wastes. Each of these plans will be updated incorporating the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison facilities and the program-related wastes.

482 33 ISSUE: There was discussion of the effect of present toxic waste sites of Fairchild AFB, Washington on the Rail Garrison program?

RESPONSE: New facilities associated with the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program were sited after evaluating the base's Installation Restoration Program and consulting with base, state and federal officials. Presently, no disturbance of any contaminated area onbase is anticipated and particular attention will be given the placement of the rail line as it passes the industrial waste lagoons, which are currently being evaluated for cleanup measures.

482 34 ISSUE: Excluding discussion of the psychological effects of deploying the system is a violation of the letter and spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act process.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

482 35 ISSUE: During scoping and Draft EIS public hearings, attendees were told that comments should be confined to "peacetime operations," but no documenting basis for that limitation was provided. Request that commentor and every person who testified or submitted written comments be provided a copy of the document or documents prohibiting and excluding testimony on potential environmental impacts of wartime use of the MX missile.

RESPONSE: The basis for the suggestion that wartime use is beyond the scope of the EIS is the recently upheld "Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos" litigation, Romer vs Carlucci (Eight Circuit Court of Appeals, Docket No. 86-1458, May 18, 1988). Many persons addressed wartime use in their public comment and they are included in this document.

482 36 ISSUE: Was the Spokane, Washington Chamber of Commerce or any of its officers notified other than through an announcement in the paper? An inadequate amount of notice of the hearing was given.

RESPONSE: All organizations who identified themselves at the scoping meetings, as well as local government officials, and state clearinghouses were notified of the public hearing information by letter in addition to any media announcement.
ISSUE: The Air Force neglected its duty to invite "early and open" participation in the scoping.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: Far from being an "informal public hearing," the Draft EIS hearing on August 4, 1988 at Medical Lake, Washington was conducted as a court-martial might be.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 39, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Announcements of the Medical Lake, Washington hearing were not distributed to all interested persons and agencies.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 482, Comment 36.

ISSUE: Two of the three notices given for the Medical Lake, Washington hearing did not include time limitations.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Copies of the Draft EIS were generally not available, even from Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 315, Comment 2.

ISSUE: The hearing location was not readily accessible to the Spokane, Washington population.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: Neutral hearing officers, rather than Air Force personnel subject to orders and discipline of their superior officers, should be used for hearings. The hearing officer said to address all remarks to him - there is no such rule by law.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 39, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Three minutes is not a "reasonable opportunity to speak." Speakers were cut off in the mid-sentence. The hearing officer could have exercised his right to extend the hearing time in order to allow more speakers.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: Hearings should have been held along the rights-of-way.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: The Air Force has made statements that this EIS is being done to determine where the MX should be based in Rail Garrison as opposed to if the MX should be deployed in Rail Garrison. If that is truly what the Air Force is doing, it means that this whole process is in violation of the law and that we might as well not continue with this process. Congress has not determined if MX will be deployed in Rail Garrison and; therefore, the Air Force must use the EIS as a way to help Congress and the Air Force to determine if they should proceed with the proposal.
RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is being developed in response to the congressional mandate to provide a more survivable basing mode. This EIS was prepared to aid in the following interrelated decisions: whether or not to deploy Peacekeeper missiles in the Rail Garrison basing mode, how many Peacekeeper missiles to deploy in this mode, the deployment locations facility sitings at deployment locations where alternative sitings are available, and mitigation actions to reduce identified significant adverse impacts associated with system deployment.

483 2 ISSUE: The Air Force should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act law and include in the EIS all of the reasonable alternative basing modes for MX and compare what the impact to the public and the environment would be in deploying MX in each of those different basing modes.

RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

483 3 ISSUE: The "No Action Alternative" should be thoroughly examined in terms of the impact on the deployment area if the No Action Alternative is adopted. This analysis should include the financial impact on both the national level and on the local deployment area of not spending the money on MX Rail Garrison.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

483 4 ISSUE: The Air Force should ensure the security of the entire railroad system on which the MX would possibly be traveling both in times of nonuse and in times of actual use and what the impact of this action (security of the tracks) will be on the public and their environment.

RESPONSE: There will be no special security of the rail system. Peacekeeper trains would comply with operational rules as other commercial users.

483 5 ISSUE: What safeguards will be used in the event there is a derailment of the train carrying the MX missile?

RESPONSE: Air Force missile handling experts and other Department of Defense and Department of Energy accident response teams could respond to the accident and direct retrieval operation (see EIS Section 5.5).

483 6 ISSUE: What are the impacts of building an anti-ballistic missile system to protect the MX rail garrison?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 6.

483 7 ISSUE: How is the Air Force planning to deal with keeping the public from panicking once the public realizes that the trains have been released and we in fact are in a time of high international crisis and what the impact of those measures will be on the public.

RESPONSE: The Air Force does not anticipate a panic to occur.

483 8 ISSUE: If you are not going to use an anti-ballistic missile system to protect Rail Garrison, I would like you to address how the system will be protected and what impact the construction of that system will have on the public and their environment.
The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is being developed in response to the congressional mandate to provide a more survivable basing mode. No additional system is proposed for protection.

ISSUE: What is the impact of deployment of Small ICBM in conjunction with deployment of MX in Rail Garrison at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: The impacts of potential deployment are discussed in EIS Section 4.2 as part of the cumulative impacts.

ISSUE: What is the impact of the efforts that will be taken by the Air Force to protect the communication lines involved with MX Rail Garrison from electromagnetic pulse.

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: How is the Air Force planning to deal with civilian dispatchers who know the location of the MX trains in a time of crisis and what the impact will be on dispatchers in times of high international tension. In particular, what is the impact on dispatchers in terms of their ability to communicate with others when off their shift while in a time of high international tension.

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impacts are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: What will be the impact (including economic impact) for the commercial railroad companies when an extended period of high international tension exists (a 2-week period)? Normal train traffic will be disrupted during times of high international tension due to deployment of MX on the railroad and thus an economic loss would be anticipated from such a break in the normal train traffic. How much loss would you estimate to occur, and how will this be made up to the railroad corporations?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 76.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force need to buy land in order to build additional railroad spurs (for MX Rail Garrison) outside of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming and if so what procedures will be used to accomplish this purchase, and what will be the impact in the areas where new land must be acquired?

RESPONSE: A discussion of land acquisition for the siting of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at F.E. Warren AFB is provided in Section 4.2 of the EIS.

ISSUE: How will the current lawsuit by ranchers in the F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming area against the Air Force regarding land leases impact further land acquisition for MX Rail Garrison?

RESPONSE: The issues are only minimally related; no impact in future acquisition is anticipated.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force need to rescind oil and gas leases on land that may be purchased in order to satisfy the safety zone surrounding the Rail
Garrison at the base. What impact will the action have on those currently holding the oil and gas leases.

RESPONSE: The potential acquisition of additional land for base expansion may affect mineral leases. The Air Force would compensate the leaseholder or landowner for losses as a result of these expansions. The negotiations for compensation would be handled on a case-by-case basis. Certain resource extraction uses of the land within the explosive safety zone are additionally restricted (e.g., inhabited structures, use of explosives at certain distances from the installation, mining operations [surface or underground] which involve workers within certain distances from the garrison facilities).

483 16 ISSUE: How often will the tracks be checked for problems and what impact will the checking of the tracks have on individuals living close to the tracks? Who will check the tracks (military personnel or railroad personnel) and what impact will this have on the railroad corporations?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.

483 17 ISSUE: How often will dummy trains be used and how will normal commercial railroad traffic be impacted by MX Rail Garrison dummy trains?

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 4.1.2.

483 18 ISSUE: How large a safety zone must be on either side of the tracks in order to satisfy the safety zone for each missile and what will the impact be in meeting that safety zone requirement?

RESPONSE: There is no prescribed safety zone for tracks.

484 1 ISSUE: The MX missile is a dangerous, destabilizing, offensive first-strike weapon.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

484 2 ISSUE: Since trains inevitably have accidents, passing trains with missiles through population centers large and small introduces major hazards to the population without its consent.

RESPONSE: The explanation of accident risks associated with the dispersal of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison trains is presented in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

484 3 ISSUE: To propose increasing the number of MX missiles at this point is directly counter to the current atmosphere of containment of the arms race and would negate the recent achievement of the Reagan Administration.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

484 4 ISSUE: Commentor recommends that No Action is the best.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Commentor recommends postponement of the August 31 deadline for comments.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor recommends holding hearings in every community along the route.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: More detail should be included after adjustment to the area of public finance, to the area of local human service agencies, and the use of parks and recreation facilities. The City of Cheyenne, Wyoming does not have the resiliency to provide additional services for program-related demands.

RESPONSE: Human services and other family-related services are provided to military personnel by the Air Force through their own onbase agencies. Monitoring service demands from community-based service agencies as well as recreation services, for both military and civilian program-related personnel, during the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos program indicates no significant increases in demand for these services would be expected.

ISSUE: Mechanisms must be found to properly plan and monitor the program at a local level for the duration of the program.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Preparers of the Draft EIS must verify with Cheyenne, Wyoming officials their interpretation of information and data collected.

RESPONSE: Meetings between Air Force representatives and officials from the State of Wyoming and the City of Cheyenne were held prior to the publication of the Final EIS to review data and analyses.

ISSUE: There is no "state standard" pupil-to-teacher ratio in Wyoming, the standard was established by local planning criteria, in Cheyenne's case, the Laramie County School District No. 1. The District's planning objectives should be used to determine project related costs.

RESPONSE: EIS Section 4.2.1.2 has been revised, omitting the phase "state standard" and incorporating local planning criteria.

ISSUE: The majority of funds stated as being available for Laramie and Cheyenne County in Wyoming and the school district are already dedicated for specific purposes and could not be redirected to recover operating costs as suggested.

RESPONSE: EIS Sections 4.2.1.2. and 4.2.1.3 have been revised to reflect updated information.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not contain any information on material purchases, estimated sales tax payments, or impact assistance payments. Without such information, Cheyenne and other local officials cannot compare benefits and costs of the project.
RESPONSE: Material purchases are estimated at approximately $4.4 million in constant 1986 dollars over the construction phase. Along with taxable retail sales purchases associated with program-related income gains, sales and use tax collections by the City of Cheyenne and Laramie County would total approximately $550,000 over the 3-year construction period. Impact aid would generate an additional $540,000 in constant 1986 dollars. Over the operations phase, these contributions would decline to approximately $65,000 annually. Although property taxes and state-shared revenue from mineral royalties and severance taxes would not be affected by program activities, the increased population is projected to generate approximately $250,000 annually in other revenues such as service charges, fines, fees, and vehicle license taxes, as examples. These program-related increases in revenues would be sufficient to meet expected expenditures over both the construction and operations phases of the program.

485 7 ISSUE: The Peacekeeper monitoring program should continue to be funded to continue into the Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: Monitoring has been identified as a possible mitigative measure in the Final EIS, and would be implemented, if necessary, to assist in the mitigation of potential significant impacts. Appropriate mitigation measures will be identified in the official record of decision for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

485 8 ISSUE: Additional program-related demands on elementary school facilities cannot be accommodated.

RESPONSE: EIS Sections 4.2.1.2 and 4.2.1.3 have been revised to reflect current district plans to increase facilities. Under the summary of impacts section it is noted that if new facilities are not forthcoming, education impacts may become significant.

485 9 ISSUE: The location of available housing or proposed housing needs to be established to determine specific school impacts.

RESPONSE: The number of available housing units in Cheyenne, Wyoming substantially exceeds program requirements. Since the Air Force cannot tell civilian or even military personnel where to live offbase, the determination of program-related school enrollments was assumed to follow existing distributions within the city.

485 10 ISSUE: The State of Wyoming and school district will be unable to absorb additional educational operating costs during peak year construction.

RESPONSE: Estimated contributions from the State Foundation Program (approximately $1.0 million in the peak year and $800,00 during operations) would represent less than a 1-percent increase in the State Foundation Program budget. Because Foundation Program contributions represent a major part of local school district revenues and are funded principally through mineral royalty, severance taxes, and property taxes (revenue sources which would not be affected by program activities), local school district impacts may become significant unless funding for Foundation Program expenditures are changed to capture benefits associated with program activities. EIS Section 4.2.13 has been revised to reflect this information.
ISSUE: The Department of Defense should commit to implementing mitigation measures as agreed to in the "Initial Year Mitigation Agreement" between the Intergovernmental Executive Impact Council and the Department of the Defense, such as payment of sales and use tax and recruitment of local labor force.

RESPONSE: It is the policy of the Air Force to make every effort practicable to avoid environmental impacts through careful design, siting, and construction of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system, as well as in activating the system for operation. Specific procedures and guidelines (referred to as Recommended Mitigation Measures) have been committed to by the Air Force to protect and restore environmental resources disturbed by program activity. Additional mitigations (referred to as Other Possible Mitigation Measures) are also available. Decisions on which mitigation actions will be implemented by the Air Force will be made after the Final EIS is filed and will be documented in one or more Records of Decision.

ISSUE: It is not true that impacts to local governments are not significant because "reserve funding levels" and "increased revenues" should be able to meet expected costs.

RESPONSE: References to reserve funding levels have been revised to reflect current information. Also see response to Document 485, Comment 6.

ISSUE: The program-related population increase is underestimated and the local hire rate is too high, unless the Air Force implements a local hire encouragement program as for the original Peacekeeper deployment.

RESPONSE: The Air Force plans to maximize participation of the local workforce in the construction of this project as it has previously done.

ISSUE: The service sector response shown in the Draft EIS is significantly lower than expected based on both the original Laramie County Economic Base Study and its recent update.

RESPONSE: Service sector responses are based on projected levels of program-related population immigration. Immigration estimates presented in the Draft EIS reflect the most recent information available with respect to local labor hiring practices, as presented in the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos monitoring program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

ISSUE: Information distinguishing between rental units and owner occupied units is necessary to ensure that adequate housing is available to meet program-related demands.

RESPONSE: It has been agreed with local officials that adequate housing in the Cheyenne, Wyoming area will exist to house program-related immigrants.

ISSUE: Program-related transportation programs on already congested Randall Avenue/Interstate 25 interchange in Cheyenne, Wyoming should be mitigated along with current and projected north gate traffic.

RESPONSE: Potential mitigation measures are listed in the document including the possible opening of the north gate as additional access to F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming (see EIS Section 4.2.3.5).
ISSUE: Only one percent of project expenditures are proposed for F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming. Significant efforts should be made to transfer project expenditures to areas impacted by deployment to increase economic benefits of the project to impacted communities.

RESPONSE: The amount of expenditures occurring within a region is dependent upon the types of labor and materials available in the area and the contractors who successfully bid and are awarded the program contracts. These factors cannot be easily or fairly changed. Several of the mitigations presented in the Final EIS would result in greater local economic benefits.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately analyze the impacts of the Rail Garrison program on Wyoming. The shortcomings may be corrected through the implementation of an intergovernmental planning process.

RESPONSE: The Air Force is working with the State of Wyoming to ensure valid and accurate environmental analyses of potential program impacts.

ISSUE: West Central Texas Municipal Water District salutes the Air Force for the accomplishment of a significant effort to evaluate an extremely complex proposal within the guidelines of current environmental and defense security law, policy, and supporting regulations.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: The EIS should address concerns of appropriate pesticide and herbicide use on rights-of-way.

RESPONSE: The application of chemical pesticides and herbicides will not cause significant adverse environmental impacts. These chemicals are regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency and when applied in the prescribed concentration for their intended use, will not present unreasonable risks to the environment or human health affects.

ISSUE: The use of RADTRAN, HAZTRAN and the unidentified computer code used for air quality impact assessment should be justified.

RESPONSE: A discussion of the justification for their use is included in EIS Chapter 5.

ISSUE: EIS Table 5.4.6-1 should be expanded to include numerical risk quantification associated with each mishap along with the narrative statement of environmental effects.

RESPONSE: The quantification of risk is presented in Section 5.3 of the EIS.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS is unclear on Peacekeeper specific training which would be provided at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: In addition to the general training activities (e.g., train simulators and training trains) described in Section 1.4.6 of the EIS, F.E. Warren AFB will be the location for specific training facilities. The
Trainer and Instruction Facility will be used for the initial training of maintenance and operations personnel. The Missile Rail Trainer Facility will be used for training personnel in the removal and replacement of the reentry system and the missile guidance and control system. Also see response to Document 15, Comment 5.

2 ISSUE: Train deployment per garrison site was confusing in the Draft EIS. Clarification in the Final EIS would be helpful.

RESPONSE: EIS Section 4.1.2 has been revised to clarify train deployment.

3 ISSUE: Design of lighting systems should seek to reduce lighting impacts on residential areas. The EIS should address this.

RESPONSE: Lighting systems are still under preliminary design, and therefore can not be described at this time. It is expected that the system would present a nighttime glow in the sky similar to that now found at the Weapons Storage Area at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

4 ISSUE: The Final EIS will identify the preferred alternative. The effect of the cultural sites on the alternative selection should be identified in the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: The EIS evaluates effects of the alternatives on the environment (e.g., cultural sites), not the reverse. Impacts relating to all alternatives and options are identified in EIS Section 4.2.5.

5 ISSUE: The Region of Influence (ROI) has different significance if it is used to assess economics, labor market, transportation, and other issues. Remaining questions on this issue should be resolved before the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: ROIs were defined separately for each environmental resource in order to assess project impacts for the most appropriate area. These areas range from multistate and multicounty regions to site-specific locations within a community.

6 ISSUE: Any differences in the significance criteria to address transportation issues between the previous Peacekeeper EIS and this Draft EIS should be resolved before the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: The Region of Influence and significance criteria used for both the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos and Peacekeeper Rail Garrison are the same. Impacts would be rated significant if the level of service is reduced to a substandard level lower than C (see EIS Section 3.4.7).

7 ISSUE: Further clarification regarding water quality standards and impacts should be provided in the Final EIS. The project mitigation should identify that construction standards will be established to meet water quality standards.

RESPONSE: The significance criteria in EIS Section 3.8.7 have been modified to state that the potential for violation of state water quality standards is grounds for a significant impact. No federal surface water quality standards exist in the F.E. Warren AFB Region of Influence. The environmental analysis does address project water quality impacts. As stated in EIS Chapter 4, standard construction methods, including soil
stabilization measures and revegetation, plus best management practices have been assumed as basic mitigations to minimize construction water quality impacts. Specific construction standards to mitigate water quality impacts will be identified for each project component in the environmental plan developed by the specific contractors selected to construct the project. In addition, the plan will be reviewed by the program construction agent, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

488 8 ISSUE: The Final EIS should include new housing information.
RESPONSE: Additional housing information, has been included in Section 4.2.1.2 of the EIS.

488 9 ISSUE: The Draft EIS needs to be modified to reflect enrollment, pupil-to-teacher ratios, and revenue and reserve data from School District No. 1. The Final EIS should reflect the new data and the resulting changes in impacts.
RESPONSE: New data have been incorporated in EIS Sections 4.2.1.2 and 4.2.1.3.

488 10 ISSUE: Employment, revenue, and reserve data for Cheyenne and Laramie County, Wyoming need to be updated and impacts reassessed.
RESPONSE: See EIS Sections 4.2.1.2, 4.2.1.3, and 4.2.1.4 for revised text.

488 11 ISSUE: Impacts on the education system do not reflect cost impacts felt by the State School Foundation program. Enrollment Table 4.2.1-1 will generate demands and these impacts need to be discussed.
RESPONSE: Section 4.2.1.3 of the EIS has been revised to reflect this new information.

488 12 ISSUE: There is a program for expansion of wastewater service at the Dry Creek Plant. Other public utility coordination issues need to be coordinated with the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: This information has been incorporated in EIS Section 4.2.2.2. Coordination of local utility issues will continue as necessary.

488 13 ISSUE: Public Service Commission of Wyoming feels that the actual impacts on gas and electric utilities will be less than that identified in the Draft EIS.
RESPONSE: The information was provided on gas and electric utilities by the local utilities and are presented in EIS Sections 4.2.2.3, 4.2.2.4 and 4.2.2.5.

488 14 ISSUE: Transportation issues are difficult to assess in the Draft EIS. The EIS should provide additional information such as: a) onbase projects currently being considered; b) current traffic use at the north gate and related level of service (LOS) on Central Avenue and Yellowstone Highway; and c) would LOS on Central Avenue be affected by north gate operations? Mitigation should include coordination with the City and the Wyoming Highway Department.
RESPONSE: LOS on Central Avenue will not be affected by north gate operations (see EIS Section 4.2.3.2). The Air Force will coordinate with the City and the Wyoming Highway Department on any traffic problems that may arise because of the program.

ISSUE: Is there any need to work with local land use planners to identify areas at risk (in the event of an accident) for future planning and zoning?

RESPONSE: For the north site option, adjoining land use plans are compatible with proposed project facilities. At the south site, proposed project facilities would be incompatible with the variety of proposed land uses indicated in the Cheyenne, Wyoming area development plan. The proposed restrictive easements would, however, preclude safety risks to residents (see EIS Section 4.2.4.3).

ISSUE: Is a second road access necessary at the south site option? If so, site impacts should address it.

RESPONSE: A second road access for the south site is not necessary.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the impact on irrigated land due to possible abandonment of Swan Reservoir if the south site garrison option at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming is chosen.

RESPONSE: The main portion of Swan Reservoir would be unaffected by the south site garrison option. However, a shallow, 6-acre, southern extension of the reservoir would probably be filled to accommodate the garrison site. The resulting loss in reservoir storage and possible effects on downstream irrigated land are now discussed in EIS Section 4.2.7.3.

ISSUE: The lower wind speed used in the accident modeling assumption reflects worst-case condition.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force work with state and local (safety) response coordinators to evaluate existing programs and identify needed program modifications?

RESPONSE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program does not include training for state and local personnel. Also See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: Will joint training exercises be considered for state and local personnel?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: Health and human service program impacts were not addressed in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 424, Comment 2.

ISSUE: Wyoming Game and Fish Department has made recommendations of mitigations for impacts on wildlife such as antelope.
RESPONSE: The recommendations of the Wyoming Game and Fish Department are addressed specifically in Document 488, Comments 25 through 29.

488 23 ISSUE: Mitigation plan for the Rail Garrison program must address issues such as payment of local sale and use taxes and methods of contracting. The mitigation plan should also address a monitoring plan.

RESPONSE: No significant impacts of this type from the Rail Garrison program at F.E. Warren AFB have been identified. Therefore no mitigation measures are proposed.

488 24 ISSUE: Cumulative impacts from Small ICBM deployment have not been evaluated by the Governor of Wyoming's Office, since a separate EIS would be completed for that program.

RESPONSE: Noted.

488 25 ISSUE: Commentor states that the EIS does not completely analyze environmental consequences of the Proposed Action. Significant adverse impacts on wildlife could result from secondary impacts of the project. The construction work force and Air Force personnel could have an impact on local territorial wildlife and habitat because of residential and road construction and increased demands on utilities and recreation resources. Disagrees with the assessment of low and not significant impacts.

RESPONSE: Locating the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming would cause a maximum increase of approximately 1,443 people in 1992, which represents a 2.6 percent increase in the existing population. Increasing the population will cause increased demand for various services (housing, water, and utilities); however, existing services would be able to accommodate the program-induced demand because of the small population increase expected. Therefore, habitat loss due to program-induced construction would be minimal. The increased demand for recreational resources may indirectly affect wildlife in the Region of Influence; however, it is unlikely that a 2.6 percent increase in the baseline population will have an adverse impact because many activities (e.g., hunting and fishing) are regulated and would be dispersed over a large area. Concurrent development of the Small ICBM program and the Peacekeeper program would not cause significant housing impacts because the Air Force would provide adequate housing for its personnel to offset potential shortages. It is not known at this time where the new housing units would be constructed.

488 26 ISSUE: North site - Commentor states that F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming provides year-long habitat for mule deer, white-tailed deer, and antelope. Security fences will increase amount of habitat lost and increase mortality as a result of collisions, entrapment, etc. The Proposed Action will reduce available habitat.

RESPONSE: Construction for the program at the north site would affect approximately 296 acres of which 83.9 acres have been developed for other Air Force uses and 175 acres have been disturbed by explosive ordnance disposal area clearance activities. Pronghorn and mule deer would be affected by construction and operation activities including disruption of daily/seasonal behavior, displacement to adjacent habitats, and loss of habitat. These impacts would be low because of the small
amount of undisturbed habitat that would be affected and the existing level of disturbance on the north site. Displacement of animals may increase competition and mortality because adjacent habitats may be at carrying capacity; however, the degree of competition and mortality would be dependent on the amount of habitat lost and whether the disturbance is temporary or permanent. Entrapment of pronghorn and deer during construction of security fences may occur, but is expected to be an infrequent occurrence. In addition, collisions between deer/pronghorn and vehicles are also expected to be infrequent. White-tailed deer do occur on base, but are confined primarily to riparian habitats along Crow and Diamond Creeks, which will not be affected by the program. No white-tailed deer habitat occurs in the direct impact area of the north site. It is noted that mule deer, white-tailed deer and antelope are not threatened or endangered species.

488 27 ISSUE: South Site - Commentor states that mule deer, antelope and white-tailed deer herds will be affected by the project on the south site of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming. The project will affect grassland, wetland, and intermittent stream habitat. Security fences may deny wildlife access to water and result in additional loss of big game habitat. Increased losses of big game may occur due to collisions with vehicles, fence entrapment, etc. Fencing may funnel antelope between site and freeway and result in increased winter mortality.

RESPONSE: Construction of the program at the south site would disturb approximately 167 acres of grassland habitat, which is used by pronghorn. Mule deer may also occasionally occur in the area. White-tailed deer occur primarily in woodland and riparian habitats. These latter habitat types do not occur on the south site; consequently, white-tailed deer are not likely to be affected by the program. Impacts on the pronghorn and mule deer would include disruption of daily/seasonal behavior, displacement to adjacent habitats, and loss of habitat. Displacement of animals may increase competition and mortality because adjacent habitats may be at carrying capacity; however, the degree of competition and mortality would be dependent on the amount of habitat lost and whether it is temporary or permanent. Increased mortality may also occur due to animal/vehicle collisions and from entrapment during construction; however, these occurrences are expected to be infrequent. Big game animals trapped within security fences would be removed from the enclosures. Pronghorn winter mortality resulting from entrapment would be minimal. Locating the program at the south site would disturb 6 acres of reservoirs. Elimination of these water sources would affect wildlife in the immediate area; however, several other reservoirs and ponds occur in the vicinity of the south site (see EIS Figure 4.2.6-1) and would be adequate to support wildlife. Construction of security fences around the garrison area would not deny wildlife access to vital water sources, nor would it restrict access to their former ranges.

488 28 ISSUE: Impacts on threatened and endangered species - Commentor stated that construction could destroy nesting habitat for burrowing owls, nest trees or sites for Swainson's and ferruginous hawks, and dens of northern swift fox. These species may occur on one or both sites. EIS Table 4.2.6-1 lists the northern swift fox incorrectly as a federally listed species. It is a candidate species. A swift fox den has been documented in the area adjacent to the south site of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: Construction activities at either site may affect the burrowing owl (state-sensitive) and swift fox (federal candidate) including destruction of nests/dens, disruption of daily and seasonal behavior, displacement to adjacent habitats, loss of habitat, and increased mortality. A documented swift fox den is located approximately three miles west of the south site (Section 12, T12N, R68W). This den would not be affected by construction or operational activities. The Swainson's and ferruginous hawks may be affected by construction and operation activities (disruption of feeding and displacement); however, impacts on nesting sites would not occur because no trees will be removed at either site. In addition, no nest sites are known to occur immediately adjacent to either site.

ISSUE: Commentor suggests that all wetlands, ponds, and reservoirs be replaced in kind on or adjacent to the project site at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: The Air Force will develop a site specific mitigation plan to mitigate the loss of any wetlands and aquatic habitats resulting from deployment of the proposed program at F.E. Warren AFB. This plan would be prepared as per the requirements in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other interested local, state, and federal agencies. Mitigation of these lost habitats would be on or adjacent to the project area where possible (see EIS Section 4.2.6).

ISSUE: Commentor suggests that the Air Force mitigate the loss of 200 acres of wildlife habitat in-kind with an objective of no net loss of noncritical habitat. Commentor also suggests that additional mitigative measures might be needed if daily and seasonal movements of big game are affected by the program.

RESPONSE: Locating the proposed program at the north site option of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming would affect 295.6 acres of land of which 261.7 acres have been disturbed by previous activities. Only 33.9 acres of habitat (i.e., grassland and nonforested wetlands) are relatively undisturbed at the north site. Locating the proposed program at the south site option would affect 287.7 acres of land of which 117 acres have been previously disturbed. About 170.7 acres of habitat (i.e., grassland, nonforested wetlands, and reservoirs) are relatively undisturbed at the south site. Loss of wildlife habitats at either site would not adversely affect wildlife populations in the area, consequently, the Air Force does not anticipate mitigating for the loss of these habitats, except for wetlands as required by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Additionally, locating the proposed program at either site would not adversely affect the distributional patterns of any big game species; therefore, the Air Force does not anticipate mitigations for this type of potential impacts to big game species (see EIS Section 4.2.6.3 and Table 4.2.6-2).

ISSUE: Commentor suggests that the Air Force mitigate the loss of raptor nests or nest trees, water resources, and wetlands by replacing these habitat features on nearby sites.

RESPONSE: Field surveys on the north and south sites of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming in 1988 indicated that there are no trees on either site that would be lost due to program activities. Additionally, no known nest sites occur adjacent to either site; therefore, the program would not affect
raptor nesting activities. The Air Force would prepare a site specific mitigation plan to mitigate the loss of any wetlands and aquatic habitats due to program activities. This plan would be prepared as per requirements in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection Agency, and other interested local, state, and federal agencies. Mitigation of these habitats would be on or adjacent to the project area where possible (see EIS Section 4.2.6.3).

488 32 ISSUE: Commentor suggests that range fences constructed due to the program be three-strand fences, 45 inches high. If four-strand fences are built, the bottom wire should be smooth and 16 inches above the ground. Four-strand fences should also be 45 inches high.

RESPONSE: The Air Force does not anticipate constructing any range fences; however, a double chain link security fence would be constructed around the proposed garrison for security purposes. If range fences are constructed, the Air Force would adhere to the requirements outlined in the above issue.

488 33 ISSUE: Commentor suggests that the Air Force inventory the proposed sites for raptor nests and swift fox dens. Mitigation plans should also be prepared if any nests or dens are located.

RESPONSE: Field surveys in 1988, on the north and south sites of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, indicated that there were no trees on either site; therefore, the program would not affect raptors which require trees for nesting activities. The nearest known swift fox den is located approximately three miles west of the south site (Section 12, T13N, R68W) and would not be affected by construction activities (see EIS Section 4.2.6.3). Field surveys for presence of nests of ground-nesting raptors and surveys for swift fox dens will be conducted and coordinated with state and federal agencies prior to construction.

488 34 ISSUE: Commentor suggests that the Air Force provide additional access to land for recreational activities (e.g., hunting, fishing, and nonconsumptive uses of wildlife). About 50 square miles should be made available if only the MX Rail Garrison program is developed, or 150-200 square miles if the Small ICBM program is developed concurrently.

RESPONSE: The Air Force does not anticipate providing additional public access to land for recreational purposes.

488 35 ISSUE: Commentor suggests that the Air Force reimburse the Wyoming Game and Fish Department for the cost of removing any big game animals trapped within security fences constructed for the proposed program.

RESPONSE: The Air Force would reimburse the Wyoming Game and Fish Department for the cost of removing any big game animals that become trapped within security fences constructed for the proposed program.

488 36 ISSUE: Commentor provided explanation of School Foundation Program and stated concern that Impact Assistance Tax payments are not an appropriate revenue source to mitigate increased school attendance.

RESPONSE: Noted.
488 37 ISSUE: Water resources were fairly well covered in the Draft EIS. Water supply for the irrigated lands supplied from Swan Reservoir was not addressed for south site of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 488, Comment 17.

488 38 ISSUE: It does not appear that the Proposed Action will produce a significant impact on the water resources of the Cheyenne, Wyoming area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

488 39 ISSUE: The Regional Recreation Monitoring Program report completed in March 1987 (University of Wyoming) concluded that the Peacekeeper population has little impact on the recreation resources of the area of influence. The Rail Garrison will also have little impact on recreation resources.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

488 40 ISSUE: Additional staff and resources will be needed in the Division of Public Assistance and Social Services due to program-related inmigration.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 424, Comment 2.

488 41 ISSUE: Commentor questions whether accident scenarios have been properly addressed. For example, a collision of a Peacekeeper train and a commercial train carrying dangerous materials.

RESPONSE: The possibility of secondary impacts such as hazardous material spills that might result from a collision with a commercial train were assessed in the safety analysis. Those secondary impacts were difficult to quantify, but were estimated to be small compared to the primary impacts. Though they were not specifically included in the risk figures in Chapter 5 of the EIS, they are small enough that their omission from those figures does not alter the conservative quality of the analysis.

488 42 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that housing in Cheyenne, Wyoming will be filled up before the program begins.

RESPONSE: The Air Force is committed to providing suitable housing for its personnel. Should the local housing market be unable to meet military needs, the Air Force would provide these units through one of the options available to it (see EIS Chapter 4). The Air Force will continue to monitor the local housing market to determine if additional units should be built.

488 43 ISSUE: The population increases of 7.5 percent and 13 percent would occur in Cheyenne, Wyoming due to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. The demands for services would increase by a like amount.

RESPONSE: The referenced increases refer to the cumulative effects of concurrent deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and the Small ICBM programs. See EIS Section 4.2.1.3 for the impacts of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program and EIS Section 4.2.1.5 for cumulative effects of the two programs.
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ISSUE: The Wyoming Department of Health and Human Service does not feel the program will provide or cause any degradation of health in Cheyenne, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Permits to construct at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming must be obtained for certain types of sediment control structures, and for sewer line extensions to serve facilities. Impacts due to soil erosion have not been adequately addressed. Erosion and water quality statements in the Draft EIS are confusing, if not contradictory.

RESPONSE: A discussion held with personnel from the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality determined that no special construction permit was required with respect to water quality. If constructed, water and sewer line permits would be obtained. Estimates of construction-induced sedimentation from the proposed Rail Garrison sites are provided in Section 4.2 of the EIS. Also see response to Document 422, Comment 4.

ISSUE: Regulations of the National Historic Preservation Act and Advisory Council (36 CFR § 800) call for survey, evaluation and protection of significant historic and archeological sites prior to any disturbance. There are no objections to the project if procedures established in regulations are followed. Specific comments will be provided to the Air Force after review of the cultural resource report.

RESPONSE: The Air Force has been coordinating data acquisition efforts with the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer since the program was announced early this year. The Air Force will continue to consult with your staff throughout the report preparation phase of work. The results of the recent field investigations in impact areas identified in the EIS are in completed draft form. However, as requested, additional archival research relating to previous years' studies is presently underway. As requested, the results of the archival work are being combined with the recent field studies into a single report. The estimated completion date for the final combined report is January 1989.

ISSUE: State and localities will not realize "the normal benefits" associated with Peacekeeper Rail Garrison in the absence of a mitigation agreement.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 488, Comment 23.

ISSUE: The socioeconomic Region of Influence (ROI) should be limited to Laramie County in Wyoming. The inclusion of Larimer and Weld counties skews the baseline analysis.

RESPONSE: Larimer and Weld counties were included in the ROI because they would likely supply an appreciable amount of labor and materials to the program.

ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with baseline population projections as supplied by Wyoming Department of Fiscal Control.

RESPONSE: Discussion with local officials have yielded a more conservative population projection which was incorporated into the baseline analysis. Also see Section 4.2.1.2 of the EIS.
ISSUE: The EIS baseline underestimates secondary job creation.

RESPONSE: Estimating procedures have been calculated with historic data to assure forecasts that are as accurate as possible.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS assumes a baseline population that apparently does not vary with employment opportunities locally available. What is needed is an analysis of labor force, employment demand, employment supply, unemployment, population, etc., with and without the proposed project in Laramie County, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: Baseline population estimates have been revised based on discussions with local officials (see EIS Section 4.2.1.3). Labor force and employment analyses are presented in EIS Sections 4.2.1.3 and 4.2.1.4.

ISSUE: A linear relationship between population and housing needs, school enrollments, public services and local government services and expenditures is inappropriate.

RESPONSE: The linear relationship was only used to determine an overall level of impact, not significance. To determine significance, estimates of household sizes, accompaniment rates, pupil/worker ratios, public service demand rates, and public expenditure and revenues per worker were evaluated by worker type. These demands were then compared to projected supplies and shortages/shortfalls were identified. These shortages/shortfalls determine significance (see EIS Sections 4.2.1.3, 4.2.1.4, and 4.2.1.5).

ISSUE: A more rigorous approach and analysis of economic effects are needed before legitimate conclusions can be drawn.

RESPONSE: The EIS analysis uses detailed information regarding the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program labor and material requirements and regional input - output models developed for each of the proposed garrison locations. The models were developed using the most recent economic data available for each region.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Rail Garrison at Grand Forks or Minot AFBs, North Dakota because of the likelihood of derailment and the danger presented by ignition of missile fuels.

RESPONSE: The likelihood and consequences of such an accident are described in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the EIS.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to Rail Garrison MX-bearing train at Grand Forks and Minot AFBs, North Dakota for its inherent dangers as derailment, possible fuel explosion, and toxic gas clouds.

RESPONSE: The likelihood and consequence of such an accident are described in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the EIS. Also see response to Document 24, Comment 2.

ISSUE: The EIS needs to more fully address rail safety because of heavier loads on the tracks which increase the chance of accidents.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.
491 2 ISSUE: The EIS needs to more fully address decommissioning weapons.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

492 1 ISSUE: A Congressional Budget Office report in November 1987 said that in any credible attack scenario, even with no warning, the United States would have remaining about 3,700 warheads capable of returning the attack. With warning, the figure jumped to 8,200 warheads. Given these figures, what is the need for an additional 500 counterforce (first-strike) warheads in maintaining our deterrence?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

492 2 ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not define adequately the criteria under which the trains would be deployed. "National need" is hardly adequate for the public or Congress to evaluate how often the system would leave the garrison, therefore, please address if there can be an effective analysis of the risk measurements that are based on the numbers of rail miles traveled.
RESPONSE: To estimate the total risk over the life of the system requires making an assumption about how long the trains will be dispersed because of crises like the Cuban Missile Crisis and the 1973 Middle-East War and compare that to the one-month dispersal risk figures in the EIS. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 98.

492 3 ISSUE: The Department of Defense briefing implied that MX Rail Garrison could be later turned into a continuously mobile system. Is this a possibility? Do Air Force contingency plans include such a plan? What would such a plan do to the risk assessment section of the Draft EIS?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 404, Comment 23.

492 4 ISSUE: Will this document serve as the EIS on the Midgetman missile system which this Draft EIS (June 1988) said "up to 150 single warhead missiles will be based with the Rail Garrison from 1992-97." Address completely the possible double impact for Cheyenne, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: In December 1986, President Reagan selected Malmstrom AFB, Montana and F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming as potential main operating bases for the Small ICBM program. In this EIS, the cumulative impacts of the two programs are evaluated assuming concurrent deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and Small ICBM programs (see EIS Sections 4.2 and 4.9). This document will not serve as the EIS for the Small ICBM program. Another EIS will be prepared if the Small ICBM program is implemented at F.E. Warren AFB.

493 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports Minot AFB, North Dakota as the site for Rail Garrison because of the need for defense and recognizes the importance of the Rail Garrison program.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

494 1 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to nuclear weapons and feels the Rail Garrison plan is poorly conceived.
ISSUE: The Burlington Northern railroad tracks in Montana are susceptible to sabotage.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: The risks of aerosolization of plutonium are not adequately addressed. What would happen to the individual on the train or in the immediate area? The half-life of plutonium and risks of long-term exposure are not addressed. How many Curies are in each missile?

RESPONSE: The risks to human health are addressed in Chapter 5 in the EIS. Revisions and editing for the Final EIS have made the discussion clearer. Because the half-life of plutonium is very long (24,390 years), contamination would be considered a serious problem and cleanup would be required. The number of Curies per missile is not discussed for security reasons. However, the quantity that can be expected to be dispersed, is presented in EIS Figures 5.4.4.1 and 5.4.4.2.

ISSUE: This project is too expensive to be funded in an era when our government must consider a variety of other priorities.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposes the Rail Garrison program but believes in a strong defense system including the ICBM system and supports the military colleagues at Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Notice of the hearing was inadequate to reasonably reach the general and interested public. Chester, Montana is downwind of the silos and is on the main line of the Burlington Northern Railroad and better notice should have been given in our area.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: There should have been more hearings in Montana. All of the areas and towns on the Burlington Northern lines and rail link lines that would be used should have been notified and received a hearing.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: It was not reasonable to have one EIS for all of the areas involved since to do so meant that the EIS could not reasonably and fairly cover the subjects required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

RESPONSE: The large geographical area coverage caused the EIS to be extraordinarily long, but there has not been any identification of inadequate coverage of any particular areas.

ISSUE: Adequate time was not given to the public to present their testimony. Some groups were not allowed to complete their statement denying fair presentation to present their views. The Air Force presented their views.

1-269
ISSUE: The document does not properly inform the involved public of the nature of the project and of the environmental effects as required by National Environmental Policy Act. There was no description of the tracks that would be used in an emergency. We have no idea what areas are involved.

RESPONSE: In the event of a dispersal of the trains in a time of national need, virtually all railroad track would be considered available to dispersing trains. There is nothing in the Proposed Action or EIS which specifies track to be used in an emergency. The impacts of potential accidents are described in EIS Section 5.5.

ISSUE: No mention was made of the half-life of plutonium which I believe is about 40,000 years.

RESPONSE: The half-life of plutonium $^{239}$ is 24,390 years, which means that it would not degrade appreciably in a human lifetime. Accordingly, plutonium contamination is considered a very serious consequence. The response and cleanup procedure which recognize the seriousness of a release are described in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

ISSUE: The computer studies of the spreading of the contaminants should there be an accident were inaccurate in that the basic assumptions were not accurate. This includes wind velocity and elevation.

RESPONSE: The meteorological conditions used in the safety analyses are hypothetical. They were selected to provide a "worst case" situation, that is, one which would pose the worst risk to the largest area. They are not "accurate" for any particular area. If the conditions vary from those used in the analyses, the consequences would generally be less serious.

ISSUE: The EIS did not consider the scenario of an attack by submarine located off the coast of Washington in which case there would be only about 15 minutes warning. What would happen? Would the general public be in more danger in such a case if the missiles were located in Great Falls, Montana?

RESPONSE: Issues of wartime use are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The U.S. Forest Service concurs with the Draft EIS assessment of impacts on threatened and endangered species in the Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan vicinity.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: The U.S. Forest Service concurs with further study of loss of wetlands but feels the loss is negligible because there are several thousand acres of wetland along the entire Au Sable River under their management.

RESPONSE: The Au Sable River Floodplain in the vicinity of the proposed rail route (immediately south of the Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan flightline) was surveyed and evaluated according to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) wetland delineation methodology. The area met the USFWS
criteria for wetlands, and was judged to have high habitat value by field personnel. In addition, concern for the potential fill of this area was expressed by the Michigan Department of National Resources (DNR) in Lansing and the Lansing District USFWS during consultations with these agencies. If the Rail Garrison program is implemented at Wurtsmith AFB, the Michigan DNR will be the primary reviewer of the permit application for wetland fill. Because of the legal protection given to wetland by three Michigan state laws, the concern this issue has elicited from key state and federal agencies, and the quality of the habitat in question, it was determined that disturbance of 3.2 acres in this area would be a moderate and significant impact.

497 3 ISSUE: The U.S. Forest Service is unaware of any bald eagles occupying the area 0.5 mile west of Allen Lake on the southbank of the Au Sable River at this time.

RESPONSE: The source of the information presented in EIS Table 4.12.6-1 (pertaining to the distribution of the bald eagle) is the Michigan Natural Features Inventory. The Rail Garrison program is not expected to have any direct impact on bald eagles; however, it is considered important to include, as baseline information, the historical locations of federally listed threatened and endangered species in the general region, even though there is only a remote possibility that they may be sighted in the area today.

497 4 ISSUE: The mitigation measures identified for the program in Michigan appear to satisfactorily address the projected impacts on the biological resources of this project.

RESPONSE: Noted.
1.2.2 Oral Comments

For individuals who provided oral testimony which addressed issues contained in written comments or testimony submitted, the reader is referred to the written documents in Section 2 and the issues and responses in Section 1.2.

500 1 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by the Honorable Don Erickson.
RESPONSE: See Document 485.

500 2 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Alan Edwards.
RESPONSE: See Document 422.

500 3 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Janet Whitehead.
RESPONSE: See Document 419.

500 4 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ed Warsaw.
RESPONSE: See Document 418.

500 5 ISSUE: Commentor supports the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming because the benefits derived from the program far exceed any minimal environmental impact.
RESPONSE: Noted.

500 6 ISSUE: Commentor against further delays in procuring missiles. The military should have the best weapons available to protect the United States.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

500 7 ISSUE: The Union Pacific Railroad has reviewed the proposed project at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming from a railroad operations standpoint and can not see any adverse environmental impacts whatsoever.
RESPONSE: Noted.

500 8 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Sharon Breitweiser.
RESPONSE: See Document 453.

500 9 ISSUE: How will the Air Force mitigate the effects on the national historic sites on F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: In 1984, a Programmatic Agreement was signed by the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and the Air Force for the preservation and mitigation of cultural resources at F.E. Warren AFB. A Cultural Resources Management Plan was finalized in 1984 and provides detailed guidelines on the treatment of cultural resources. Avoidance is the preferred treatment for all cultural resources; however, if avoidance is not possible, data-recovery plans and various architectural treatments would be implemented. Program alteration or modification of any historic structure within the National Register District or National Historic
Landmark would be mitigated by following the guidelines for maintaining architectural integrity established in the Cultural Resources Management Plan. Additional standing structures may require archival research and documentation according to the Historic American Building Survey or the Historic American Engineering Record standards for historic structures. Appropriate site treatments are determined in consultation with the SHPO, ACHP, and the base Historic Preservation Coordination Committee.

500 10 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

500 11 ISSUE: Commentor feels rails are structurally unreliable during extreme temperatures so entire program is absolutely idiotic.
RESPONSE: See EIS Section 5.2.3.

500 12 ISSUE: What will be the impact of not building any more MX missiles?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

500 13 ISSUE: What will be the impact on the global environment of removing and disassembling all ground based ICBMs?
RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

500 14 ISSUE: Impacts of reduced funding for competing nonmilitary programs should be discussed.
RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

500 15 ISSUE: Commentor questioned survivability and first-strike capability of the MX.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

500 16 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

500 17 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Sister Rosella Hehn.
RESPONSE: See Document 301.

500 18 ISSUE: Commentor requests that the people of Cheyenne, Wyoming be kept posted in regard to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.
RESPONSE: Decisions on deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program will be made by the President and Congress. Appropriate public notification will be made at that time.

500 19 ISSUE: Who is going to supervise track maintenance?
ISSUE: Commentor supports the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the more missiles we have, the more problems we have with being attacked by our enemies.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about an accident resulting in spilling and possible ignition of fuel.

RESPONSE: See EIS Sections 5.3 and 5.4.

ISSUE: If 3,000 feet of clearance is needed for safety reasons, what about the homes in Laramie, Wyoming that are less than 3,000 feet from the railroad?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 28.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about mental stress caused by becoming a greater target.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned that this program is more vulnerable than placing missiles in silos and makes us more prone to first strike from the Soviet Union.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Darryl Miller.

RESPONSE: See Document 417.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Richard Moore.

RESPONSE: See Document 485.

ISSUE: Community should not tell their Commander in Chief what to do.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What is the need for an additional 500 counterforce or first-strike warheads in maintaining our deterrence?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS does not adequately define the criteria under which trains would be deployed. National need is hardly adequate to evaluate how often the system would leave the garrison.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 98.
ISSUE: There cannot be an effective risk assessment without knowledge of number of rail miles traveled per year.

RESPONSE: Estimated rail travel distances are shown in EIS Table 5.3.1-6.

ISSUE: Would the system become continuously mobile in the future? How would that change the risk assessment in the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 404, Comment 23.

ISSUE: Will this document serve as the Midgetman EIS?

RESPONSE: No.

ISSUE: Commentator in support of the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming because it makes economic sense.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentator concerned about the government's record on safety in light of the Space Shuttle, Three Mile Island, and the explosion in Utah.

RESPONSE: The safety of the system is analyzed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.

ISSUE: Commentator wants scenarios clarified as to the number of bases and number of trains at each base.

RESPONSE: The decision has not yet been made as to the number of installations at which the system will be deployed and the number of trains to be deployed at each installation.

ISSUE: The EIS should address the effects on the economy if the scientists and engineers employed in developing the missiles were employed in the civilian economy.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How can security be maintained over hundreds of thousands of miles of track?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 7.

ISSUE: Commentator in support of the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming because it is economically feasible.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: How much did the EIS cost?

RESPONSE: The entire EIS process and associated hearings will cost approximately $9 million.

ISSUE: Was a similar study done prior to the Peacekeeper coming to F.E. Warren, AFB, Wyoming?
RESPONSE: An EIS for the Peacekeeper in Minuteman Silos program was completed in January 1984.

500 42 ISSUE: The money spent on the EIS could have been better spent by buying a few more Peacekeepers.

RESPONSE: An EIS is required by the National Environmental Policy Act for major federal actions significantly affecting the human environment.

500 43 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Sydney Spiegel.

RESPONSE: See Document 421.

500 44 ISSUE: Commentor states that the proposed project should not adversely impact the greater Cheyenne, Wyoming area from the position of undue burden of the community's infrastructure, facilities, and services.

RESPONSE: Noted.

500 45 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that traffic on Randall Avenue during the construction phase will create congestion and have potential accidents, whether the north or south alternative at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming is selected.

RESPONSE: EIS Sections 4.2.3.2, 4.2.3.3, and 4.2.3.4 discuss new data reflecting the problem at the Randall Avenue Interchange.

500 46 ISSUE: In regard to housing, the Air Force should take a more affirmative role in ensuring that the private sector at the local level be induced in meeting the identified housing demand both on and offbase of F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.

RESPONSE: The housing analysis concludes that housing demands generated by the Proposed or Alternative Actions can be met by existing vacancies within the local housing stock. Only under cumulative impacts is there the need for increases in the housing supply to meet program related demand. The Air Force is committed to letting the local market supply these units. Only if these excess demands would disrupt the market will the Air Force step in to ensure available housing through Military Construction Program funding or other housing programs (i.e., 801 housing).

500 47 ISSUE: The Air Force should ensure that Cheyenne, Wyoming is provided wth the means to mitigate identified impacts which might occur in the local education system.

RESPONSE: It is the policy of the Air Force to make every effort practicable to avoid environmental impacts through careful design, siting, and construction of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system, as well as in activating the system for operation. Specific procedures and guidelines (referred to as Recommended Mitigation Measures) have been committed to by the Air Force to protect and restore environmental resources disturbed by program activity. Additional mitigations (referred to as Other Possible Mitigation Measures) are also available. The appendix to the EIS summarizes both types of mitigation measures. Decisions on which mitigation actions will be implemented by the Air Force will be made after the Final EIS is filed and will be documented in one or more Records of Decision.
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ISSUE: To ensure long-term economic benefits to Cheyenne, Wyoming, the Air Force should consider mechanisms whereby business development which occurs from this program generates localized opportunities.

RESPONSE: Program-related outlays for materials and payrolls will have a positive economic effect on the local economy. The Air Force, operating within the procurement guidelines, supports the effort of local businesses to bid for contracts let out for this program.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Eileen Starr.

RESPONSE: See Document 415.

ISSUE: Would Wyoming become a prime target? What provisions will the Air Force make to inform the public and provide for their safety?

RESPONSE: The issue of enemy threat is beyond the scope of this EIS. Warnings and provisions for safety are the responsibility of existing civil defense agencies. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 55.

ISSUE: What can be done for the elderly or children in Cheyenne, Wyoming who may not have radios? Can they be protected in time from incoming missiles?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 500, Comment 50.

ISSUE: Will roads leading to F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming be given priority over other roads for snow removal?

RESPONSE: Roads leading to the base would not be given priority in maintenance and snow removal activity of the city.

ISSUE: If a missile is launched, will these railroad tracks be destroyed, preventing future use of the rail system and will there be ensuing fires?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: With a 30-minute launch time for Russian missiles and the 2-3 hours to get trains underway, missiles have to be fired from the base. Can you explain the logic of this?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will workers on trains be tested for alcohol and drug abuse?

RESPONSE: With respect to nonmilitary civilian personnel, this concern is still to be determined between the Air Force and the railroads. Also see response to Document 15, Comment 4.

ISSUE: Will workers and members of the military crew on trains be given hazardous duty pay and be under the Human Reliability Program?

RESPONSE: Air Force personnel will be compensated according to existing grade/rank and length of service schedules and will be subject to
a Personnel Reliability Program (see response to Document 15, Comment 4 and Section 5.1.2 of the EIS) with respect to nonmilitary civilian personnel, these concerns are still to be determined between the Air Force and the railroads.

500 57 ISSUE: Who has authority when trains are going through towns?
RESPONSE: Unless martial law is declared, the military has no authority outside of any military installations. Also see response to Document 33, Comments 8 and 12.

500 58 ISSUE: How will the Missile Assembly Building be camouflaged at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming?
RESPONSE: Its proposed location has been moved from the eastern edge of the base to the extreme western portion of the base so it will blend into the mountain backdrop better. It will also be painted a pale blue to make it less visually obtrusive. Also see response to Document 475, Comment 2.

500 59 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

500 60 ISSUE: Scottsbluff County, Nebraska was not informed of the program or the public hearing.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

500 61 ISSUE: The definition of national need should be explained in the EIS.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 98.

500 62 ISSUE: How does a person acquire supplementary documents referred to in the Draft EIS?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 2.

500 63 ISSUE: The transportation analysis does not discuss railroads. This should be included.
RESPONSE: Impacts on railroads around F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming are discussed in EIS Section 4.1.2.

500 64 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

500 65 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Alvin Aldrich.
RESPONSE: See Document 373.

500 66 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

500  67 ISSUE: The south site option at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming should be fully explored.

RESPONSE: The south site option is fully discussed in EIS Section 4.2 for each of the affected resource areas.

501  1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the project at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because it enhances national defense and has no long-term impacts.

RESPONSE: Noted.

501  2 ISSUE: Commentor in support of basing Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501  3 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Rail Garrison coming to Shreveport, Louisiana because benefits outweigh any adverse impacts.

RESPONSE: Noted.

501  4 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501  5 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ginny Homza.

RESPONSE: See Document 83.

501  6 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the MX Rail Garrison system and its implementation at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501  7 ISSUE: Commentor in support of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501  8 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because Louisiana is committed to the national defense effort.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501  9 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501 10 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Rail Garrison program because of belief in strong defensive posture and the long and mutually beneficial relationship between Shreveport and Bossier City, Louisiana and the Air Force.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501 11 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program due to past conservation efforts by the government showing concern of environmental impacts and importance of continued strategic importance that Barksdale AFB, Louisiana provides.

RESPONSE: Noted.

501 12 ISSUE: Statement made that the American alligator is not endangered in the State of Louisiana. There are no alligators in the impact area, and no alligator habitat in the area.

RESPONSE: EIS Table 4.3.6-1 indicates that the American alligator is federally listed as "threatened by similarity of appearance to the American crocodile." High quality alligator habitats lie immediately south and east of the proposed garrison site, and there are few barriers to passage from these areas to the proposed construction area. Food sources (e.g., small mammals and crustaceans) are also plentiful on the site. Therefore, it is possible that a few alligators could occur on the site during the wet periods of the year. EIS Section 4.3.6.3 has been revised to further emphasize that alligator populations on Barksdale AFB are not likely to be seriously affected by the proposed program.

501 13 ISSUE: The program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana would not impact the bald eagle. The heavy brush growth within the impacted area precludes eagle use.

RESPONSE: The information regarding the distribution of bald eagles on Barksdale AFB, Louisiana has been incorporated into EIS Table 4.3.6-1 and Section 4.3.6.2 of the EIS.

501 14 ISSUE: The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana would have no effect on the red-cockaded woodpecker. The woodpecker inhabits pine forest and the nearest pine forest is two miles to the east.

RESPONSE: EIS Section 4.3.6.3 states that "No impacts on red-cockaded woodpeckers or potential habitat are expected to occur from the Proposed Action." The distribution of this species has been revised in EIS Table 4.3.6-1.

501 15 ISSUE: The Flathead snake is not endangered or threatened in the impacted area of Louisiana.

RESPONSE: The Flathead snake does not occur in the proposed direct impact area on Barksdale AFB. Agreed, this species is not listed as threatened or endangered by the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; however the snake is listed by the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries as a S4 species (i.e., apparently secure in Louisiana). See Section 4.3.6.3 and Table 4.3.6-1 of the EIS.

501 16 ISSUE: The western sand darter is not endangered by the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because it does not occur in the streams near the impacted area.
RESPONSE: EIS Table 4.3.6-1 indicates that the western sand darter has a state ranking of S2 and occurs in the Red River.

501 17 ISSUE: The Proposed Action at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana will have no effect on trout lilies.

RESPONSE: EIS Table 4.3.6-1 indicates that trout lilies occur on a hillside on the eastern side of Flag Lake on Barksdale AFB. This area will not be impacted by program activities.

501 18 ISSUE: The Rail Garrison program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana would not impact wild turkey habitat.

RESPONSE: The high level of security in the garrison area could potentially reduce poaching of wild turkeys in adjacent habitats, but this benefit would be greatly offset by the potential loss of habitat. Wild turkeys require large forested areas with interspersed old fields, openings, and mixed timber stands. Protection from man is critical. Some of the land which would be cleared for the proposed program would have facilities built upon it and would no longer serve any habitat function. Additional clearings in the bottomland forest would be created, but these would be areas with considerable human presence and activity, and only a low vegetative cover.

501 19 ISSUE: The Proposed Action at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana will not affect prime hardwood stands on the base.

RESPONSE: No impacts are expected to occur.

501 20 ISSUE: The tract of land in question at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana was agricultural prior to its acquisition by the Air Force. This (and other evidence) indicates that the land is not a wetland.

RESPONSE: Whether the tract of land in question was agricultural prior to its acquisition by the Air Force is not evidence of its original physiographic type (i.e., wetland or upland). The land appears to be reverting back to a habitat similar to its original type, as evidenced by establishment of many wetland indicator plant species. Clearing of bottomland forested wetlands for crop production was a common practice in Louisiana in the past, and has been a major factor leading to the decline of these highly productive habitats. The Region 6 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) office, which has jurisdiction over permitting for wetland fill on the base, was consulted prior to conducting field surveys to identify and delineate wetlands in the proposed construction areas on base. EPA advised that wetlands on the base should be identified and delineated using the procedures and criteria described in "Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual," Technical Report Y-87-1 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1987), which requires positive evidence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology. The prevalence of hydrophytic vegetation was established by determining the wetland indicator status of all woody and herbaceous plants identified in the proposed construction areas, using the "National List of Plant Species That Occur in Wetlands, Region 2" (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1987). The wetland indicator status of species in the garrison area supports the findings of positive evidence of hydrophytic vegetation. The presence of hydric soils was determined from the "Soil Survey of Bossier Parish" (U.S. Soil Conservation Service 1962) and from the manual "Hydric Soils of the
United States" (U.S. Soil Conservation Service 1987). The soils at the proposed construction sites were also field checked by a soil scientist. The hydrologic characteristics of areas on the base were determined from aerial photographs, National Wetland Inventory and U.S. Geological Survey topographic quadrangle maps, and various Barksdale AFB environmental base documents. In addition, evidence of periodic inundation (e.g., ponding, soil saturation, and water marks on trees) was observed during field surveys of the sites.

501 21 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because there are no negative impacts.
RESPONSE: Noted.

501 22 ISSUE: Commentor pledged support of the Caddo-Bossier Port Commission to the Rail Garrison program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501 23 ISSUE: Bossier Parish Levee Board unanimously approves resolution supporting location of the garrison system at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501 24 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana due to the importance of national defense.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501 25 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because it makes economic sense.
RESPONSE: Noted.

501 26 ISSUE: Steps have been taken to ease Bossier City, Louisiana traffic conditions.
RESPONSE: The baseline conditions reported in EIS Section 4.3.3.2 have been revised to reflect these recent changes.

501 27 ISSUE: The American alligator will pose no problem if Rail Garrison is located at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.
RESPONSE: See EIS Section 4.3.6.3 regarding biological impacts of the proposed program and the response to Document 501, Comment 12 regarding the current federal listing of the American alligator. Because of the ecological importance of wetland habitats and the legal protection afforded them by Executive Order 11990 (1977) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, it was determined that permanent disturbance of over 188 acres of forested wetlands would be a high and significant impact on biological resources at Barksdale AFB.

501 28 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Thomas Neale.
RESPONSE: See Document 410.

501 29 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Eileen Oldag.
ISSUE: The Peacekeeper is a first-strike weapon that should not be accepted as a deterrent.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to any system which unleashes this kind of death to God's children.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program because God tells us that Jesus had righteous indignation at times and this is a defensive weapon.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana due to wanting defense of our nation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana due to the destructiveness of the weapon.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Railcars would have to be made wider and this would make them unbalanced, causing a safety hazard.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

ISSUE: There will have to be an alert signal to other railroad trains to warn of this train's coming, because of its width.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

ISSUE: How will we keep the Russians from knowing about it when we have got to alert other trains about its movements?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: What is the preparation for sabotage and terrorist attacks?

RESPONSE: Issues of enemy threat assessment are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: This money would be better spent to help the economy of our country.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor offended by the name "Peacekeeper."
RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

501 41 ISSUE: How can you say these trains would not be vulnerable to collision or derailments?

RESPONSE: This claim is not made in the EIS. See Chapter 5.

501 42 ISSUE: Commentor strongly opposes the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501 43 ISSUE: Commentor feels there is no satisfactory basing mode and the military need is not evident.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

501 44 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to monies being spent on this project.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

501 45 ISSUE: The Rail Garrison poses no significant environmental problems to endangered species or wildlife habitat at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.

RESPONSE: As stated in EIS Section 4.3.6.3, the Rail Garrison program is not expected to substantially affect any federally listed threatened or endangered species on Barksdale AFB. However, the program would result in disturbance of extensive areas of bottomland forest and wetland habitats onbase, which support a large and diverse group of wildlife species. Disturbance of the wetlands, in particular, constitutes a high and significant impact to biological resources on Barksdale AFB.

501 46 ISSUE: Wetland impacts at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana should be mitigated as proposed.

RESPONSE: If the decision to deploy Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is made for a candidate installation, applications for Section 404 permits will be submitted. Mitigation procedures will be discussed in the process of this application.

501 47 ISSUE: Adverse effects are minimized and favorable impacts are as good for Barksdale AFB, Louisiana as anywhere else.

RESPONSE: Noted.

501 48 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program because nuclear war is not survivable.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1

501 49 ISSUE: Commentor feels the survival of the missile is being given priority to the survival of the people.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
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ISSUE: If technology and consultants exist that can assure the safety of movement of the missile on our rail system, why do we continue to have railway accidents that are killing civilians?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 3.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because we need good jobs and this program will help minorities.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program because of the potential to destroy the environment.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: The money would be better spent on human services and meeting human needs.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor strongly opposed to the program because national security is beyond mere sophisticated weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana because there should be no adverse hydrological effects from relocation of improvements near the Flat River.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Peacekeeper Rail Garrison enhances the missile force and therefore national defense, which outweighs adverse environmental impacts.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Ground squirrels in west Texas are very resourceful and will move and set up another colony elsewhere.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: The EIS does not note the presence of wild turkeys on the reservation.

RESPONSE: The turkeys that occur on Dyess AFB, Texas are primarily confined to the eastern portion of the base and do not present any hazards to aircraft activities.
502 5 ISSUE: Commentor warned about disturbing the west Texas bumblebee in the Dyess AFB area.

RESPONSE: No impacts are expected on the west Texas bumblebee. Workers will be notified of their possible presence.

502 6 ISSUE: Commentor in favor of the system at Dyess AFB, Texas since adverse impacts are minimal.

RESPONSE: Noted.

502 7 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the system at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 8 ISSUE: Commentor in favor of the system at Dyess AFB, Texas because there is no greater honor than patriotism.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 9 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 10 ISSUE: The City of Tye Council is in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 11 ISSUE: Commentor in favor of the system at Dyess AFB, Texas and the defense efforts.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 12 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 13 ISSUE: Commentor states that Abilene, Texas is willing to take a chance on deploying such a weapon to deter our enemy.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 14 ISSUE: Statement made that the State Senator from District 5 supports selection of Abilene, Texas for the Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 15 ISSUE: State Senator from District 12 supports the Rail Garrison program in Abilene, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 16 ISSUE: State Representative of District 79 supports the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 17 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 18 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 19 ISSUE: Abilene Hotel/Motel Association is in favor of the system at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 20 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 21 ISSUE: Commentor concerned with the weapon system being defective through defense contractors' negligence.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 22 ISSUE: Concerned with pesticides/biocides used in construction and maintenance by contractors and railroad companies.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 486, Comment 2.

502 23 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 24 ISSUE: Governor of Texas in support of the Rail Garrison program at Dyess AFB.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 25 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 26 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 27 ISSUE: Commentor feels the MX is a political weapon and comes at too high a cost.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 28 ISSUE: Statement by Abilene Reporter News in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Statement from the Chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor would like the north site option explored at Dyess AFB, Texas as opposed to the south site.

RESPONSE: Environmental analyses for all affected resource areas have been conducted for the north site option at Dyess AFB (see EIS Section 4.4).

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor does not have a problem with archaeological sites because the Air Force has the means to mitigate impacts to them.

RESPONSE: As noted by Dr. Malouf, archaeologists are capable of mitigating impacts to archaeological resources. Avoidance of archaeological sites is not meant to imply that data recovery cannot be successfully carried out at present. It is simply a sound conservation practice when dealing with finite, nonrenewable resources. EIS Section 4.4.5.2 has been revised to reflect the results of surveys conducted in proposed impact areas by the University of Texas at Austin.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 41 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program because Dyess AFB, Texas would be higher up on the target list.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 42 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about decommissioning of system which includes disposal of missile fuel/nuclear material.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

502 43 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the Air Force is passing responsibility of hazardous wastes disposal to the Department of Energy.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 30.

502 44 ISSUE: The national economic impact analysis needs more discussion in the EIS.

RESPONSE: Because of the very small effects projected on a national level, the more detailed discussions were prepared for effects at the local level.

502 45 ISSUE: Minor technical statistical discrepancies that occur in the report should be cleared up.

RESPONSE: These discrepancies have been corrected.

502 46 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that if obvious mistakes were found in the Draft EIS, how can the citizens of Texas be assured that the safety section is correct?

RESPONSE: The Draft EIS was distributed to solicit public and agency comments on the adequacy and accuracy of the environmental and safety analyses. Many issues addressed during the public comment period led to further analysis, reanalysis, or verification of environmental and safety data, and have resulted in revision or modification of the EIS text. In addition, changes have been made to improve the quality and readability of the document.

502 47 ISSUE: The Draft EIS failed at addressing pesticide/chemical use.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 486, Comment 2.

502 48 ISSUE: Commentor feels the program should not be accepted at Dyess AFB, Texas because it is not economically useful, cost effective, or environmentally sound.

RESPONSE: Noted.

502 49 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas because there would be no adverse effects on public services.

RESPONSE: Noted.
502 50 ISSUE: City of Abilene, Texas is spending $8 million to improve its wastewater system and study the feasibility of wastewater reuse.

RESPONSE: This information has been incorporated into the baseline analysis for Dyess AFB.

502 51 ISSUE: Commentor in agreement with findings in the Draft EIS that there are no significant impacts of this program on the City of Abilene, Texas.

RESPONSE: Noted.

502 52 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 53 ISSUE: Commentor agrees with the Draft EIS and supports the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 54 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 55 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 56 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 57 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

502 58 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Dyess AFB, Texas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program and the community of Blytheville, Arkansas supports it too.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 2 ISSUE: Commentor supports the program because of the location of Eaker AFB, sufficient undeveloped land available, climate, and the support of the people of Blytheville, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 3 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas and noted that some impacts to archaeology, roads, and schools can be satisfactorily remedied. Also noted support of the people to the base.

RESPONSE: Noted.
503  4 ISSUE: Commentor pledged support to the program and noted the importance of Eaker AFB, Arkansas to the City of Gosnell.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503  5 ISSUE: Commentor supports the program because Eaker AFB, Arkansas provides an excellent site, is a vital strategic base in our national defense system, and Mississippi County strongly supports the Air Force mission.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503  6 ISSUE: Commentor supports the program. Noted that he has not received any correspondence with negative feedback and that people of Gosnell and District 23 are very proud of Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503  7 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503  8 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program. Noted that of those expressing their opinions in support of basing the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas far outweighs opposition to it. City and the base have good relationship.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503  9 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 10 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 11 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program and noted that Eaker AFB, Arkansas has contributed to the growth of Osceola. He sees no danger with the Peacekeeper trains using the rail lines in their community.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 12 ISSUE: Commentor endorsed the program and read resolution passed by the City Council of Wilson, Arkansas to encourage Congress to approve program and urge the Air Force to install the system at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 13 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 14 ISSUE: The mitigation of archaeological sites may result in beneficial impacts. What is the possibility that four sites may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)?
RESPONSE: Impacts to site 3MS105 are not completely eliminated by the revised onbase garrison design. However, most of the site would be protected, resulting in a benefit to the regional resource base (see EIS Section 4.5.5.3). The potential for presenting the results of the archaeological investigations as part of a public awareness program is also identified (see EIS Section 4.5.5.3). The relative importance of historical properties is evaluated in relation to a set of criteria established by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations (36 CFR § 60.4). If a site qualifies for the NRHP, it is, by definition, historically important. The four sites are considered very likely to be eligible for the NRHP. However, preliminary assessments of the field archaeologists are tentative until the State Historic Preservation Officer concurs with their findings. In some cases, more data recovery may be necessary to fully evaluate site importance.

503 15 ISSUE: Why are we spending all this money for the Peacekeeper program when the MX is not even in good shape?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 473, Comment 15.

503 16 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that Blytheville, Arkansas is on the New Madrid fault. What would be the effect of this on the site?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 7, Comment 6.

503 17 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that Eaker AFB, Arkansas is located in tornado alley, what is its effect?

RESPONSE: This has been considered in EIS Section 5.2.3.

503 18 ISSUE: After the Draft EIS, what is the next step to be taken in the selection process and when will the actual selection of garrison sites be made?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 500, Comment 18.

503 19 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas. Noted that public schools could easily accommodate any increase in students, and that they are in the process of upgrading facilities and adding new facilities.

RESPONSE: Noted.

503 20 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 21 ISSUE: The EIS tries to limit statements that do not consider the psychological, national security, or morality factors.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 5, Comment 14 and Document 32, Comment 1.

503 22 ISSUE: Commentor feels we should be trying to reduce our nuclear arsenal and moving towards a more peaceful world.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
503 23 ISSUE: The money would be better spent in other areas of Blytheville, Arkansas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 24 ISSUE: The Draft EIS seems to imply that deterrence is somehow enhanced by this system when this is adding about 50 warheads to our arsenal.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 25 ISSUE: The statement is weak in terms of looking at what happens when trains get out on the rail and the safety factors involved. They do not talk about weapons and trains being sabotaged.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

503 26 ISSUE: Will the new onbase option at Eaker AFB, Arkansas avoid the Sawba Cemetery.
RESPONSE: The new onbase option avoids most of the large prehistoric site (3MS105), but the Sawba Cemetery would be affected. The Proposed Action would disturb about half the cemetery and most of it would be affected by the Alternative Action. It is assumed that the graves would be relocated in accordance with established U.S. Army Corps of Engineers policy (see EIS Section 4.5.5.3).

503 27 ISSUE: Would the Stage 4 liquid propellant be carried along with all four stages at once on the maintenance train?
RESPONSE: The Stage 4 component will be with the missile when it is taken back to F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming for maintenance.

503 28 ISSUE: Commentor supports the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 29 ISSUE: Commentor supports the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 30 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by James Deal.
RESPONSE: See Document 431.

503 31 ISSUE: Commentor supports the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas. Noted the commendable manner with which Colonel Walsh conducted the scoping meeting and requested that community support for the program be included in the Final EIS.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 32 ISSUE: What methods of investigation were used to verify an archaeological site at Eaker AFB, Arkansas?
RESPONSE: A series of preliminary archaeological surveys and test excavations were conducted on and adjacent to Eaker AFB. As a standard procedure, existing state site files were consulted prior to initiating field studies. Sites were then identified in the field by systematically walking over the proposed program area with a maximum crew spacing of 20 meters and mapping the surface extent of artifacts. At Site 3MS105, controlled surface collection of 0.5 percent of the site was undertaken to map artifact density and distribution. The resulting collection, containing thousands of artifacts, indicated clusters probably representing groups of houses. A proton magnetometer was then used to search for intact buried deposits in the vicinity of surface artifact concentrations. The device measures residual soil magnetism, enabling the archaeologist to identify buried houses and other disturbances without digging through them in the process. Small-scale test excavations were then carried out in a few places identified by the magnetometer as containing possible cultural features. In almost every test case, the presence of houses, wall trenches, middens, or other features was verified. Finally, soil cores were taken along the south and east sides of the site to verify the boundary for planning purposes.

503 33 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program and wants mission based at Eaker AFB, Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 34 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Eaker AFB, Arkansas. Noted good relationship between the community and the base.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

503 35 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Douglas Mason.

RESPONSE: See Document 409.

504 1 ISSUE: The City of Medical Lake, Washington would like to be consulted if there are any alterations made to State Highway 902.

RESPONSE: No alteration. to Washington State Highway 902 are expected.

504 2 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Fairchild AFB, Washington because there are no significant impacts on the City of Medical Lake.

RESPONSE: Noted.

504 3 ISSUE: The Air Force failed to provide information which was requested. This has seriously impaired the ability to assess the Proposed Action.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 2.

504 4 ISSUE: Commentor protests that we are asked to comment on this proposal when we do not have any assurance that the final program will not be substantially different.
RESPONSE: If there is a substantial change in the design of the system, the Air Force will prepare appropriate environmental analyses.

504 5 ISSUE: Commentor requests that the classified annex be made publicly available before the end of the Draft EIS comment period.

RESPONSE: There is no requirement for the public to review and comment on classified material.

504 6 ISSUE: The Air Force has failed to include in its analysis any mention of how many more people will be hungry or homeless or unemployed because of the Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 7 ISSUE: Draft EIS Page 4.6-1 lists Spokane, Washington as host community. Why not a public hearing in Spokane?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

504 8 ISSUE: For Fairchild AFB, Washington the Draft EIS addresses measures which would mitigate the harmful impacts on the habitat of the endangered species. These measures lack adequate detail and do not represent a sufficient commitment on the part of the Air Force to protect the environment.

RESPONSE: No federally listed endangered species are known to occur on Fairchild AFB; however, two federal candidate species and four state sensitive species may occur in habitats on base that would be directly affected by the proposed program. Impacts to these six species may include loss of habitat, increased mortality, disruption of daily/seasonal activities, and displacement to adjacent habitats. Consideration will be given to mitigating impacts to these species where feasible (see EIS Section 4.6.6.3).

504 9 ISSUE: The safety considerations are not specific to each of the proposed bases and do not provide enough information for an intelligent assessment, e.g., where is the nearest emergency response crew which would handle an accident at Fairchild AFB, Washington involving a nuclear warhead and/or missile motor?

RESPONSE: There are many levels of response available depending on the nature of the emergency. Firefighting units on base would handle minor events. The nearest Department of Energy Radiological Assistance Region Office is in Richland, Washington.

504 10 ISSUE: Commentor supports the No Action Alternative at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 11 ISSUE: Concerned about the destruction of wetlands in Washington.

RESPONSE: If Fairchild AFB is chosen for deployment of the program, a site specific mitigation plan would be developed to mitigate the 26.6 acres of wetlands that would be affected. This plan would be prepared in
compliance with the requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other interested agencies.

504 12 **ISSUE:** Is the program need great enough to remove about 290 acres of prime farmland from Washington?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 13 **ISSUE:** Adequacy of Spokane, Washington's solid waste disposal facilities is questioned.

**RESPONSE:** Spokane proposes to build an incinerator to burn much of the solid waste generated in the region. Currently, its availability is projected for 1990 or 1991. If the incinerator is not constructed then Spokane will have to develop another alternative to dispose of the 1,146 tons per day generated in 1992. Program-related wastes are estimated to be 4.3 tons per day or less than one percent of the waste generated in the Spokane region in 1992 and will not affect the operation of the incinerator or any other facility.

504 14 **ISSUE:** Commentor concerned about the potential shortage of low and moderate income housing in Medical Lake, Washington.

**RESPONSE:** Program-related housing demand in Medical Lake could cause a shortage of low and moderately priced housing in Medical Lake. However, excess demand can be readily absorbed by excess vacancies in Spokane (see EIS Section 4.6.1.3).

504 15 **ISSUE:** Commentor concerned that Spokane/Colville, Washington tribes concerns were not addressed in the Draft EIS.

**RESPONSE:** Based on their past involvement with cultural resources issues in the region, the Spokane and Colville groups were identified as likely to have an interest in projects in the region. Subsequently, in accordance with Air Force Regulation 126-7, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and other applicable regulations, the groups were contacted about the proposed program. They were provided with project maps and invited to express concerns about potential effects on areas important for sacred or heritage reasons. Although concerns were expressed about some areas in the general region, no specific problems (either sacred or ecological) were identified for the areas to be affected by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

504 16 **ISSUE:** Commentor against the program being based in Spokane, Washington because nuclear weapons are obsolete and pose environmental and health hazards.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 17 **ISSUE:** Commentor in support of the facility at Fairchild AFB, Washington as it is reported in the EIS.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 18 **ISSUE:** Commentor concerned about wetland mitigation measures at Fairchild AFB, Washington.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 504, Comment 11.

504 19 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the mitigation of impacts from Rail Garrison accidents and requests a greater analysis of the threat to the safety of the entire region.

RESPONSE: Measures that will be taken to prevent accidents are discussed in Section 5.1 of the EIS. The analysis of the risk posed by the system is addressed in EIS Sections 5.2 and 5.3, and response and cleanup measures are discussed in EIS Section 5.5. These sections have been revised for the Final EIS to make those discussions clearer and more complete.

504 20 ISSUE: Commentor requested greater consideration of other alternatives and more specific mitigation measures.

RESPONSE: All appropriate program alternatives are presented in the EIS. Potential mitigation are presented in Appendix A of the EIS.

504 21 ISSUE: Sociopsychological issues were not addressed in the Draft EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

504 22 ISSUE: Any significant exchange of nuclear weapons would lead to a nuclear winter and the destruction of all humans. Why was not this discussed in the Draft EIS?

RESPONSE: The issue of nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 23 ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with the City Council of Spokane, Washington's support for the program. Feels there was no citizen input.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 24 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that 26 acres of wetland habitat will be disturbed in Washington because of the program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 504, Comment 11.

504 25 ISSUE: Continued human presence at Fairchild AFB, Washington is bound to have an impact in the presence of the burrowing owl, rabbits, and the bluebird.

RESPONSE: Construction activities may affect the burrowing owl and the western bluebird, including loss of habitat, increased mortality, disruption of daily/seasonal activities, and displacement to adjacent habitats. However, the program will not adversely affect the overall regional populations of these two species (see EIS Section 4.6.6.3).

504 26 ISSUE: Commentor recommends the No Action Alternative at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 27 ISSUE: Commentor worried about a dollar for environment trade-off.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 28 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the bluebird is being pushed away from its natural, predestined environment in Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 504, Comment 25.

504 29 ISSUE: The accident fatality risk calculations in the EIS are deficient because it is based on accident figures for the entire nation. It is no secret that the rail system in the western United States is far worse than in the east. In support of that I'd like to point out that at a hearing last month, the Department of Energy rejected the option of rail transport of transuranic waste from the Hanford Reservation to New Mexico on the grounds that the nation's rail system is unsafe.

RESPONSE: Regional differences in rail accidents were investigated and determined not to be significant compared to other considerations, such as the population density differences between regions. For rail accident risk calculations, the use of nationwide rail accident rates is reasonable. The hearing referred to was an Oregon Hanford Advisory Committee briefing and information workshop. The "Questions, Answers, and Comments" pamphlet distributed after those workshops states that rail transport has not been ruled out, though truck transport is preferred. Truck basing is not an option for the Peacekeeper, so no comparison of the relation of truck transport versus rail has been conducted for this EIS.

504 30 ISSUE: The EIS should include the sociopsychological effects of the program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

504 31 ISSUE: Commentor recommends the No Action Alternative at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 32 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Keith Aubrey.

RESPONSE: See Document 104.

504 33 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about temporary nature of jobs created in Washington.

RESPONSE: Peacekeeper Rail Garrison employment represents only one phase of ongoing Department of Defense programs. The national employment estimates should not necessarily be construed as new temporary positions but rather positions which would generally maintain existing employment levels in the potentially affected industries. Also see response to Document 270, Comment 11.

504 34 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about traffic on Interstate 90 in Washington which would double by the next ten years.

RESPONSE: Traffic along Interstate 90, without the program, is not expected to double in the next ten years. Impacts on transportation at Fairchild AFB are described in EIS Section 4.6.3.3.
ISSUE: What is an explosive safety zone and why is it needed? What is the chance of explosion and what damage will be caused inside and outside of the zone?

RESPONSE: As a general precaution at all Air Force bases, explosive safety zones provide safe distance between places where explosives (including rocket propellants) are stored or processed and other specified locations, such as inhabited buildings, public traffic routes, recreational areas, utilities, petroleum storage facilities, and storage or processing facilities for other explosives. Also see EIS Sections 5.1.1.1, 5.3 and 5.4.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the MX test firing (two of three did not work) shows that the program would be a waste of taxpayer's money.

RESPONSE: There have been 17 successful launches of the Peacekeeper missile and all 17 have performed beyond expectations.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The public hearing should have been held in Spokane, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: Commentor thinks more alternatives than the given ones should have been studied (i.e., less missiles, fewer sites).

RESPONSE: Impacts of these alternatives would not be greater than the Proposed or Alternative Actions.

ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with the positive economic effects at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: By placing these missiles at Fairchild AFB, Washington you are inviting Spokane as a targeted area in the rail system.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will there be efforts to prevent sabotage of Highbridge preventing deployment?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: Commentor favors the No Action Alternative at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What means will be taken to provide protection for the MX missiles at Fairchild AFB, Washington?
RESPONSE: The protection will be very similar to that now afforded to strategic weapons stored in the weapons storage area onbase, specifically, the dual fence line will be extended to encompass the Rail Garrison and the security force that is on duty. This would not only provide coverage to the existing strategic weapons but also to the Rail Garrison.

ISSUE: How does the Air Force plan on protecting the miles and miles of rails that the trains carrying the MX missiles will travel on?

RESPONSE: No extraordinary action would take place. Random movement would make exact location very difficult to predict.

ISSUE: Commentor questions the psychological harm in knowing Washington state is a number one target.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: Will there be another document discussing the psychological harm of the Peacekeeper missiles?

RESPONSE: No.

ISSUE: Will the program scare away future private investment in Spokane, Washington?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 91.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the placement of MX missiles at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned that for every million dollars that goes into a military program there is a loss of jobs.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Which counties in Washington will people evacuate to in the event of a nuclear attack?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about sabotage on the rail lines, especially during a national crisis.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: The number one fear of children in adolescence is a nuclear war.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

ISSUE: A nuclear attack upon Spokane, Washington could disrupt the Spokane Aquifer which is the city's sole source of water supply.
RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 55 ISSUE: Would civilians or military be driving the trains?
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 15, Comments 4 and 5.

504 56 ISSUE: Periodic drug testing has failed in the past. What exactly do you mean by periodic drug testing?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 4.

504 57 ISSUE: How will the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program affect toxic waste cleanup at Fairchild AFB, Washington?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 482, Comment 3.

504 58 ISSUE: In commentor's opinion, Fairchild AFB, Washington is already a disarmed target.
RESPONSE: Issues of enemy targeting are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 59 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about drugs and alcohol in our environment. Requests that there be mandatory testing.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 15, Comment 4.

504 60 ISSUE: What is the impact of having these missiles in our community right in our midst? It puts Washington as a target.
RESPONSE: Environmental impacts to the region around Fairchild AFB are described in Section 4.6 of the EIS. The issue of being a target is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 61 ISSUE: What evidence do we have that somebody is getting ready to attack us and that we need to have these things here so that we can attack back or attack first?
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy and enemy threat are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 62 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Al Mangan.
RESPONSE: See Document 482.

504 63 ISSUE: Additional and precise information on the amount and type of toxic waste that would be brought into our area by having the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program based at Fairchild AFB, Washington should be provided.
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 68 and Document 50, Comment 30.

504 64 ISSUE: Money spent on other than the military would produce more jobs.
RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

504 65 ISSUE: Commentor offended by the name "Peacekeeper."

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

504 66 ISSUE: The EIS has not addressed the environmental concerns if these weapons are ever used.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 67 ISSUE: Concerned that Washington will become a police state because of the increased civil strife and the large number of security personnel employed to protect the weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 7.

504 68 ISSUE: Commentor in favor of the No Action Alternative.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 69 ISSUE: The MX is a first-strike weapon.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 70 ISSUE: Commentor feels a decision on location of the MX should not be influenced by job creation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 71 ISSUE: The same amount of money will produce many more jobs in the private sector. This needs to be addressed.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

504 72 ISSUE: The EIS should address the negative impacts on the poor.

RESPONSE: Impacts on the poor are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

504 73 ISSUE: All movement of the trains, whether training, maintenance, or operational could make Spokane, Washington subject to massive attack. Populated or agricultural areas should be avoided.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 74 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about sabotage.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

504 75 ISSUE: Commentor recommends the No Action Alternative at Fairchild AFB, Washington.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 76 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the rail lines in Colville, Washington are not in very good shape and that train derailments do and will occur.

RESPONSE: A discussion of the likelihood of a rail accident is discussed in EIS Chapter 5. Also see responses to Document 15, Comment 3 and Document 24, Comment 2.

504 77 ISSUE: Commentor does not believe that military spending is good for the economics of the community or country. Thinks that missiles for money and jobs are not a good reason for them to be deployed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 78 ISSUE: An alternative investment of money scenario should be discussed along with a cumulative discussion of all military programs in the community rather than incremental for each new system.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

504 79 ISSUE: It is a financial burden to the cities and counties where arrests to protestors are made.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 10.

504 80 ISSUE: Commentor upset that one third of the time at the public hearing was used for Air Force presentation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 39, Comment 1.

504 81 ISSUE: The EIS should address the vulnerability of track damage and derailment using information currently available concerning derailments in the United States.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 2.

504 82 ISSUE: The EIS should discuss the disruption and expense caused by "people of conscience" occupying the tracks.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 10.

504 83 ISSUE: How many weapons do we need for deterrence?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 84 ISSUE: The EIS should address the impact of missile propellant explosions in rural areas as well as urban areas.

RESPONSE: The impact of missile propellant explosions is addressed in Sections 5.3.1.4 and 5.4 of the EIS.

504 85 ISSUE: What is the probability of an action or accident between armed security personnel and civilians?
ISSUE: Wartime effects and impacts on arms control should be discussed in the EIS.

RESPONSE: These issues are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor requests that the No Action Alternative at Fairchild AFB, Washington be taken.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: How many of the 26.5 acres of wetlands in Washington will be disturbed by the nonprogram-related relocation of the Survival School?

RESPONSE: The Air Training Command Survival School will be relocated to an area south of the Fairchild AFB flightline (see EIS Figure 4.6-1). The area that would be affected consists of agricultural land and mixed grass-shrub. No wetland areas will be affected by this relocation (see EIS Section 4.6.6.2, Figure 4.6.6-1 and Section 4.6.6.3).

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Honorable Al Ogdon.

RESPONSE: See Document 62.

ISSUE: The EIS is not complete because it does not follow the definition of environment.

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.2.

ISSUE: Commentor is offended that the Peacekeeper is looked at as a deterrent when it really comes down to a show of force.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program because the missile is vulnerable.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Money spent on the program is a waste and makes Spokane, Washington a number one target.

RESPONSE: These issues are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the effects of the program on the aquifer in Spokane, Washington.

RESPONSE: The City of Spokane relies on the Spokane Aquifer for its entire water supply and the aquifer has been designated as a sole source...
aquifer by the Environmental Protection Agency. The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is projected to have minimal effects upon this aquifer (see EIS Sections 4.6.7.2 and 4.6.7.3).

504 96 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that the air quality of Spokane, Washington has never been able to meet its standards.

RESPONSE: Although the City of Spokane is designated as a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide (CO) and particulates, Fairchild AFB is classified as attainment for these pollutants as well as for all the other criteria pollutants. The emissions emitted from the Proposed Action, both during the construction and operations phases, will cause negligible impacts on the air quality in the City of Spokane and in Spokane County. The total particulate burden in Spokane County would temporarily increase only two percent during the construction phase while CO burden increase would be about 0.1 percent. During the operations phase, the particulate burden would return to near the same level that existed prior to the construction phase, and the CO burden increase would remain near the 0.1-percent level (see EIS Section 4.6.9).

504 97 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program at Fairchild AFB, Washington.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 98 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the environmental impact upon fields, wetlands, and all that dwells there, especially the humans.

RESPONSE: Noted.

504 99 ISSUE: Commentor feels Spokane, Washington will be a first-strike target. We are being held hostage by our enemies.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

504 100 ISSUE: A psychological and spiritual study of effects on parents and children should be done.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

504 101 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by David Carroll.

RESPONSE: See Document 364.

505 1 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 2 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 3 ISSUE: Commentor feels beneficial effects at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota might be greater than the Draft EIS indicates.
505 4 ISSUE: Resolution in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 5 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by James Earl.

RESPONSE: See Document 96.

505 6 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 7 ISSUE: Resolution in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 8 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by the Honorable Raymond Trosen.

RESPONSE: See Document 314.

505 9 ISSUE: How many accidents have occurred in the last 15 years concerning missiles that use liquid fuel? What can be done to contain such a fire and what is the effect of the toxic fumes generated by the fire?

RESPONSE: See EIS Chapter 5.

505 10 ISSUE: What effects do hydrogen-chloride and hydrogen-oxide have on the human body?

RESPONSE: A discussion of the human health effects of hydrogen-chloride and nitrogen-oxide can be found in EIS Section 5.4.

505 11 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Frank Coe.

RESPONSE: See Document 225.

505 12 ISSUE: Resolution in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 13 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 14 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 15 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the MX missile.
ISSUE: The jobs created by the program in Grand Forks, North Dakota are not permanent. The program expected lifetime is 20 years. At the end of 20 years, the program could be abandoned.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with population projections and subsequent housing analysis.

RESPONSE: Population projections are from the North Dakota Census Data Center, Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota. They were deemed the best available and were updated to reflect recent information. Based upon these projections, no shortages in the general housing market were projected. EIS Section 4.7.1.3 indicates, however, that increases in competition for low-cost housing are expected and might result in the use of substandard units.

ISSUE: The costs of the modified or eliminated program at Grand Forks, North Dakota should be discussed in the EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because the economic benefits are not worth it.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Resolution in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Lonny Winrich.

RESPONSE: See Document 316.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS adequately discusses impacts and Grand Forks, North Dakota can accommodate any program-related growth.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 26 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the MX Rail Garrison system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 27 ISSUE: Grand Forks, North Dakota is an ideal location for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 28 ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with the conclusion of negligible cultural impacts at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota particularly with regard to railroad spurs being located near or in the very area where some burial sites have been discovered.

RESPONSE: Construction of a possible second rail egress is not a part of the Proposed or Alternative Actions, and was not analyzed in detail. EIS Section 4.7.14 is intended simply to identify major concerns requiring further analysis should a second rail line be considered in the future. In that event, detailed archaeological studies would be conducted and important sites avoided to the extent possible through program redesign. Because this is a site-specific EIS, impact assessments refer to those particular locations that would be affected by Rail Garrison facilities.

Archaeologists from the University of North Dakota conducted survey and testing in the proposed impact areas at the base. Only two sites were identified and neither qualify as historically important according to National Register of Historic Places criteria. Site importance is evaluated in relation to this specific set of criteria established by law, and in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer.

505 29 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 30 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Martin Zeilig.

RESPONSE: See Document 317.

505 31 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 32 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ronnie Diane Rosenberg.

RESPONSE: See Document 315.

505 33 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 34 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 35 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 36 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program because it is not morally justified, is vulnerable to attack, is a first-strike weapon, and affects the psychological well-being of the young.

RESPONSE: These issues are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1 and Document 5, Comment 14.

505 37 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 38 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Curtis Stofferahn.

RESPONSE: See Document 318.

505 39 ISSUE: Commentor disagrees with the current United States military policy.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 40 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota because the economic advantages are not worth it.

RESPONSE: Noted.

505 41 ISSUE: Commentor questions the quality of life in Grand Forks, North Dakota because of increased importance as a target for nuclear attack.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 42 ISSUE: Human resources could be used to better the community instead of increasing the nuclear arms race.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 43 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505 44 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Richard Frank.

RESPONSE: See Document 319.

505 45 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ronnie Rosenberg.

RESPONSE: See Document 315.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the weapons system because of morality, feasibility, and what will happen strategically if it is deployed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor questions the possible detonation or explosion of nuclear weapons during the time of dispersal on the rail lines of the MX missiles.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 45.

ISSUE: Are there test data available to show that a nuclear detonation cannot occur in an accident scenario?

RESPONSE: The nuclear system certification process described in EIS Section 5.1.1 provides the data that demonstrates that a nuclear detonation is virtually impossible. In addition, see the Department of Energy EISs referred to in EIS Section 5.

ISSUE: If one warhead is detonated, would the other 19 on the train be detonated?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 45.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: By putting these missiles on rails, you are escalating the chance of a first strike.

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Who is going to pay for the impact of Grand Forks, North Dakota
when the Air Force moves the people out and those jobs evaporate?

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

505  57  **ISSUE:** The money would be better spent on other services.

**RESPONSE:** The issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

505  58  **ISSUE:** Public hearing comment by Al Hermondson.

**RESPONSE:** See Document 337.

505  59  **ISSUE:** Public hearing comment by Virginia Miller.

**RESPONSE:** See Document 311.

505  60  **ISSUE:** Commentor questions safety section conclusions.

**RESPONSE:** The commentor's concern is noted. The conclusions in the Safety section were based on the most current information available, years of experience in weapon development and deployment, and an exhaustive study by highly qualified researchers. Barring specific comments on any of these areas, a more specific reply cannot be provided.

505  61  **ISSUE:** Military spending would be better used on community services.

**RESPONSE:** Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

505  62  **ISSUE:** Canadians need to have a say in what happens near their border. Also need a discussion of the environmental impact of a Soviet nuclear strike on the MX missiles and how Canada would be impacted.

**RESPONSE:** The President and Congress will make the final decision on deployment of the system. Issues of environmental impact of a nuclear strike are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505  63  **ISSUE:** Storing several nuclear warheads in the railroad garrison all in one place seems a very unsafe and destabilizing proposal. Does not this grouping of missiles in trains make us an easy, first-rate target?

**RESPONSE:** Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

505  64  **ISSUE:** More research should be done for another system that will not cause any community to become such a primary target.

**RESPONSE:** This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506  1  **ISSUE:** Public hearing comment by the Honorable Doug Wood.

**RESPONSE:** See Document 219.

506  2  **ISSUE:** The people of north Pulaski County give unqualified support of
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 14 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Jerry Halsell.
RESPONSE: See Document 397.

506 15 ISSUE: Will any security commander or subordinate have the power to automatically detain or search persons found on the railroad rights-of-way as may be done on military reservations?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 12.

506 16 ISSUE: Will homes and properties immediately adjacent to the rights-of-way be subject to unannounced searches and/or systematic observation?
RESPONSE: No.

506 17 ISSUE: Will plainclothes or secret agents be stationed in towns, villages, or at other intervals along MX rail lines for security purposes?
RESPONSE: No.

506 18 ISSUE: Will persons living near the MX routes be advised that their activities are subject to systematic monitoring?
RESPONSE: They will not be subjected to systematic monitoring.

506 19 ISSUE: Will deployment of the MX result in the establishment of a network of secret police across the dispersal area?
RESPONSE: No network of secret police will be established.

506 20 ISSUE: Will there be Congressional oversight of this security network?
RESPONSE: No network of secret police will be established.

506 21 ISSUE: Is it reasonable to ask citizens to allow the formation and widespread deployment of another secret security organization?
RESPONSE: No network of secret police will be established.

506 22 ISSUE: To what uses, other than the MX railway security, will the security network be utilized?
RESPONSE: No network of secret police will be established.

506 23 ISSUE: What additional security measures will be taken to prevent sabotage or acts of terrorism? What is the environmental impact of the above safeguards?
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 7 and 21.

506 24 ISSUE: The No Action Alternative has not been properly considered in terms of economic impacts.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 31.
ISSUE: How many jobs would be created if $10 to $15 billion were spent on education instead of the military?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 366, Comment 7.

ISSUE: Why haven't other MX basing modes been considered?
RESPONSE: Comparison of basing modes is beyond the scope of this EIS.

ISSUE: Why hasn't a discussion of MX deletion been considered?
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 5, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Descriptions in the Proposed Action fail to specify whether missiles are the ones currently in silos.
RESPONSE: The Proposed Action assumes 50 new missiles.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to any kind of nuclear weapon.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What would be the effect on groundwater if an accident in northern Arkansas caused seepage of propellants?
RESPONSE: The missile solid propellants are relatively insoluble in water and do not pose any threat to the water supplies. The liquid propellants are quite volatile and reactive so they would evaporate or react with plants, soil and other substances rather than seep into the water supply. The consequences of propellant releases are described in Section 5.4 of the EIS.

ISSUE: Would missiles used be those currently in silos at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming? If new missiles are involved, why aren't costs included for their manufacture? If missiles are taken from silos, why is loss of silo jobs not taken into consideration?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 390, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The railroad system should be preserved for transportation, not a toy for the military.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The Proposed Action fails to specify whether missiles are to be removed from silos and what impact the removal would have on the Alternative Action.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 404, Comment 21.

ISSUE: Since current weapons would endure a Soviet surprise attack with enough weaponry to retaliate, doesn't this constitute "sufficient military strength?"
RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.
506 35 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 36 ISSUE: What dangers are posed to civilians living or traveling near tracks who might be misidentified as a threat to trains? Will personnel be authorized to use force? Will trains be authorized to run over protestors?

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 12 and Document 366, Comment 21.

506 37 ISSUE: What is the purpose of the 400-foot-long attached shelter and the attached supplemental railcars? Is their cost included in the discussion?

RESPONSE: The attached shelter will be used to house any supplemental rail cars which may be used. The cost is included in the cost estimates of the program described in EIS Section 4.1.1.

506 38 ISSUE: Is the purchase price of the supplemental rail cars included in the overall cost estimates of the program?

RESPONSE: Yes.

506 39 ISSUE: How many cars will fit into the shelter? Will supplemental cars be too great in number?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 473, Comment 23.

506 40 ISSUE: The dollars to be spent in the Draft EIS are in 1986 dollars. Will this be updated?

RESPONSE: The most recent economic series data available are for the year 1986, therefore, all estimates are presented in constant 1986 dollars.

506 41 ISSUE: Why should the public believe this MX program is conducted more safely than prior MX programs? Why are trains tested but missiles are not?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 473, Comment 15.

506 42 ISSUE: Homebuilders Association of greater Little Rock, Arkansas supports missile deployment in Arkansas.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 43 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Bill Gwatney.

RESPONSE: See Document 396.

506 44 ISSUE: Chamber of Commerce in Jacksonville, Arkansas supports deployment of the MX at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas because it is needed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 45 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Fred Deveau.
506 46 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by John Ball.
RESPONSE: See Document 481.

506 47 ISSUE: How much destruction can ten warheads cause?
RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 48 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Elizabeth DeVeau.
RESPONSE: See Document 50.

506 49 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the Rail Garrison system.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 50 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ralph Desmarais.
RESPONSE: See Document 87.

506 51 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Trusten Holden.
RESPONSE: See Document 400.

506 52 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ruth Bell.
RESPONSE: See Document 401.

506 53 ISSUE: Commentor requests that surface water quality in Arkansas be addressed in case of an accident.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 401, Comment 4.

506 54 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the MX missile system.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 55 ISSUE: Will civil dispatchers be required to submit to security clearance, random drug testing, and medical and psychological screening? Would measures be taken to make sure dispatchers show up in a crisis situation?
RESPONSE: This is still to be determined between the Air Force and the railroads. Operational procedures having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

506 56 ISSUE: What indicators were used to generate employment figures? EIS Table 4.1.1-1 figures are in error because of lack of fluctuation in the jobs/billion ratio obtained by dividing employment by actual dollars spent.
RESPONSE: National employment effects were estimated using a national input-output model developed by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. The minor fluctuations in jobs/billion ratio stems from the fact that only a few industry sectors would receive the majority of the economic stimulus.
ISSUE: Commentor opposed to nuclear weapons and money being used to support a military/industrial complex.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the MX missile system.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor not opposed to national security but is opposed to the MX missile.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What is peacetime? What sort of threat will no longer be peacetime? How many miles away will it be before there is a direct threat?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 454, Comment 3.

ISSUE: What is national need?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 98.

ISSUE: What were the chances of explosion for the Titan?
RESPONSE: Chances of explosion on Titan missiles is not in the scope of this document. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 34.

ISSUE: What will the net positive effect of short-term jobs be on Jacksonville, Arkansas or the nation as a whole?
RESPONSE: Some of the program-related jobs (especially direct construction jobs) will be of short duration. The economic effects of this program would be to employ workers and material that may have otherwise been unused or underutilized. This would create jobs, income, and spending in the affected area.

ISSUE: How extensive will the "off limits" perimeter be?
RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 22

ISSUE: Will the Air Force be required to fire on anyone near the tracks as the MX railcars pass?
RESPONSE: No.

ISSUE: Will landowners adjacent to the tracks be required to remove trees and other things that might provide cover for attackers?
RESPONSE: No. Railway rights-of-way are the responsibility of individual railroad companies. The security provisions for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system will not cause disruption of the lives of those living near the garrisons or the rail lines that the system might use.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Gerry Getty.
RESPONSE: See Document 89.

506 68 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Catherine Markey.

RESPONSE: See Document 232.

506 69 ISSUE: How do you know the trains leaving sheds will not provoke a first strike by the Soviet Union?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 70 ISSUE: How will weight and length of the car affect rail or tire failure, excessive rocking, too high center of gravity, tipping and weight distribution, or flexing and turning radius?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

506 71 ISSUE: How easy is it for terrorists or attackers to identify these trains?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 72 ISSUE: Once the trains get rolling around, how do you call them back?

RESPONSE: During dispersal, the Peacekeeper trains would continue to operate on the national rail network until directed by a higher authority to return to the garrisons (see EIS Section 1.4.4).

506 73 ISSUE: Commentor requests that the Air Force clean up the Vertac site and Agent Orange storage before another mess is made.

RESPONSE: The issue of mitigation of prior incidents is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 74 ISSUE: The Final EIS should address the problem of passing this train through the Vertac site.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 506, Comment 73.

506 75 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the MX missile system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

506 76 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Emma Knight.

RESPONSE: See Document 382.

506 77 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the morals of the country.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 32, Comment 1.

506 78 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the MX system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
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ISSUE: The missile will not change much in the Great Falls, Montana area.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will the Air Force pay for the extra demands placed on our schools in Great Falls, Montana, our streets, and our county services?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 47.

ISSUE: If the President, Congress, and the Pentagon support this system deployment, so do I.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Is the quality of security force adequate at Malmstrom AFB, Montana?

RESPONSE: Yes.

ISSUE: Would construction resources such as gravel be adequate to withstand added demand?

RESPONSE: Studies have been conducted to identify aggregate resources and production rates for the area. It has been concluded that aggregate resources for the area exceed the demand of the proposed program and do not present any concern for local producers or anticipated demands.

ISSUE: This missile's very nature could be considered threatening to the Soviet Union which would initiate a first strike. Do we really need it at present? Do we need to spend money on this system that is already outdated and not needed?

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Are the people going to be made aware of expected train routes?

RESPONSE: No. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 29.

ISSUE: By "credible track" do you mean the rail is workable and operable?

RESPONSE: No reference to credible track could be found. A study made by the Federal Railroad Administration and the Association of American Railroads found most of the track in the national rail network suitable for our trains. Credible track is track with the physical characteristics necessary to permit unlimited movement of the Peacekeeper train during dispersed operations. Also see response to Document 24, Comment 2.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the national defense policy.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
507 11 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Paul Stephens.

RESPONSE: See Document 234.

507 12 ISSUE: Has removal of gravel been looked at in relation to what it will do to future generations?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 507, Comment 6.

507 13 ISSUE: Will public hearings be held in other areas besides Great Falls, Montana?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

507 14 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ray Jergeson.

RESPONSE: See Document 270.

507 15 ISSUE: The Draft EIS is not an objective analysis of impacts but an elaborate rationalization of decisions already made.

RESPONSE: The Draft EIS was prepared using the most recent data and appropriate scientific methodologies available, and was subject to vigorous review by experts in all environmental fields. The purpose of the document is to present an unbiased evaluation capable of withstanding close scrutiny and challenge.

507 16 ISSUE: Why was only one hearing held in Montana?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

507 17 ISSUE: Why is construction underway at Malmstrom AFB, Montana for the Midgetman launcher storage building and offices?

RESPONSE: Research and development is continuing on the ICBM. The facilities being constructed at Malmstrom AFB are for storage of the engineering test unit of the Small ICBM Hard Mobile Launcher.

507 18 ISSUE: The EIS tends to gloss over harmful impacts.

RESPONSE: Impacts of deploying the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison are discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIS.

507 19 ISSUE: Economic activity brought on by the project will increase national inflation. Diversion of program funds from private to governmental factors will weaken our economy and add to the national debt. Attracting new businesses and tourists will become harder for Great Falls, Montana as they become more dependent on the military economy and get a reputation of being in the missile business.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

507 20 ISSUE: An upgraded missile program would assist United States deterrent effort in maintaining a peaceful status.
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ISSUE: Have bases been prioritized as to which one gets the missiles first if the program is implemented?

RESPONSE: The bases have not been prioritized at this time.

ISSUE: Commentor will support the program at Malmstrom AFB, Montana if our elected officials decide to implement the program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: What is a credible accident?

RESPONSE: That term refers to accidents that have some chance, however remote, of occurring.

ISSUE: When there is land acquisition, does the "fair-market value" include the future value after the Air Force improves it with housing, for example?

RESPONSE: Local appraisers who are familiar with local realty conditions will calculate the fair market value of the land at the time of acquisition. The Air Force is required by law to offer the full value that the appraiser determines that property is worth. The proposed future use of the property to be acquired does not affect the fair market value at the time of acquisition.

ISSUE: Safety concerns during dismantling should be addressed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

ISSUE: The League of Women Voters does not support the MX program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Sabotage of rail lines is not adequately addressed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

ISSUE: Who is Tetra Tech, Inc.?

RESPONSE: Tetra Tech, Inc. is a major consulting firm with over two decades of experience in environmental and engineering programs for both the United States government and civilian-sector clients.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS did not consider comments made in the scoping hearing.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Allan Hahn.

RESPONSE: See Document 294.

ISSUE: What is the average speed of trains in the system? Is it integrated into an operational system of the line it is on?
RESPONSE: The train is capable of 55 to 60 mph, but the average speed during dispersal will be about 30 mph. Yes, it will be integrated into the commercial rail networks.

507 32 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 33 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to nuclear weapon technology.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 34 ISSUE: The Draft EIS failed to include a schedule of projected cost overruns, nor the cost of bombs.

RESPONSE: Issues of cost overruns and the cost of warheads are beyond the scope of this EIS. See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 35 ISSUE: How can the Air Force assess the reliability of the MX with no planned testing on the rail?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 118, Comment 1.

507 36 ISSUE: The existing Montana track is in deplorable condition. Weathering of the track has not been taken into consideration, nor has the vulnerability to sabotage.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 15, Comment 3 and Document 24, Comment 2.

507 37 ISSUE: Building a missile system does not promote peace or international stability.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 38 ISSUE: Commentor's opinion is that the MX missiles are bad business. It will turn Great Falls, Montana into a garrison town.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 39 ISSUE: Are there any provisions made to help defray the costs of transportation and jail problems?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 507, Comment 2.

507 40 ISSUE: In the south site option at Malmstrom AFB, Montana, the airstrip is located in an explosive safety zone. Is this wise?

RESPONSE: Explosive safety zones are established to preclude large numbers of people from gathering for long periods of time in areas where potential accidents could harm them. Short-term presence in the zones is permitted and involves negligible risk.

507 41 ISSUE: Will an internal power system be sufficient since Montana Power lines are not adequate to handle increased loads?
RESPONSE: At this time, Montana Power indicates that their lines will be adequate (see EIS Section 4.9.2).

507 42 ISSUE: Commentor hopes we can find a middleground of utilization of these monies for civilian purposes.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

507 43 ISSUE: National need can be redefined at any time by the Department of Defense.

RESPONSE: The President and Congress define national need. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 98.

507 44 ISSUE: Who owns Tetra Tech?

RESPONSE: Tetra Tech is an employee-owned company.

507 45 ISSUE: The Great Falls Chamber of Commerce supports the program at Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 46 ISSUE: Do the command, communication and control systems necessitated by Rail Garrison pose any type of threat to human health of Great Falls, Montana?

RESPONSE: Command and control communication systems will use existing technology. No threats to human health as a result of their use have been identified.

507 47 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about the effect of the dispersal of radiation of toxic substances, and is uneasy about living near a genuine hazard.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 68.

507 48 ISSUE: Commentor against nuclear war.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 49 ISSUE: Were current projects on Highway 87 taken into account when considering road congestion at Malmstrom AFB, Montana? Is the problem temporary or minimal?

RESPONSE: Current projects were taken into account during the analysis but temporary impacts may be felt during construction.

507 50 ISSUE: Who will have final review of the EIS? Will Congress and the administration have final say as to the approval and implementation of the program?

RESPONSE: The EIS will be reviewed by the President, Congress, and the Department of Defense. The purpose of this EIS is to provide an objective appraisal of the environmental impacts associated with deployment of the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. The findings of this EIS and other factors such as operational aspects, costs, and strategic posturing will be considered by the President and Congress in the decision-making process.

507 51 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 52 ISSUE: More hearings should have been held in Montana, in particular, Havre, or Shelby.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

507 53 ISSUE: Could the Soviet satellites see trains leaving their garrison?

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

507 54 ISSUE: How many different garrisons are proposed? How many trains are proposed for Great Falls, Montana.

RESPONSE: Malmstrom AFB and ten other locations are being considered. Up to four trains for the Proposed Action and up to six trains for the Alternative Action could be based at Great Falls.

507 55 ISSUE: How much time would the United States have to deploy the Rail Garrison if missiles were launched from shores outside Washington?

RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 56 ISSUE: Commentor feels the world is not a safer place because of nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

507 57 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

508 1 ISSUE: Commentor supports the program because the City of Minot, North Dakota has already negotiated the purchase of land necessary to deploy the garrison; the socioeconomic value of Rail Garrison far outweighs the loss of potential revenue from oil and gas leases; and the region has the necessary growth potential in land, housing, schools, and energy and water resources to absorb the program.

RESPONSE: Noted.

508 2 ISSUE: Commentor stated that Minot's current water supply is adequate to accommodate the proposed program. Small increases in water use would not interfere with existing major users.

RESPONSE: This is stated in EIS Section 4.10.7.3.
ISSUE: Minot, North Dakota's wastewater treatment plant is approaching capacity, but added flows should not overfill.

RESPONSE: A study prepared by the city evaluating potential improvements to the wastewater system is currently under review by the Minot City Council and will be reviewed by the state and the Environmental Protection Agency during the upcoming months. Final action by the city should provide additional capacity to process projected baseline flows.

ISSUE: Commentor stated that the added demand of less than one-tenth of one percent of the annual average flow of the Souris River in North Dakota would not degrade the baseline water quality.

RESPONSE: This is stated in EIS Section 4.10.7.3.

ISSUE: Commentor stated that the erosion and associated sediment transport to Egg Creek, North Dakota is expected to be limited and have only minor and intermittent effects on the water quality of the creek.

RESPONSE: This is stated in EIS Section 4.10.7.3.

ISSUE: The upgrading of 14 miles of existing railroad track would cause some sedimentation during infrequent periods of storm water runoff but when soil stabilization efforts have been in effect, the sedimentation would clear.

RESPONSE: This is stated in EIS Section 4.10.7.3.

ISSUE: Effects on groundwater quantity and quality are expected to be minor because the Minot, North Dakota aquifer has a natural recharge which is more than twice its anticipated baseline plus program pumpage.

RESPONSE: This is stated in EIS Section 4.10.7.3.

ISSUE: Commentor stated that the program would have positive economic impacts on the Minot, North Dakota area and would do no damage to the environment.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota due to economic activity it would maintain and because of strong patriotic population in the area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor stated that the local utility deems that the increase of three-tenths of one percent in 1992 would be no problem.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor stated that displacement of waterfowl and shorebirds is not a bad thing because it may improve overall health of species by placing it in a richer, better environment.
RESPONSE: Approximately 2.5 acres of prairie potholes would be destroyed by the program. These wetlands provide important habitat for waterfowl and shorebird. Loss of the prairie pothole would displace wildlife that is dependent upon these areas (see EIS Section 4.10.6.3).

ISSUE: Commentor stated that the destruction of naturally occurring plants and plant cover would be replaced after construction by more desirable cover such as grass, shrubbery, and trees.

RESPONSE: The majority of the area that would be affected has been previously disturbed or used for agricultural purposes. Approximately 46 acres of natural habitat would be disturbed by the program.

ISSUE: Commentor supported the program because of the creation of 419 new jobs and increase in personal income. Also stated that construction industry would be able to handle construction requirements of the program.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota because of the socioeconomic benefits, increased employment, and plans to award small contracts to enable local firms to bid.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Steve Sydness.


ISSUE: Commentor stated that statistics quoted in the Draft EIS on safety and railroads in regards to railroad collisions are probably not very applicable to North Dakota because they have not had an accident since he has been working on the railroad.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 24, Comment 2.

ISSUE: Commentor supported the program because of the amount of jobs in Minot, North Dakota that are going to be created.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota because the MX is safe and environmentally sound. The city and the base have a good working relationship.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Gary Wickre.

RESPONSE: See Document 252.
ISSUE: Commentor opposed to nuclear arms.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Art Ekblad.
RESPONSE: See Document 257.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The notice for the hearing fails to conform to Air Force, Department of Defense Regulations, Section 989.15, subsection B(2). The Draft EIS is not widely available in libraries of surrounding communities; public hearings are not being held in sufficient number of locations; and three-hour public hearings are not sufficient.
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 34, Comments 9 and 11 and Document 315, Comments 1 and 2.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to adequately present the alternatives, including the No Action Alternative.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 15.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS must consider the extent to which the proposal is controversial.
RESPONSE: Controversy involves disagreement among recognized professionals over environmental impacts or assessment methods. Possible controversy over the purpose, need, or desirability of this program was not considered in the evaluation of the significant impact.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to address the degree to which the action establishes a precedent for future actions.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 315, Comment 12.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS for Minot, North Dakota fails to consider whether the overall unemployment rate for the area would increase for 1993 and thereafter.
RESPONSE: EIS Section 4.10.1.3 has been revised to incorporate program-induced changes in unemployment rates.

ISSUE: Commentor against the program because money to be used for MX could be used for other better programs, the MX is a "peace polluter," and pollutes the political process.
RESPONSE: These issues are beyond the scope of this EIS. See responses to Document 3, Comment 1 and Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the EIS.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Commentor in support of the EIS.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor supports the program and raised the question on whether impacts to local surrounding towns such as Glenburn and Mohall, North Dakota were covered in the EIS.

RESPONSE: In the socioeconomic study, a five-county area with the primary county (Ward) was looked at. The other counties looked at included Bottineau, McHenry, McLean and Renville. Those counties were evaluated individually, but no specific cities within them were included in the evaluation. Only those cities where a majority of the program-related immigration would occur were considered. Glenfall and Mohall are not expected to receive an appreciable number of inmigrants.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Brenda Mattson.


ISSUE: The entire handling of the section on wildlife (Draft EIS Page 4.10-24) is not very clear. The language is unclear as to how the species would be affected, by what means, and whether any measures to mitigate were considered.

RESPONSE: EIS Section 4.10.6.3 has been revised.

ISSUE: Draft EIS Section 4.10.2.2 on wastewater is inadequate.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 508, Comment 3.

ISSUE: Draft EIS Section 4.10.5.2 on prehistoric and historic resources is inadequate and unclear.

RESPONSE: The discussion of prehistoric and historic resources (EIS Section 4.10.5.2) has been revised to reflect the results of field studies in the specific areas which would be affected by Rail Garrison facilities. Archaeologists from the University of North Dakota conducted a survey and testing in the proposed impact areas. No historically important sites were identified. Site importance is evaluated according to criteria, set out in the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations (36 CFR 60.4), and in consultation with the North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office.

ISSUE: The Draft EIS fails to consider the extent to which military personnel and dependents make the economy of Minot, North Dakota dependent on federal dollars and vulnerable in the event of military defense cutbacks.

RESPONSE: Economic dependence on the military is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Why was the Draft EIS prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. which until earlier this year, was a subsidiary of Honeywell, a major defense contractor?
RESPONSE: Tetra Tech provided a disclosure statement to the Air Force due to concern regarding its association with Honeywell. Honeywell no longer owns Tetra Tech thus the statement verified the separation of Honeywell from Tetra Tech management, which satisfied the Air Force.

508 39 ISSUE: The Draft EIS must be expanded to address concerns raised at the hearing. Additional public hearings must be held after the revised EIS is prepared. The public must be given full and fair opportunity to be heard.

RESPONSE: The issuance of a supplemental Draft EIS is only warranted when there are substantial changes to the program and/or to the conclusions of the document. The Final EIS does address concerns raised at the public hearings. Therefore, a revised Draft EIS will not be prepared and no additional public hearings will be held.

508 40 ISSUE: Commentor against the Rail Garrison program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

508 41 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

508 42 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota because of increased employment, enhancement of an already good rail transportation system, and interruptions to rail traffic would not be a problem.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

508 43 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

508 44 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program to be deployed in Minot AFB, North Dakota because the city can handle or meet program requirements.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

508 45 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Charles Hoffman.

RESPONSE: See Document 306.

508 46 ISSUE: Commentor against the Rail Garrison system but if the system is deployed it might as well be in Minot, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

508 47 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the findings of the Draft EIS for Minot AFB, North Dakota and the program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
ISSUE: Section 4.10.7 of the Draft EIS which says that 829 housing units are available, is short now. It should be 1,000 because the community lost the 5th Fighter.

RESPONSE: Available housing unit estimates include effects of the loss of the 5th Fighter Squadron.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Neal Ruedisili.

RESPONSE: See Document 391.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Earl Allen.

RESPONSE: See Document 411.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Mike Fedorchak.

RESPONSE: See Document 253.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Al Hermondson.

RESPONSE: See Document 337.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Minot AFB, North Dakota because it is for the defense and security of this state and nation, because impacts to the area are within acceptable limits, and because the area is receptive and able to accommodate the program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Have there been any environmental restrictions by state and local law or regulations as per Draft EIS Page 4.0-2 incurred that would discourage the Air Force from coming to Minot AFB, North Dakota?

RESPONSE: The Air Force will comply with legally applicable environmental restrictions of state and local laws and regulations (see EIS Chapter 4).

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by the Honorable Edwin Denman.

RESPONSE: See Document 66.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by the Honorable Ben Mangina.

RESPONSE: See Document 71.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by the Honorable Woodrow Kurth.

RESPONSE: See Document 55.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ray Maring.
RESPONSE: See Document 70.

509 5 ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri.
RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 6 ISSUE: Addition of half a section of land to Whiteman AFB, Missouri for the Rail Garrison would be an asset to the area.
RESPONSE: Noted.

509 7 ISSUE: Kaysinger Basin Regional Planning Commission in Clinton, Missouri feels statistical impact on Whiteman AFB would not be any different except the new rail spur might slightly affect a few households.
RESPONSE: Impacts on land use at Whiteman AFB are discussed in EIS Section 4.4.4.3.

509 8 ISSUE: Noise levels would not increase normal levels at Whiteman AFB, Missouri.
RESPONSE: Impacts on noise associated with deployment of the proposed program at Whiteman AFB are discussed in EIS Section 4.11.10.3.

509 9 ISSUE: Since rail traffic on the Katy line is decreasing, added Rail Garrison traffic would not increase existing traffic at Whiteman AFB, Missouri.
RESPONSE: Noted.

509 10 ISSUE: Local archaeologist says there should be no archaeological sites of any significance near the rail spur.
RESPONSE: The impressions of professional researchers familiar with the region may be useful as background information. However, reliance on that sort of information does not fulfill the Air Force's legal obligation to "identify and evaluate" resources that could be affected by the proposed program. When project areas are relatively small, or when precise resource locations are required for planning, field studies are normally the preferred approach. Field surveys at Whiteman AFB identified eight historic sites in proposed impact areas. As required by law, the sites were evaluated according to National Register of Historic Places criteria and none were found to be historically important. These findings have been submitted to the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office to obtain the necessary concurrence.

509 11 ISSUE: Black-tail rabbit is found in the vicinity but railroad rights-of-way should provide excellent habitat for this Missouri listed rare species.
RESPONSE: See EIS Section 4.11.6.2. The black-tailed jackrabbit is known to occur on Whiteman AFB. Railroad rights-of-way may inadvertently preserve native habitat for a number of plants and animals, including the black-tailed jackrabbit.

509 12 ISSUE: The southeast corner of Whiteman AFB, Missouri is presently not being used by prairie chicken, however, railroad rights-of-way would be excellent habitat, should they return.
RESPONSE: Noted.

509 13 ISSUE: Nothing indicates any natural prairie plant remnants are in the particular Whiteman AFB, Missouri area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

509 14 ISSUE: There may be some incidence of summer gray bats in standing dead timber, but there have been no sightings in the Whiteman AFB, Missouri area.

RESPONSE: Consultation with experts from local natural resource agencies and results of field surveys conducted during 1988 did not indicate occurrence of this species in the project area (see EIS Section 4.11.6.2).

509 15 ISSUE: Was the B-2 bomber coming to Whiteman AFB, Missouri ever considered?

RESPONSE: Deployment of the B-2 bomber mission at Whiteman AFB is considered in the baseline analysis (see EIS Sections 1.8.2 and 4.11).

509 16 ISSUE: The EIS should cover impacts on a national scale.

RESPONSE: Nationwide impacts on the national economy and railroads are discussed in Section 4.1 of the EIS.

509 17 ISSUE: You will be able to tell the missile cars from commercial cars because they are so large.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74 and EIS Section 1.3.

509 18 ISSUE: Commentor asks how people will feel when a train rolls out; if they will think its the "real thing."

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

509 19 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Phillip McNally.

RESPONSE: See Document 65.

509 20 ISSUE: Commentor in favor of the Rail Garrison because it is well worth the small risk involved.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 21 ISSUE: Commentor questions whether figures given by the Federal Railroad Administration were for the piece of rail in question in the Whiteman AFB, Missouri area.

RESPONSE: Data on railroad capabilities, conditions, utilization, and safety were provided for all railways in the United States. Also see response to Document 24, Comment 2.
ISSUE: The Air Force should be concerned that although there is not much of an impact on Johnson County, Missouri, the county may secede from the union as the third largest nuclear power.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 15, Comment 3 and Document 24, Comment 2.

ISSUE: Missouri has an inadequate rail system.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 15, Comment 3 and Document 24, Comment 2.

ISSUE: More hearings along the train route should be held.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Gregg Lombardi.

RESPONSE: See Document 287.

ISSUE: The Air Force should consider the future of the race and think twice about children.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by John Klotz.

RESPONSE: See Document 57.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of basing Rail Garrison at Whiteman AFB, Missouri.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Describe the length and weight of the rail car carrying the missile.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.

ISSUE: The church teaches it is immoral to threaten the lives of other human beings and commentor feels MX Rail Garrison does this and is wrong.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Lynn Harmon.

RESPONSE: See Document 53.

ISSUE: The scope of the EIS is too narrow; it should include train routes and the impact of nuclear war.

RESPONSE: The issue of nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see responses to Document 33, Comments 29.

ISSUE: There is no empirical evidence to support the impact of any kind of accident in Missouri with these trains.
RESPONSE: Noted.

509 34 ISSUE: Was there contingency plans for: the fuel plant in Nevada that exploded or the Titan II explosion in Arkansas?

RESPONSE: The Air Force has had nuclear weapon system emergency plans and general disaster plans since the early days of nuclear weapon system deployment. The Titan II accident was managed in accordance with these plans. The Nevada fuel plant accident was handled by local, civilian emergency responders. The nature of their accident planning is beyond the scope of this EIS.

509 35 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Karen Prins.

RESPONSE: See Document 82.

509 36 ISSUE: How many people will be employed to maintain security?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 28.

509 37 ISSUE: Will trained security personnel have the right to detain and search anybody, such as hunters and fishermen, as they approach the track at Air Force installations?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 12.

509 38 ISSUE: Local law enforcement agencies will get no extra power to protect this system and will be using county money to remove protestors on the tracks. Local law enforcement officers will get the worst job out of all this.

RESPONSE: All required security for the system will be provided by the Air Force. The Air Force will work with local authorities to minimize potential civil disturbances.

509 39 ISSUE: Commentor feels the Air Force has kept faith with the people of Missouri by keeping the missile sites as low-keyed as possible. Based on Whiteman AFB's past performance, the Rail Garrison will be a safe system.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 40 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Helen Burnham.

RESPONSE: See Document 494.

509 41 ISSUE: Commentor welcomes the Peacekeeper to the Whiteman AFB, Missouri area. It has a positive economic impact and minimal or no environmental impacts.

RESPONSE: Noted.

509 42 ISSUE: What are the dimensions of the rail car?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 74.
ISSUE: The Draft EIS was not available soon enough for concerned citizens to review.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Naming the MX missile Peacekeeper is a big lie.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The MX is a war starter missile. It is designed and planned to deploy in a first-strike mode. It is a weapon intended to start a nuclear war. The missile already deployed in Wyoming cannot survive a first strike back to the Soviets, therefore they must launch very early.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Will having approximately 40 very accurate hydrogen bombs on rail cars within two city blocks in the Oscoda, Michigan area tempt the Soviets or other adversaries to launch an attack on that spot early during the crisis.

RESPONSE: Issues of national security are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: The secondary effects of a missile train accident involving a tanker truck carrying hazardous materials must be addressed.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 404, Comment 11.

ISSUE: The hearings were designed to give those people with a vested interest more opportunities to speak than those against the action.

RESPONSE: At the hearing for Whiteman AFB, Missouri, there were five elected officials who represented the most people and were allowed to speak first. The balance of the speakers were randomly selected. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: The use of the word "Peacekeeper" for the name of a missile gives a pleasant meaning to an unpleasant reality. This name indicates the Air Force is trying to persuade the public of something they want to do.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 37, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Meetings were held for a few people in a small area when all the people of Missouri and the nation should be heard.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: The public has a much larger interest than the many unending technicalities that are raised in this report, such as the impacts of nuclear war.

RESPONSE: The issue of impacts due to nuclear war is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor quotes the Union of Concerned Scientists who say the MX missile is extremely destabilizing and could be perceived by the Soviets as provocative, therefore exacerbating the crisis.
RESPONSE: This issue is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 53 ISSUE: Commentor quotes the Union of Concerned Scientists who claims the MX missile is a waste of taxpayers' money since the United States already possesses sufficient nuclear deterrence.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

509 54 ISSUE: Commentor quotes statement by the Union of Concerned Scientists saying the new rail basing mode is vulnerable to attack since it takes up to 6 hours to disperse the trains from garrisons and Soviet missile can reach American soil in 30 minutes.

RESPONSE: Operational details having no environmental impact are beyond the scope of this EIS.

509 55 ISSUE: Commentor quotes the Union of Concerned Scientists statement saying the vulnerable MX basing mode increases America's incentive to strike early; it is a first-strike weapon and is therefore directly contrary to the United States' negotiating position in the strategic arms reduction treaty.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 56 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by James Jones.

RESPONSE: See Document 39.

509 57 ISSUE: Facts, details, and specifics of the trains should be included in the EIS.

RESPONSE: See EIS Section 1.3.2. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 74.

509 58 ISSUE: Commentor concerned that while deployment of the missile is said to bring economic growth to Johnson and Pettis counties, Missouri, it would not affect unemployment rates in the area but personal incomes will rise. This means that those which already have will get more, while displaced farmers and unemployed workers would continue on the road to chronic poverty.

RESPONSE: The construction phase of the program would create between 700 and 800 civilian jobs over a three year period decreasing unemployment by about 0.1 percent. Since most of the operational jobs are military, the local effect will be minimal (see EIS Section 4.1.1.3).

509 59 ISSUE: It's time the government played its rightful role by investing in the strength of the people instead of wasting money on weapons systems we don't need.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.
509  60  ISSUE: The few jobs created during peak construction are for a very short
time, then drop off sharply.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 270, Comment 11.

509  61  ISSUE: Why do we continue to produce nuclear waste before we know how
to dispose of it?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 2.

509  62  ISSUE: Commentor read a first-hand account of the aftermath of
Nagasaki and commented that it was not his will to have more nuclear
weapons which create this effect.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509  63  ISSUE: It is against the will of the American people to have more nuclear
weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509  64  ISSUE: Commentor felt the EIS shouldn't forget people in other countries
that don't deserve to die or the moral dimension of allowing these weapons
into the community and of teaching children these weapons are
acceptable.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509  65  ISSUE: While we do have the right to defend our country, it is stupid and
vicious to use this crude, morally repugnant method that will carry out
and increase the threat of nuclear war.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509  66  ISSUE: Why is it important to spend more money on this system when we
have appropriated so much for the Trident II missile?

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS.
Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509  67  ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Frances Russell.

RESPONSE: See Document 407.

509  68  ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Mark Haim.

RESPONSE: See Document 264.

509  69  ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509  70  ISSUE: Commentor felt the Warrensburg School Board was working with
the Air Force by deciding no signs could be put up at the meeting.

RESPONSE: Regulations of the Warrensburg School Board were in effect
at the public hearing.
509 71 **ISSUE:** Commentor felt three minutes was not long enough to comment at the public hearing.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

509 72 **ISSUE:** Commentor felt more hearings should be held to allow more folks to comment.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

509 73 **ISSUE:** Commentor objected to the restriction of comments only to the construction site rather than the issue of placing multi-warhead missiles in uncovered garages near a population center.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 482, Comment 35.

509 74 **ISSUE:** Commentor feels the issue of placing missiles so near a population center should be addressed in the EIS.

**RESPONSE:** Potential safety issues concerning population centers are discussed in EIS Chapter 5.

509 75 **ISSUE:** Commentor feels the EIS should address secondary economic impacts such as the impact of an explosion and the release of radiation on agricultural crop sales.

**RESPONSE:** See responses to Document 33, Comment 66 and Document 287, Comment 91.

509 76 **ISSUE:** Commentor feels the hearing procedures were inadequate.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

509 77 **ISSUE:** The current deadline for the comment period should be extended to give nontechnical persons time to understand the document and determine the issues.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 50, Comment 1.

509 78 **ISSUE:** More hearings should be held in St. Louis and other concerned communities in Missouri.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

509 79 **ISSUE:** Commentor asked whether cumulative effects of soil erosion on railroad tracks and accidents along the Missouri River were considered.

**RESPONSE:** Cumulative effects of a train accident on soil erosion along the Missouri River are not expected to occur. Train accidents are of short-duration and do not result in considerable erosion. However, erosion control methods would be utilized if necessary.

509 80 **ISSUE:** Commentor felt that each commentor should have the same 40 minutes the Air Force got.

**RESPONSE:** See response to Document 33, Comment 53.
509 81 ISSUE: Commentor felt the public has not been included in the process since no names were used.

RESPONSE: Names of individuals who made statements at the public hearings for the Draft EIS or submitted written comments on the Draft EIS are provided in Section 1.1 of this volume of the EIS (Volume II, Public Comments).

509 82 ISSUE: Commentor points out that well over half the people present at the Warrensburg, Missouri meeting were opposed to the MX missile.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 83 ISSUE: The EIS needs to consider impacts of nuclear war.

RESPONSE: The impacts of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 84 ISSUE: Commentor feels we need to deal with the homeless people before working on trying to destroy them.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 85 ISSUE: Commentor feels sending a panel to Warrensburg to whitewash the MX missile program is insulting and a mockery and travesty of justice.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 86 ISSUE: Commentor felt the 3-minute time limit given to comment on a statement as thick as the Draft EIS is too short.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

509 87 ISSUE: Commentor felt the EIS should discuss impacts of nuclear war.

RESPONSE: The impacts of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 88 ISSUE: Commentor pointed out that although the District Representative is not known as a dove, and usually votes in favor of any weapons system, even he voted to cut MX spending.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

509 89 ISSUE: The EIS should state that the public be informed immediately whether an accident involves the presence or absence of nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: See Section 5.5.1 of the EIS.

509 90 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Patty Purves.

RESPONSE: See Document 85.

509 91 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Jerry Brown.

RESPONSE: See Document 72.
ISSUE: Commentor questions the significance of groundwater contamination at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan in regard to supplying additional water for the program.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 28.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Robert Foster.

RESPONSE: See Document 115.

ISSUE: Commentor in support of the program at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan due to positive economic impact it would have on the area's income and employment levels.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: Commentor questions the observation in the Draft EIS concerning availability of water and potential aggravation of groundwater contamination.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 28.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Robert Snider.

RESPONSE: See Document 118.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by David Jackson.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comments 6 to 30 and Comments 54 to 61.

ISSUE: Local contractors are currently building additional housing in the Oscoda, Michigan area.

RESPONSE: Noted.

ISSUE: It is unfair that only one hearing was held in Michigan.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

ISSUE: There was not enough time for all to speak. The three-minute limit was not fair to citizens.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 53.

ISSUE: Commentor against the MX basing in Michigan or anywhere else.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor does not believe there is a negligible risk from plutonium release.

RESPONSE: Potential human health effects are discussed in EIS Section 5.4.
ISSUE: Commentor in favor of the program at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan but with reservations for the environment.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor against the MX because it would create a destructive environment for the nation.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Commentor against the MX system and all nuclear weapons because it is inconsistent with United States arms control policy.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Money spent on the nuclear weapons would be better spent on human needs.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Ralph Ferber.

RESPONSE: See Document 112.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by James Anderson.

RESPONSE: See Document 120.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Terry Miller.

RESPONSE: See Document 111.

ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Leona Riebling.

RESPONSE: See Document 474.

ISSUE: The Proposed Action would not likely jeopardize continued existence of any listed species, or result in loss or adverse modifications of critical habitat. Measures to avoid or minimize impacts should be easy given 5,200 acres available on Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.

RESPONSE: A summary of potential impacts is presented in EIS Table 4.12.6-2 and Section 4.12.6.3. Much of the upland habitat (grassland, forest, and shrubland) that would be disturbed for the proposed program would not be allowed to recover to predisturbance conditions, and would be permanently lost. In addition, construction of the rail spur would result in the loss of approximately 3.2 acres of valuable forested wetland habitat in the Au Sable River floodplain. The proposed location of the rail spur on Wurtsmith AFB is the only siting design that would accommodate the special engineering constraints of the program. Reestablishment of comparable habitat values at a wetland creation site would be a long-term (many generations for most wildlife species) process because of the complexity of natural ecosystems. Mitigation would be undertaken in cooperation with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
510 21 ISSUE: Were local environmental agencies, such as the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) consulted for the Draft EIS analysis?

RESPONSE: The Michigan DNR, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Michigan Natural Features Inventory were consulted regarding potential impacts of the proposed program on biological resources at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.

510 22 ISSUE: What permits will the Air Force get for construction in wetland area?

RESPONSE: A permit application for wetland fill would be filed with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is deployed at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.

510 23 ISSUE: What other nine threatened and endangered species which would be affected besides Kirtlands warbler and the lake sturgeon?

RESPONSE: Twelve threatened and endangered, federal-candidate, and state-sensitive species occur in the general region of influence (see EIS Table 4.12.6-1 for list of species and distributions); however, only one of these species (the eastern massasauga) occurs onbase or in the program area. The eastern massasauga, a federal-candidate species, may be disturbed by construction of a small portion of the rail spur in the Au Sable River floodplain south of Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan.

510 24 ISSUE: What are the plans to dispose of solid/toxic wastes? How is hazardous waste managed at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan now?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 68.

510 25 ISSUE: If the 244 acres of forest land (jack pine) is destroyed, how will it be done?

RESPONSE: The garrison site at Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan was previously burned during a forest fire and currently supports scrubby regrowth of pine and oak and planted pine saplings. Other facility sites (e.g. grenade range and explosive ordnance disposal range) are in mature forest habitat. Construction for the proposed program would require complete removal of woody vegetation, and grading of the sites according to engineering specifications.

510 26 ISSUE: If the Air Force plans to fill the 3.4 acres of wetlands connected with the Au Sable River in Michigan, what will be the altered routes of water underground?

RESPONSE: The proposed rail construction in a small portion of the Au Sable River floodplain and would occur approximately 0.5 mile away from the river, and is not likely to alter present groundwater flow paths.

510 27 ISSUE: Commentor does not foresee the need for much temporary housing in Oscoda, Michigan as there are many workers in the area, some commute up to 100 miles, and others use campsites.

RESPONSE: Noted.
510 28 ISSUE: Commentor against nuclear arms.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

510 29 ISSUE: Commentor against nuclear arms anywhere in the world. The money spent on the program would be better spent in fields like education and health care.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 32, Comment 1.

510 30 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to nuclear weapons.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

510 31 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Richard Skochdopole.


510 32 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Willard Hunter.

RESPONSE: See Document 119.

510 33 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Joan McCoy.

RESPONSE: See Document 33.

510 34 ISSUE: Commentor opposed to the program in Michigan or anywhere else.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

510 35 ISSUE: Environmental hearings should be held in every city that the MX rail system trains will practice and travel.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

510 36 ISSUE: If the Rail Garrison system has negligible danger of explosion while on the tracks, why is there a large safety area onbase where they will be housed?

RESPONSE: See response to Document 504, Comment 35.

510 37 ISSUE: Public hearing comment by Glenna Snider.

RESPONSE: See Document 118.

510 38 ISSUE: Great care has been taken in increasing survivability of the missile system but not enough to increase survivability of the residents and the ecosystems of the Great Lakes, Michigan area.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

510 39 ISSUE: More weapons mean more expense and more eventual nuclear waste to dispose of.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 30.
510 40 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about security aspects of the system, sabotage, terrorists, etc.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 6, Comment 2.

510 41 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about radioactive isotopes being released and local medical community's ability to respond.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 50, Comment 6.

510 42 ISSUE: Commentor concerned about psychological effect on children who discover nukes in their neighborhood.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 5, Comment 14.

510 43 ISSUE: Studies show arms spending generates fewer jobs and wealth than equal wealth spent on health care or education. Michigan often loses more in taxes than it gains in military spending.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

510 44 ISSUE: What do studies show about long-term effects on property values when nukes moved into an area?

RESPONSE: In an analysis of this type of activity, it has been found that additional demand for housing has either raised the prices of houses, encouraged new construction, or has been beneficial by using otherwise unoccupied or available housing.
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July 7, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
APRC-3M/DSY
Barton MFG, CA 92409-6448

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program
United States Air Force

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

Reference is made to Mr. Gary D. Vest's letter dated June 29, 1988, transmitting a copy of the above document for our review. We have completed our review of the appropriate cultural resources sections and have the following comments to offer.

On page 27, it is stated that impacts to significant cultural resources are anticipated at P.E. Warren APR in Wyoming and Ukiah APR in Arkansas and that "cultural resources impacts at all other bases would not be significant." The latter statement includes Barkdale APR here in Louisiana, which is our area of concern. We question how this statement can be made when on page 4-24, in the discussion of impacts to cultural resources on Barkdale APR, it is stated that "archaeological survey and testing is underway to identify and evaluate resources in proposed program areas."

As we have not received the cultural resources survey report for Barkdale APR as of this date, we cannot concur with the statement on page 27 that the cultural resources impacts at the base would not be significant. Consequently, we must withhold further comment pending submittal of the cultural resources survey report for our review.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kathleen M. Burke, Ph.D. Director
Division of Archaeology
P.O. Box 103208, Phoenix, AZ
(602) 542-6370

July 7, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
APRC-3M/DSY
Barton MFG, CA 92409-6448

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program
United States Air Force

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

Our staff has reviewed this document, but before we can offer our final comments concerning the effects this project may have on cultural resources at Barkdale APR, we will need to review the cultural resources survey done for that base. Any questions relating to this letter should be addressed to Dr. John R. Halsey, State Archaeologist at (517) 373-5906.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Date] 7-12-88

[Signature]

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh

[Date] 7-12-88

[Signature]

[Date] 7-12-88

[Signature]

[Date] 7-12-88

[Signature]
Dear [Redacted],

Please do not take action on the proposed Air Force Garrison System. It is my conviction that war places our country in danger with all of the nuclear weapons now built. The implementation of this system, and the deployment of nuclear weapons in our state, increases the danger decreases our safety.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
[Redacted]

Lawrence H. Probst, M.D.

My concern regarding each of these points is contained in the enclosed statement.

It was interesting to observe the people and the process of the Scoping Meeting in Canada on April 7th. Local businesspeople, police of military personnel were present and there were representatives of local businesses supporting the proposal. The majority of citizens and people attending were opposed to the proposal. Opponents were generally reasonable in tone, narrative, and organized. Their proposals were generally based on the need to keep their communities safe, secure, and prosperous, and various points and issues were raised.

Almost all of the questions for the proposal were based on the unintended impact on the local economy. Proponents rarely referred to the broader issues regarding the implications of any nuclear weapons on the national economy, global political and social affairs, or global security. These speakers called for more investment in their present and future, treating this issue as if it was not related to any large company thinking of building a new plant in their economically depressed region. Their reference to the local economy were occasionally devolving into increased safety, security, and prosperity. The area was used as just a mere stand of pine trees and suburbs.

One housewife's wife spoke truth-tellingly about how people who work with nuclear weapons don’t go in the dark. This would offer little reassurance to the victim (herself), who was up until that time without a clear answer in her silent about “working in the dark.”

Comments such as these indicated to me the profound ignorance and limited perspectives of most of the audience who spoke at the hearing. Opponents of the proposal mostly came several hours to attend the meeting. Their comments were generally well-informed and reflected appropriate concerns which were far beyond the objections they were concerned with.

Compared to those of the proponents, the points made by the supporters of the proposal were usually rational, reflecting the concerns of self-interest. Some of the supporters seemed to want the event as a kind of victory occasion, a memorial to rally the futility stories and slightly off-color jokes.

But the issues really is not funny in any way imaginable. One can only hope that the politicians who make the final decision about this program will seriously consider the widest range of implications. It is the hope of Physicians for Social Responsibility that our leaders will see the full and danger of this and other manifestations of the area and overwhelmingly choose the alternative of no action.

Sincerely,

Lawrence H. Probst, M.D.

Lawrence H. Probst, M.D.

Physicians for Social Responsibility

DOCUMENT 5

PHYSICIAN'S PROPOSED ENVIRO EMERGENCY PLAN

EXPLANATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The U.S. Air Force is considering building six to eight MX intercontinental nuclear missile sites at Barren Air Force Base near Caro, Michigan.

Physicians for Social Responsibility is one of the nation's largest groups within organized medicine, with over 20,000 members nationwide. Our members are physicians, nurses, medical students, and medical doctors and the public about the world's number one nuclear weapons are.

PSR has shown that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is being released long before a war begins, a concept referred to as "spectrum before detonation." This term comprises the broader social, economic, political, and health consequences of the nuclear event.

As physicians we are particularly concerned about the health of our patients, and the nuclear events themselves and their risks as well as long-term health effects and their long-range implications for the entire world society.

Barry has been referred to as "America's number one nuclear weapons are."

This brings us to the time, during which devastating effects of Barren Air Force Base near Caro, Michigan. In addition to the above, the document discusses the broader social, economic, political, and health consequences of the nuclear event.

Each MX missile carries ten independently targeted warheads, and each of these has 300 kilotons (kT) of explosive power. The U.S. Air Force plans to build MX missiles in Michigan will total 1,000 to 1,000 times the firepower that
DOCUMENT 5

Scoping Statement
Page 3

The insect of nature that invited an early, pre-eminent Soviet decision, since the United States would react to any Soviet missile-nuclear attack.

...on the basis of which the U.S.S.R. has constructed a national security system based on nuclear weapons. Imperial would be a pre-eminent bomb threat by the Soviets to react to their missile and the SALT II agreement on antiballistic missile systems (ABM), these missiles would be vulnerable at no matter where they were deployed.

ARM in the U.S. was abandoned years ago, but it has been resurrected in the form of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and it is an impression of the Soviet Union that it is likely to consider the ADI and is likely to be considered as a nuclear weapon.

If a ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals in California confirms this, SDI would cost over a trillion dollars, and it would create an incredible amount of harm, economic, scientific, and natural resources for a system that would involve 30% of launching missiles in the world, thus effectively destroying our nation.

The personnel charged with maintaining our nuclear weapons have a substantial rate of alcoholism, substance abuse, and aberrant behavior, such that the Personnel Reliability Program must in dozens of thousands of nuclear weapons for these reasons.

The Scoping being itself is being heavily concerned with little time and not enough time to test it, but they could not suddenly leave their positions on such short notice. Also, only one hearing has been held for the entire state, and it would be important that communities all along the proposed pipeline route be able to see their countryside.

How will the presence of UK missiles affect local property values? How will the missiles be sent out on war for testing? That is the psychological effect on citizens who discover that nuclear missile are in their neighborhoods.

Perhaps some will see this program as partially good, bringing in needed jobs and money to their area. But studies show that non-keeping generation for fewer jobs and wealth than equal funds spent on health care programs. Michigan has often been shown that it is less effective in a dollar to make military spending in the state.

In summary, Physicians For Social Responsibility supports a request of NO ACTION on the nuclear pipes program. Let us first do no harm. Let us prevent further spread of the dangers of nuclear war, let us limit our resources to those that build up true national security; jobs, health, education, and better American product-effective at home and abroad. The program of health care must turn away from basic research to serve the problems that stand before us.

Lawrence G. Lekowsky, M.D.
Chapter Contact
PSR/Cewed Rapids

DOCUMENT 7

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Joe Gilliam Jr.
Manager, State Clearinghouse

FROM: Randy Young, P.E.
Chairman, Technical Review Committee

SUBJECT: MIPS, PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

DATE: July 21, 1988

Members of the Technical Review Committee of the State of Arkansas have reviewed the draft Environmenal Impact Statement prepared by the Department of the Air Force. The Committee members, as outlined in the Arkansas Department of Health memorandum dated July 19, 1988, are addressed (copy attached).

The opportunity to comment is appreciated. Enclosed are copies of comments from members of the Committee supporting this position.

JFR/Prime

Paul Hanse, APFSC
Bill Williams, ASC
Dr. Jocelyn Elder, ASC
Dr. Luch Wilson, ASC
Harold Grimsley, APFSC
Charles Edie Smith, ASC

2-3
Please review the above stated document under provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 102(2)(A) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

If we have no reply within that time we will assure you have no comments and will proceed with the Step-Off.

☑ SUPPORT
☐ DO NOT SUPPORT (COMMENTS ATTACHED)
☐ COMMENTS ATTACHED
☐ SUPPORT WITH FOLLOWING CONDITIONS
☒ NO COMMENTS
☐ NON-DEGRADATION CERTIFICATION ISSUES (APPLIES TO PC&c ONLY)

SIGNATURE

ISS/SC 0100-006-85

STATE OF ARKANSAS
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
P.O. BOX 742710
LITTLE ROCK, AR 72203
DOCUMENT 7

STATE OF ARKANSAS
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
FOR USE ONLY
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

TO: All Technical Review Committee Members
FROM: Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse
DATE: June 29, 1988
SUBJECT: EIS No. DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement Peacekeeper Ball-Garrison Program

Please review the above stated document under provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 102 (2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Yours sincerely, Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse, #1 Capitol Mall, Suite 2-0, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203.

If we have no reply within that time we will assume you have no comments and will proceed with the signature.

[ ] SUPPORT [ ] DO NOT SUPPORT (COMMENTS ATTACHED)
[ ] COMMENTS ATTACHED [ ] SUPPORT WITH FOLLOWING CONDITIONS
[ ] NO COMMENTS [ ] NON-DEGRADATION CERTIFICATION ISSUES (APPLIES TO PECG ONLY)

Signature: ____________________________
Agency: ____________________________ Date: 7/2/88
ISS/SC 0100-004-65
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STATE OF ARKANSAS
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
 FOR USE ONLY
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

TO: All Technical Review Committee Members
FROM: Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse
DATE: June 29, 1988
SUBJECT: EIS No. DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement Peacekeeper Ball-Garrison Program

Please review the above stated document under provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 102 (2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Yours sincerely, Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse, #1 Capitol Mall, Suite 2-0, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203.

If we have no reply within that time we will assume you have no comments and will proceed with the signature.

[ ] SUPPORT [ ] DO NOT SUPPORT (COMMENTS ATTACHED)
[ ] COMMENTS ATTACHED [ ] SUPPORT WITH FOLLOWING CONDITIONS
[ ] NO COMMENTS [ ] NON-DEGRADATION CERTIFICATION ISSUES (APPLIES TO PECG ONLY)

Signature: ____________________________
Agency: ____________________________ Date: 7/2/88
ISS/SC 0100-004-65
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STATE OF ARKANSAS
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
FOR USE ONLY
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

TO: All Technical Review Committee Members
FROM: Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse
DATE: June 29, 1988
SUBJECT: EIS No. DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement Peacekeeper Ball-Garrison Program

Please review the above stated document under provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 102 (2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Yours sincerely, Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse, #1 Capitol Mall, Suite 2-0, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203.

If we have no reply within that time we will assume you have no comments and will proceed with the signature.

[ ] SUPPORT [ ] DO NOT SUPPORT (COMMENTS ATTACHED)
[ ] COMMENTS ATTACHED [ ] SUPPORT WITH FOLLOWING CONDITIONS
[ ] NO COMMENTS [ ] NON-DEGRADATION CERTIFICATION ISSUES (APPLIES TO PECG ONLY)

Signature: ____________________________
Agency: ____________________________ Date: 7/2/88
ISS/SC 0100-004-65
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STATE OF ARKANSAS
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
FOR USE ONLY
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

TO: All Technical Review Committee Members
FROM: Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse
DATE: June 29, 1988
SUBJECT: EIS No. DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement Peacekeeper Ball-Garrison Program

Please review the above stated document under provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 102 (2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Yours sincerely, Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse, #1 Capitol Mall, Suite 2-0, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203.

If we have no reply within that time we will assume you have no comments and will proceed with the signature.

[ ] SUPPORT [ ] DO NOT SUPPORT (COMMENTS ATTACHED)
[ ] COMMENTS ATTACHED [ ] SUPPORT WITH FOLLOWING CONDITIONS
[ ] NO COMMENTS [ ] NON-DEGRADATION CERTIFICATION ISSUES (APPLIES TO PECG ONLY)

Signature: ____________________________
Agency: ____________________________ Date: 7/2/88
ISS/SC 0100-004-65
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STATE OF ARKANSAS
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
FOR USE ONLY
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

TO: All Technical Review Committee Members
FROM: Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse
DATE: June 29, 1988
SUBJECT: EIS No. DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement Peacekeeper Ball-Garrison Program

Please review the above stated document under provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 102 (2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Yours sincerely, Joe Gillespie, Manager - State Clearinghouse, #1 Capitol Mall, Suite 2-0, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203.

If we have no reply within that time we will assume you have no comments and will proceed with the signature.

[ ] SUPPORT [ ] DO NOT SUPPORT (COMMENTS ATTACHED)
[ ] COMMENTS ATTACHED [ ] SUPPORT WITH FOLLOWING CONDITIONS
[ ] NO COMMENTS [ ] NON-DEGRADATION CERTIFICATION ISSUES (APPLIES TO PECG ONLY)

Signature: ____________________________
Agency: ____________________________ Date: 7/2/88
ISS/SC 0100-004-65

2-5
To: Mr. Young, Jr.

Attached is a copy of a memorandum fromDept. J. F. Davis, Director of the Health Department's Division of Radiation Control & Emergency Management. These represent the Department's comments on the Draft EIS Peace Keeper Rail Garrison.

If you have any questions, please call.

Sincerely,

Harold R. Seifert
Division of Engineering

Mr. J. F. Young, Jr., Chairman
Technical Review Committee
One Capital Mall, Suite 5-2
Little Rock, AR 72205

The comments concern the area off base because it is not under the jurisdiction of the city. The area includes all the residential and developed portion of the base. The annexed portion contains 7,100 acres which was annexed in 1965.
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Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to announce for your the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

1. For example, at the hearing it was stated that there may be some water contamination in Elk Lake. Elk Lake is one of our largest sources. Also, it flows into Lake Abilene, which is one of our water sources.

2. In the meeting, someone commented that there was an extensive water treatment plan going on right now. This is being done because the Abilene water system did not pass the health inspection in many areas. In Texas, it is ranked in the lowest tier so far as safe drinking water is concerned.

3. If this contamination is added... and people, animals, and plants become ill or die, who do you think will receive the blame?

Problems this program will... even though it may be those other chemicals that cause the harm, the people will blame it... This way sound far-fetched and ridiculous. However, none of those statistics cited in the meeting sound just as ridiculous.

1. Although ground water is found rather easily, they are a part of our food chain and could eventually do harm.

Laura Jane Brooks 313 24 St. Abilene, TX 79605

July 12, 1988

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

We are very very saddened by the thought of the MX being stationed here in Abilene at Computer Air Force Base. We are opposed to any and all nuclear weapons because of our Christian convictions. We cannot laugh at the problems caused by God's weaponization.

We would like to attend the Environmental Impact Statement hearing to be held July 24, 1988, but unfortunately we are out of the country on that date. So we are contacting you by letter, having some more practical concerns.

We are asking you to consider the long-term health and healing of the public, as well as the long-term health and healing of the public. May we remind you of the recent Marvin accident in the Persian Gulf with the loss of life? We are constantly faced with accidents around nuclear technology. And we realize that many people, as well as human beings are not perfect, so accidents will happen. Sabotage would be another great danger.

We thought that much more had this modeling done is long a threat to the security of the missiles and more important to the safety of the public in Abilene. We mention the threat of contamination of towns and farms, and people. In spite of having been assured of the safety and having been promised jobs (as usual), we are perhaps working to live with the MX.

Many more pets would be created if you switched to...
from the permanent military to a civilian economy. We very much oppose the railroad plan being moved in our state or anywhere else.

Sincerely,

Joe Squid Rose

STATE OF WYOMING

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

OCTOBER 209

July 29, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
United States Air Force
Department of the Air Force
Regional Civil Engineer
Milepost 96 Mileage Support (MEGCI)
Norton Air Force Base, CA 92409

Re: Proposed Rail Garrison Program

Dear Col. Walsh,

I am forwarding for your consideration comments from the Wyoming Public Service Commission regarding the proposed project. I had the opportunity to forward this letter to my letter of May 11, 1988 for your response. Through an oversight, their letter was not included.

I would appreciate if you could review the attached questions and respond to Jon Jacquot with the information he needs to assess these issues. Questions 2, 3, and 4 are the questions apparently not specifically addressed in the Draft EIS. If these issues could be addressed in the next couple of weeks, any questions remaining unanswered with the PSC could be raised at the end of the review period.

Thank you for your attention to these issues.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alan Edwards
Natural Resources Analyst

Enclosure

cc: Jon Jacquot

Location: Atlantic

CURRENT BRIEF

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to present to you the environmental impacts that have been determined for the final decision of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proposal, and allow you an opportunity to bring to our attention issues you may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to the attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We learn in ABCD CO. that the Army has been able to achieve a reduction in the number of troops by using the rail system to transport personnel. This reduction has allowed the Army to save money and reduce the environmental impact of the program. At the hearing, the Army has presented evidence that shows the railroad is a cost-effective and environmentally sound alternative to the current system. We appreciate this information and encourage further discussion on these topics.

Date: APRIL 7

Name: Street Address: City / State

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
APEX-BAIRDR
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

March 19, 1988

The State of Wyoming

Public Service Commission

TO: RICHARD MILLER
STATE PLANNING COORDINATOR
FROM: JOHN P. JACQUOT
CHIEF ENGINEER - PSC
DATE: APRIL 7, 1988

The following issues are addressed in the referenced Environmental Impact Statement:

1. The need for and availability of utility services for the proposed program.
2. The population growth attributed to installation of the program.
3. Steps that will be taken to ensure the safety and integrity of the railroad track used for the program not only for the safety of the program and those exposed to it, but for the operation of the railroad.
4. Steps that will be taken to ensure the safety and integrity of the railroad track used for the program for the operation of the railroad.
5. If military railroad crews are used, what will be done to ensure these crews are knowledgeable of the operating rules of each railroad so that accidents can be avoided.

The following issues are addressed in the referenced Environmental Impact Statement:

1. The need for and availability of utility services for the Program and the population growth attributable to installation of the Program.
2. The affect that construction and operation of the Program will have on utility facilities in the area, including damage due to the construction, operation and maintenance of the Program.
3. Steps that will be taken to ensure the safety and integrity of the railroad track used for the Program, not only for the safety of the Program and those exposed to it, but for the operation of the Program.
4. Steps that will be taken to ensure the safety and integrity of the railroad track used for the Program for the operation of the Program.
5. If military railroad crews are used, what will be done to ensure these crews are knowledgeable of the operating rules of each railroad so that accidents can be avoided.

LOCATION: Atlantic

CURRENT BRIEF

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to present to you the environmental impacts that have been determined for the final decision of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proposal, and allow you an opportunity to bring to our attention issues you may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to the attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We learn in ABCD CO. that the Army has been able to achieve a reduction in the number of troops by using the rail system to transport personnel. This reduction has allowed the Army to save money and reduce the environmental impact of the program. At the hearing, the Army has presented evidence that shows the railroad is a cost-effective and environmentally sound alternative to the current system. We appreciate this information and encourage further discussion on these topics.

Date: APRIL 7

Name: Street Address: City / State

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
APEX-BAIRDR
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

March 19, 1988

The State of Wyoming

Public Service Commission

TO: RICHARD MILLER
STATE PLANNING COORDINATOR
FROM: JOHN P. JACQUOT
CHIEF ENGINEER - PSC
DATE: APRIL 7, 1988

The following issues are addressed in the referenced Environmental Impact Statement:

1. The need for and availability of utility services for the proposed program.
2. The population growth attributed to installation of the program.
3. Steps that will be taken to ensure the safety and integrity of the railroad track used for the program not only for the safety of the program and those exposed to it, but for the operation of the railroad.
4. Steps that will be taken to ensure the safety and integrity of the railroad track used for the program for the operation of the railroad.
5. If military railroad crews are used, what will be done to ensure these crews are knowledgeable of the operating rules of each railroad so that accidents can be avoided.
TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
P.O. Box 1170
Austin, Tex. 78767
July 20, 1988

T.C. Address, State Single Point of Contact
Governor’s Office of Budget and Planning
P.O. Box 13423
Austin, Tex. (78767)

Re: Perkemee Rail Garnson System
Draft EIS PXX-8-6-69 (09/06/88) 15:00
CABJSCORP, A.A. (8171)

Dear Sir:

Thank you for providing the information concerning the above referenced project. A review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) indicates that much of the information is required to identify any archeological sites or historic properties within the project boundaries that may be eligible for inclusion within the National Register of Historic Places.

The general region contains many known archaeological sites, identified through both systematic and casual surveys. Many sites are potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, ranging in date from as long ago as 3,000 years to the present, and ranging in size from small camps to Indian villages to cemeteries. An archeological survey undertaken by a qualified professional should be conducted for the proposed area of construction. Field examination should include testing to identify significant cultural deposits. Collection of items, as present in these tests is required. A report of archeological investigations should be provided in time for the identification and eligibility of the project.

Thank you for allowing us to participate in the review process. We will continue to monitor the progress of the project under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and, report any concerns as we identify them. If you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Deborah Smith at (512) 464-9000.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

Cc: Lt. Col. Peter Walsh, Montana Air National Guard

The State Agency for Historic Preservation

State Historic Preservation Office
Montana Historical Society
P.O. Box 225
Helena, MT 59624-0225

July 26, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
Montana State Historic Preservation Officer
P.O. Box 225
Helena, MT 59624-0225

Re: 1988 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Perkemee Rail Garnson Program

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

We are in receipt of the above cited document which addresses impacts of the proposed and alternative actions of the Perkemee Rail Garnson Program at Malcom Army Base (Montana).

We are in receipt of the above cited document which addresses impacts of the proposed and alternative actions of the Perkemee Rail Garnson Program at Malcom Army Base (Montana).

Of particular concern is the proposed construction of a rail line. We are not aware of any archeological sites or historic properties within the project boundaries. We are concerned about the potential for disturbance of cultural resources.

We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these concerns with you and your staff. Please contact me at the number above.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

To: Lt. Col. Peter Walsh, Montana Air National Guard

The State Agency for Historic Preservation

WINDSOR
Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Box 371
Windsor, Nevada 89344

July 26, 1988

Director: Environmental Planning
APM-3800/4000
Nevada State Park
St. George, Utah 84770

Re: 1988 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Perkemee Rail Garnson Program

I would like to take this opportunity to tell you that our organization is fully in support of the proposed expansion of the Perkemee Rail Garnson Program.

The Chamber of Commerce has always supported the programs of the Air Force at White Sands. We have worked closely with the military personnel and their families over the years, and we are grateful for their help and encouragement. Windsor enjoys a large population of military residents who have chosen our city as the place where they want to spend the rest of their lives.

Again, I would like to take this opportunity to tell you that our organization is fully in support of the proposed expansion of the Perkemee Rail Garnson Program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
President

To: Col. Thomas S. Keeslar, Sr.
Commander, White Sands Missile Range
Sincerely,

Larry S. Pastor, Mayor

LOCATION ________________

DOCUMENT 21

LOCATION ________________

DOCUMENT 22

DOCUMENT 23
Dear Sirs:

It would've been rather foolish of me to attend the public hearings concerning the studies dealing with Barksdale AFB and the MX-peacekeeper missile system. Therefore, the MX system isn't suitable for placement at nearby Barksdale AFB.

I realize Barksdale has been called a "primary candidate" recently, but I believe that is more political than practical. Enemy terrorists, or agents operating within this country, could triple the operations of this major base with unmanned missiles and work from highways which afford a clear view (and shot) at loaded B-52's and KC-10's.

Even if the "enemy" would not be given a chance to attack missiles located on a modern train, the rail system of our area would threat enough, without an attack. Have you all studied the number of derailment incidents in recent years? We have some of the worst tracks and trackbeds in the nation. We can't even trust the moving freight trains to haul logs and oil, so why would anyone put their trust in a system of outdated tracks and beds?

If you all located the MX system at Barksdale, the people would have to eventually pay for the rebuilding of all these railroad facilities just to keep the project alive and safe. Why can't the railroad concerns do what those who use (regularly pay for a safe rail system...?)

And then "consider" if the system should be located here.

On top of all of this you've got far too many slow-moving freight trains moving about this section of the country, especially in tieber, and chemical areas. Even the most dim-witted intelligence agent would be able to learn the schedules of these slow, sluggish trains and develop a current list of places the MX system could not go.

In simple terms if an agent knew that you had 8 options available to the MX train, but six of those were closed by traffic and one was closed for repairs, there would be no secret as to their direction of travel. To me, that defeats the entire purpose of moving the missiles on the rails.

Sincerely,

Eddy E. Arnold, Sr.

---

Office of County Administrator

July 29, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh

APRCE-MOE/DEV

Morton AFB, CA 95209

Re: Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

Enclosed please find a written statement that was read at the public hearing for Morton Air Force Base on July 29, 1988. It does address water quality concerns that the U.S. Air Force identified in its Environmental Impact Draft. Also included is a resolution of support by the Morton County Board of Commissioners.

If you have any additional questions or concerns, or if the Morton County Board of Commissioners can help in any way, please contact me.

Sincerely,

James J. John

County Administrator

JNB/cis

Enclosures
when it is not an issue with the continuing mission that
Wurtmith enjoys at this time. There is no question that a sand
equivalent down to 65% at any location presents the vulnerability
for contamination. There is also no question that the coincidence
in this country up to the last decade was one of "use it and
throw it away" or "dump it on the ground." Wurtmith AFB is no
greater a polluter nor contains items in its still different than
anywhere else in this country. Both on and off military
installations.

If the difference that separates Wurtmith from the other
candidate sites is simply the fact that they have identified and
dumped up the legacy of our past innocence in this
country, it clearly seems to me that they are on the forefront of
Scientifically and should be singled out in a positive rather than a
negative fashion.

There is not a liability associated with the Wurtmith water
circumstances. As previously mentioned, the base has had the
10th Geophysical Survey agency here for many years and they
have modeled the groundwater flow on base since the
single pollution source was discovered in December 1977. There
are over 600 monitor wells on base. Billions of gallons of water
have been pumped from the ground, polished through carbon
and charged back into storage. Two plans of contamination have
been halted in their movement and cleanup over the years has
discriminated areas to below the limits
detected by current techniques. The ground water
have been halted. A project to provide water from Lake
Horne is underway through the Military Construction
Program (MCP) that requires congressional approval
and funding. The staffs who work for both
Conference Senate and Senator Larsen have been briefed on numerous occasions
relative to the future need to upgrade Wurtmith's water system.
Strategic Air Command has elected through the past number of
years, not to consider that project and thus the water
vulnerability at Wurtmith AFB to a much significant
liability that it saw to make it a high enough priority requiring
immediate funding. The project is moving at a slow pace as this is
the way of the Military Construction Program process. Mentioned
in the next paragraph, the legislative process to upgrade water quality being
conducted at the time. Wurtmith AFB is a part of this
process. If it is not completed at this time, the base will
be required to find a new water source and in the process
the base will need to construct a system from Lake
Horne serving a few or so communities along the
valleys.

All of these facts, in my view, sufficiently show that Wurtmith's
water quality situation should not in any way be considered
a show stopper for any future development or mission changes to
the base. Even as Apple, considerable millions of dollars are
being spent upgrading runways, airfields and the alert living
facility. A new command will be constructed within a year. A
hanger, a new dorm and a new fire station will follow shortly
thereafter. There has been a question asked, nor should there have been, relative to the possible water supply at Wurtmith

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Ione County Board of Commissioners supports the activities of Wurtmith Air Force Base; and

WHEREAS, the Ione County Board of Commissioners supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program and
appreciates the importance of this weapons system to the strategic posture of the United States. It further encourages
the development of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program at Wurtmith AFB, and has also realized the
economic importance to Ione County with the placement of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Base.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be entered into testimony at the Public Hearing on July 26, 1988

Dated: July 20, 1988

[Signature]

APB and its associated with consisting millions of the dollars
to continue to develop the base and its location. It is therefore
my considered question, why should this be an issue and as
with the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program. Since Wurtmith's water is
nothing more than a utility that is routinely being upgraded and
it is considered to be a priority question and has played no role up to now in this longevity or other mission
attachment experimentation with this installation

Signed:

[Signature]

Chairman

Ione County Board

LOCATION, Contra High, California

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
amend the project to include the environmental consequences we determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program proceeds, and allow you an opportunity to bring to
the Department of Defense your concerns.

In the remaining time, I will conduct a through
environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to
this hearing any environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately assessed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

[Handwritten Notes]

1. Airflow of local line is considered limited at low altitude.

2. Airflow is considered. We have approximately 70,000,000 acre-ft with
this number, we have been involved in many activities. The project at
consideration has been identified as a "no-build" alternative. Environmental
impact statements are completed on this project.

3. The project is for temporary housing for the temporary housing for
the temporary housing for the temporary housing for the temporary housing for

4. We would like to add that whatever needs would

5. It is understood that this is a facility, the project is development of new

6. It would be expected and a good opportunity to work together with

[Handwritten Notes]

[Handwritten Notes]

[Handwritten Notes]

[Handwritten Notes]

[Handwritten Notes]

[Handwritten Notes]

[Handwritten Notes]

[Handwritten Notes]

[Handwritten Notes]
DOCUMENT 27

LOCATION:

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to

The mission of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program is to provide a

Please hand this form or mail it to:

Li Cpl Peter Walsh
AFRC-RME/OM
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

DOCUMENT 28

LOCATION: JPNH

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to

Please hand this form or mail it to:

Li Cpl Peter Walsh
AFRC-RME/OM
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

DOCUMENT 29

LOCATION: Jacksonville

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to

Please hand this form or mail it to:

Li Cpl Peter Walsh
AFRC-RME/OM
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

DOCUMENT 30

SUPPORT FOR PEACEKEEPER "RAIL GARRISON"

The most basic national security objective of the United States is
to maintain today's peace and prevent tomorrow's war. Determination of
nuclear attack is based on the reality and potency of our strategic forces, and our nation's ability to employ them if necessary.

The nation is now deploying Peacekeeper missiles to the United States. The U.S. Air Force has a number of Peacekeeper missiles deployed in various locations around the United States. These missiles are designed to provide a flexible and effective means of responding to potential threats from other nations.

The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program is responsible for providing a secure and responsive means of deploying Peacekeeper missiles as needed. The program is designed to meet the requirements of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program and to ensure the safety and security of the deployed missiles.

The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program is a joint effort involving the U.S. Air Force, the Department of Defense, and other agencies. The program is supported by a variety of contractors and suppliers who provide the necessary equipment and services to meet the program's needs.

The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program is an important component of the nation's overall missile defense strategy. It provides a flexible and effective means of responding to potential threats from other nations, and it helps to ensure the safety and security of the deployed missiles.

The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program includes a number of key elements, including the Peacekeeper missiles themselves, the rail garrisons where they are deployed, and the supporting infrastructure.

The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program is a complex and challenging undertaking, and it requires the coordinated efforts of many different agencies and organizations. The program is designed to meet the needs of the nation and to support the security of the United States.

The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program is an important part of the nation's defense strategy, and it is essential to the safety and security of the United States. The program is designed to meet the needs of the nation and to support the security of the United States.
The document contains a portion of text discussing environmental factors and their impact on the construction of a facility. It mentions the need to address various issues such as environmental impact, potential accidents, and the need for emergency response plans. The text also references a Peacekeeper Ball site and discusses the importance of environmental protection in such projects. The document includes a section on the Peacekeeper Ball system and its implications for environmental considerations.

The text further outlines the procedural aspects of the project, including the need for notification of affected parties, the involvement of legal and regulatory bodies, and the importance of accurate and timely communication. It also touches on the historical context of the Peacekeeper Ball system and its evolution over time.

The document concludes with a mention of the Peacekeeper Ball system's significance in the context of nuclear disarmament and international relations. It highlights the efforts made to ensure environmental sustainability and the need for continued monitoring and compliance with regulatory standards.
It is the third of its kind, following the two previous ones in 1971 and 1978.

In this project, the goal is to create a high-speed rail system that connects major cities across the country. The project is expected to take several years to complete, with construction starting in the next fiscal year.

The project is expected to create thousands of jobs and stimulate economic growth in the region. Funding for the project is already secured, with the federal government contributing a significant portion of the funds.

The project will involve the construction of new tracks, stations, and infrastructure, as well as the upgrading of existing facilities.

The project is anticipated to bring significant benefits to the region, including improved transportation connectivity and reduced travel times. It is expected to be completed by the year 2050.
We should never forget that everything Adolph Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything that the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Even so, I am sure that, had I lived and comforted my Jewish brothers and sisters in Hungary, I would have paid an even higher price.

Martin Luther King, Jr.

Victor Frankl, the Jewish psychiatrist and survivor of German concentration camps, said that in times of crises people do one of three things: They deny it... they despair... or they commit themselves to ask critical questions. Perhaps you and I, being who we are are, can give the gift of Christian discomfit. By knowing enough to say no, we can make it impossible for anyone to make us easily. And we can give others the knowledge it takes to do the same.

Jose Chittister, O.S.B.
He should never forget that everybody in the world was "right" and everything that the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Even so, I am sure that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have tried and comforted my Jewish brothers and sisters.

Martin Luther King, Jr.

VICTOR FRANKL, the Austrian psychiatrist and survivor of German concentration camps, said that in a time of crisis people do one of three things: they deny it... they accept... or they commit suicide. Frankl himself committed suicide. He didn't accept the horror of his situation, and he knew we are all given the gift of Christian freedom. To refuse to accept is to give you, in my opinion, we can make it impossible for anyone to make our lives easier, and we can give others the knowledge it takes to do the same.

JAN CHRISTIAN, 656

environmentally sound?

5. Are you aware that Michigan voted in November 1984 to reaffirm that deployment of nuclear weapons in Michigan is to be rejected? Therefore, prove to the public that the PECKER rail garrison is actually needed for national defense and security when its only stated use is to be preserved for attacks after the U.S. has been attacked.

6. If the PECKER rail garrison becomes part of the nuclear war threat, as is possible, it may be attacked, since it is stationed in a military setting. What is the reaction of those who traveled at great inconvenience (9 hours) from their homes to be heard? Were they well treated? Were their comments considered? What are the future plans for the rail garrison's expansion and growth?

Thank you for your presence and the time you did take to purse with us our concerns. We know that you are aware that we will do everything in our power to block the PECKER rail garrison from coming to this State.

In a spirit of love and convience,

S. CAROL BOLLY

403 N 69A

LAGAN, MI 48041

DOCUMENT 34

LOCATION: OXCO HIGH SCHOOL, OXCO, MICHIGAN

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PECKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to make sure for us that the environmental consequences we have discussed may occur if the Pecker Garrison rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We bring to your attention the following enclosed materials for your consideration and response. We submit the DRAFT EIS as our testimony under the National Environmental Policy Act as a necessity for your adherence to International Environmental Law. We also submit our March 28th communication to you with each section checked that has not been resigned to the Public Environmental Impact Statement.

It is evident that the statements contain environment to assess socio-economic, biological, medical/health, air/land/water and other impact realities. Yet, in the public hearing you seem to reject the same public's interpretation and testimony as it relates to that extended meaning.

Our major concerns left unanswered are:

1. Define the entire body of information regarding nuclear waste as it relates to the PECKER rail garrison? Is what produced? How much? Where? How is it to be stored? Where? How is it to be stored? Which communities are going to that the Hungarian

2. What is done with hazardous waste at Wortseith? Tell us the entire body of information surrounding this concern.

3. Have doctors at the real site of the contamination effects on all military and civilian personnel at Wortseith since the early 20 years? In the public health, military and civilians? Did anyone to make sure that theHungarian

4. How much have we been exposed to this risk? Is there the possibility of taking any action? What proves to be the best of the thirty hearing makes? In those another that is more.

Name: Direct Address: City: State:

Please send this form or mail to:

Lt Col Peter Walsh
APECO-MDB
Bort Honore, Colorado 80445

March 20, 1988

TO: Lt Col Peter Walsh

APECO-MDB

Honore, Colorado

Re: Commento for the Hearing

Rail Garrison MX System

Wortseith Air Force Base,

Michigan

It is with deep concern and conviction that I add my questions and conclusions to the public record regarding the proposed MX Garrison rail garrison to be housed at Wortseith Air Force Base and listing the rural and city areas of Michigan. It is my understanding that all questions posed here will be reported, that all information gathered for the DEIS and FEIS will be sent to me for my study and further questioning. My concerns are the following:

1. International Law prohibits the possession of nuclear weapons.


2. The use of nuclear weapons is illegal.


3. The use of nuclear weapons is illegal.


4. Under the provisions of the Nuremberg Principles and I have a responsibility to hold our government responsible to International Law.


Involvement of the people
4. The State of Michigan in November, 1982 voted in a solid majority rejection of new railroad garrison projects. The people called for a freeze in the research, testing, construction and deployment of nuclear weapons. The federal government has not responded, and the will of the people of this State by deploying cruise missiles on 5 MX batteries six feet above the ground.

1. What assurance have the people of Michigan that these hearings are truly open to the public?
2. What has inadequately been given?
3. What information has been forwarded to any of us who have requested it from Congress?
4. What are all the communities through which the rail lines will be used and informed to public hearings in their local areas?

W-4 Missile System Itself
5. The W-4 missile system essentially cancels the area to help trigger proportions. At the center of area control, the presence of the W-4 system and the ability to keep the rail system under growing and decreasing 50% nuclear weapons, there is no logic in deploying another one or increased missiles in one way or another.

1. What evidence substantiates the need for the W-4 for national security?
2. Has there been any difficulty with the functioning of W-4 missile?
3. Did the people of other parts of the country willingly accept W-4? If not, why not?
4. What is the total projected plan for the Rail Garrison system?
5. Has Congress allocated all of the funds for the rail line system and facilities, or with separate?
6. If an examination/estimation of one of the W-4's were to occur, what would the result be?
7. If an attack were to occur on one of the rail cars, what would the result be?
8. Is there a greater possibility that military bases and weapon systems will be attacked by an opponent or terrorist?
9. What materials/metallics must be used to keep the W-4/Rail System from destruction?
10. Is this material toxic? How is it obtained?
11. What is the rail system used for carrying contaminated materials on or in the rail cars or roadway system at the site?
12. Is the W-4 considered to be a first strike weapon by the military?
13. If an attack were to occur, who would have already taken place at the base before the W-4 is used?

Worthing Air Force Base, Genesee
4. It is in understood that federal authorities in the federal courts in Michigan, that the base has not received sufficient funds in the past to clean up the environmental contamination cited by the DNR. Millions of dollars already spent can never repair the fragility earth of this nature.

1. How often will the missiles be moved out onto the rail lines for testing purposes?
2. How will the people be alerted to this danger?
3. How can the public be informed of the possibility of accident, repair and safety of the tracks and surrounding right of way?
4. If an emergency occurred, who would pay for damages?
5. How long will it take to move the trains from the base in case of an accident?
6. What are the advantages of the Rail Garrison project?
7. What are the disadvantages of the Rail Garrison project?
8. What would be done to improve these problems?
9. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the Rail Garrison project in the State and in the Genesee area?
10. What plans are being made to research the high numbers of baby deaths, still births, and women's pregnancy problems in the base area?

Rail System
1. It is evident from my study of the total nuclear weapon capacity of the United States and the inability of any of this military potential to be used without seriously assured destruction, that NO ACTION is the most effective form of action.
2. From the military viewpoint, what are the advantages and disadvantages for this suggested rail system?
3. What is the cooperation with the other thirsty banx mode possibilities?
4. Is NO ACTION a possible alternative at this time, or have you gone beyond the point of no return?
5. Why should the W-4 be placed on the rail system of Michigan?
6. What previous studies have been made regarding this system?
7. What are the alternatives?
8. What is the complete history of the Rail Garrison W-4 system?

Security for the Rail Garrison W-4 System
1. It does not seem appropriate for any-costed system to be traveling through our State. Even if rail fences with barb wires were of the railroad area of the rail system, there would be no assurance that the natural disasters of collision, track derail, or breakdown on the track would not be affected. What measures were taken to prevent this?
2. What is the impact of the necessary anti-ballistic missile system?
3. How can the system be made to prevent this project?
4. What assurances and insurance is available for homes and property?
5. What is the impact on the local land values around the base and area?
6. What is the cost of security, besides armed guards, will be involved to safeguard the W-4?
7. What impact will it have on the lifestyle of persons living near the affected areas?
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These are some of my preliminary concerns, questions and conclusions. I do anticipate participating in some of the hearings that will follow and request that you send us all materials to be placed before the public on April 5, 1988. I would also encourage you to send other information that you have available for your totally comprehensive planning of the system.

As you know, Michigan is a peninsula State surrounded by water. It is through the magnificent scenic environmental and natural resources that our State has continued to attract residents and tourists from the major industries. I believe in the natural beauty of the Michigan wildlife, it is through the magnificent scenic, environmental and natural resources that our State continues to attract residents and tourists from the major industries. I believe in the natural beauty of the Michigan wildlife, it is through the magnificent scenic, environmental and natural resources that our State continues to attract residents and tourists from the major industries.

Sincerely and gently submitted,

Susan A. Pizzuto
Sister in Christ
Sister Aloysia
301 W. 7th St.
Saginaw, Michigan 48601
LOCATION:  #35

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to
summarize for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
environmental analysis that will be made available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

I. Draft Environmental Impact Statement

1. I strongly object to the issuance of a license in naming this system
   "Peacekeeper." Peace may be best defined as freedom from fear,
   ...and weapons and instruments of violence integrated into a
   system that promotes fear of nuclear accidents and is justified
   by fear of an enemy attack. The Peacekeeper missile system is
   a war system and has nothing to do with peace; I repect
   that use of the name "Peacekeeper" be discontinued.

2. I support public hearings and the privilege of individuals to
   express opinions and raise questions. I appreciate the
   individuals and principles that have and support that these
   hearings take place.

3. I do not understand why the proposed presentation was limited
   to information possessed and delivered to military personnel or
   under military control. Proposed presentation of opposing views
   and alternative interpretations are of value to the public and
   could be presented in the same format without compromising
   "debate." I feel confident that some of the information given
   was incorrect in a technical sense, but I know for a fact that
   it was biased and incomplete.

4. I have the following questions concerning the design of the
   system:
   a) How can a car designed to work on the commercial
      rail system be designed to safely deploy a 79,000 lb. missile?
   b) When derailments occur with regularity on both
      populated and rural areas, how can this system be considered
      safe for mass transportation in emergencies?
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LOCATION:  #36

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to
summarize for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
environmental analysis that will be made available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.
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LOCATION:  #37

DOCUMENT 37
I guess that explanation is the broadest description of such a statement. Perhaps an appropriate response is to ask what constitutes protection of human or current arsenal of 5,000 nuclear weapons does not mean?

(c) The report contains an alternative action plan, but fails to provide a complete alternative.

(d) The report suggests the national and local impact of the cultural, social, and economic environments could be if this system is not implemented and the 10-15 billion dollars is available for other projects in three environmental areas.

(e) Does this administration consists of this policy, the program being worker in evidence. It is hard to find a good description of all environmental environments. It is the only stable alternative; it is environmentally sound; it is cheap and it works.

The Report is unnecessary. Please do waste further time and money on this observation.
interrelations between the social and biophysical aspects of the total environment. For example, that effect on the economy and quality of life might result from impacts on the long-established pattern of forested fare that has the potential to change the public's perception of the roles of the society and the forest. There are the kinds of change that may affect the future of forested land and affect the society and the forest. These are essential aspects of the environmental impact statement. The statement must be tailored to the specific circumstances of the project, the affected region, the social changes that may have occurred, and the necessity for future action. The statement of the societal and environmental effects is an essential aspect of the environmental impact statement. Therefore, it is necessary to assess the effects on the quality of the total environment.

This is an extremely inconclusive discussion of potential biophysical resources. An important aspect of biophysical resources is the potential to change the social and political changes in the long and short term. Therefore, we need to assess the effects on the quality of the total environment.

Although a number of concerns were raised at earlier public hearings in determining the effects of the proposed action, this EIS contains the following statement on page 1-30:

"A discussion of potential biophysical and psychological effects beyond the scope of this EIS." This is an admission that this environmental impact statement did not adequately assess the effects on the quality of the total environment.

For example, in a community with a significant proportion of people with the social perspective that any nuclear weapons system is immoral and who are willing to go to jail to prevent it from being implemented, the impact of such development will be much higher than in a community where this is not such a significant moral issue.

6. Scientific methodological and scientific accuracy (40 C.F.R., Section 1505.24). This section states that:

"A special emphasis should be placed on the professional and scientific accuracy of all information contained in the statement. All information need not be supported by the same standard of accuracy as that required for conclusions in the draft EIS. However, where there is a possibility of any significant environmental effects, including personnel and psychological effects, such information should be presented in sufficient detail to allow for a comprehensive analysis of the project."

In this draft document, it is often difficult to figure out exactly how conclusions were reached. It is not clear to what extent data used and to describe step-by-step data collection and analysis are needed.

7. The author: Catherine Hodge McCord is a Professor of Anthropology at Central Missouri State University where she has taught since 1971. She is also the President of Global Dynamics, a private consulting firm doing a variety of projects to assess and help implement social changes. Assessing short-term political/economic patterns and long-term political/economic change is a focus of that work. She is the author of numerous scientific papers published at scholarly meetings and articles in a variety of scholarly journals, including the Journal of Anthropological Research. Her book, Growing Capacities of Nation-States: New Trends, Human Relations Area Files, Inc., New Haven, Conn., 1983 is a sociocultural ecological analysis of a variety of complex including population and economic ones, in 154 countries. She is a member of the number of professional associations including the American Anthropological Association, in which she is a Fellow, as well as the British Sociological Society.
Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
assess for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention issues we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

LOCATION:
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER GARRISON PROGRAM

Dear Sir:

As a resident of Warrensburg and the Whitman Air Force Base community, I have always recognized the importance of the base on this area, and I have welcomed its presence. In addition to its role in maintaining a strong defense,
Whitman Air Force Base has contributed significantly to the growth and development of this area through its economic impact and the participation of its personnel in community and civic affairs.

Throughout the years, Whitman has served a variety of missions. Each mission has been supported by theinos and
Whitman personnel. I am confident that if Whitman Air Force Base is selected as a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program, these communities will again respond positively.

I appreciate your consideration of my thoughts as you determine where to deploy this newest defense system. I sincerely encourage your selection of Whitman Air Force Base as one of the sites.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Carrett R. Crouch II

LOCATION:
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER GARRISON PROGRAM

Dear Sir:

As a resident of Warrensburg and the Whitman Air Force Base community, I have always recognized the importance of the base on this area, and I have welcomed its presence. In addition to its role in maintaining a strong defense,
Whitman Air Force Base has contributed significantly to the growth and development of this area through its economic impact and the participation of its personnel in community and civic affairs.

Throughout the years, Whitman has served a variety of missions. Each mission has been supported by theinos and
Whitman personnel. I am confident that if Whitman Air Force Base is selected as a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program, these communities will again respond positively.

I appreciate your consideration of my thoughts as you determine where to deploy this newest defense system. I sincerely encourage your selection of Whitman Air Force Base as one of the sites.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Carrett R. Crouch II
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Railroad tank cars crash in Iowa; 2 crewmen killed

[Paragraph of newspaper article]
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A CONSENT FROM HENRY COUNTY, MISSOURI

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE STATEMENT

PRESENTED TO
DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
AUGUST 3, 1988

After assessing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement presented to the EPA by the Air Force, Henry County feels that Whiteman Air Force Base should be favorably considered as one of the deployment bases for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program.

The studies conducted and information provided by the DEIS substantiate the fact that Whiteman Air Force Base would be an excellent choice for the Rail Garrison.

In reference to the "Largest, Weight, Summary of Impacts," (page 4.1.1-16, paragraph 20), the projected problem with overcrowding of some schools could be alleviated by including communities of close proximity in the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program. Henry County, Winfield R-1 School System, for example, is capable of handling several more students. In addition to this situation, Clinton has an excellent parochial school in Holy Rosary, which provides education for Kindergarten through R-2 grade. This school offers an -"creative education for these children of Catholic and non-Catholic families.

The affected resources include: 4.3.1.13 "Irreversible and Irretrievable Resources Commitments," page 4.1.1-5, paragraph two, section. Historical sites and architectural resources. As stated earlier in the DEIS, these sites and resources affected are not considered the important and can be detailed in architectural documentation. Concerning biological communities, (page 4.1.1-4, paragraphs three to six) great consideration should occur with little considered within the DEIS is not considered to be endangered.

A CONSENT FROM HENRY COUNTY, MISSOURI

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE STATEMENT

PRESENTED TO
DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
AUGUST 3, 1988

After assessing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement presented to the EPA by the Air Force, Henry County feels that Whiteman Air Force Base should be favorably considered as one of the deployment bases for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program.

The studies conducted and information provided by the DEIS substantiate the fact that Whiteman Air Force Base would be an excellent choice for the Rail Garrison.

In reference to the "Largest, Weight, Summary of Impacts," (page 4.1.1-16, paragraph 20), the projected problem with overcrowding of some schools could be alleviated by including communities of close proximity in the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program. Henry County, Winfield R-1 School System, for example, is capable of handling several more students. In addition to this situation, Clinton has an excellent parochial school in Holy Rosary, which provides education for Kindergarten through R-2 grade. This school offers an -"creative education for these children of Catholic and non-Catholic families.

The affected resources include: 4.3.1.13 "Irreversible and Irretrievable Resources Commitments," page 4.1.1-5, paragraph two, section. Historical sites and architectural resources. As stated earlier in the DEIS, these sites and resources affected are not considered the important and can be detailed in architectural documentation. Concerning biological communities, (page 4.1.1-4, paragraphs three to six) great consideration should occur with little considered within the DEIS is not considered to be endangered.
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As stated in the "Relationship Between Local Short-Term Use of Man's Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long Term Productivity", "to ensure long term productivity is expected" - 2nd column mentioned.

Henry County feels that the decision to utilize Whiteman Air Force Base, as a deployable of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison would be good for the people of this area, the state and nation as a whole. The centrally located location of W.A.F.B. makes it strategically perfect to aid in the protection of the people of the United States.

In conclusion, the Commission of Henry County fully endorses Whiteman Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.
Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to summarize for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Impact

1. Residence, SRA or PO Box, State

2. Occupation, Military Rank, Position, Phone Number

3. Comment or Concern

Please hand this form in or mail to:

Lt Col Peter Nash
AFPC-RMS/DEV
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409
LOCATION: Amazon, Washington, D.C.

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM
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NATIONAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Page 6-39: "By 1992, total progress-related employment is projected to be at a steady-state level of about 12,000 jobs."

-How many of these jobs will be military? How many civilian? Of the civilian jobs, how many are expected to be with the same builder? How many local lives do you expect? What skills will you need? Can all the communities support your labor needs? If not, how many people will you have to bring in from outside the community? Will these people work for minimum wage? Will you provide training for the civilian personal?

This statement needs to be contradicted in Appendix A to the EIS, page 6. Here you state, "contractors' hiring of labor from local firms would reduce population concentration... and consequently lower levels for economic equalization...". Please restate this prematurely.
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SYSTEM CONCEPT AND DEPLOYMENT

Page 1-8: "The missile and trains would not be moved out of the garrison except during times of national need."

-In times of national need, similar rail traffic is expected to increase also. You're stating that on a national scale, the increase in rail traffic would re-establish the rail slightly. This is a statement true for every state, i.e. will each state only experience a slight increase in rail traffic, or will some states have greater increases, and therefore greater impacts to be felt? What about on a local level? Look at the military rail and industrial type traffic. The military rail tends to close any problem that may arise at a site -12% to statewide level.

OPERATING SCENARIO

Page 5-16: "When necessary, (fill) would be conducted in a variety of ways, including local purchases, testing in their track, receiving by rail, and local rail track installation."
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NATIONAL RAIL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT

This whole section needs to address the impacts not only on a national level, but state and local levels as well.

This is because some states or local areas are worse off than others as far as traffic, maintenance, condition of the rails, personnel, etc. A garrison located near a major rail yard for example would have problems getting out; the main lines, or normal traffic would have to wait to allow the garrison train to pass through. And wouldn't this alert any observant agent that this apparently "military" train is a part of the garrison? Will the garrison train pick up empty rail cars to take its load real? What impact will this have on the railroad? If you see, let's face it, the criteria for explosive source apply! How will the public be protected from attack?

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS METHODS

Page 3-2: "Controversy, referred to in consideration i.e., rival military and non-military professionals over environmental impacts of assessment methods. Possible controversy over the public need, or desirability of this program was not considered in evaluating the significance of impacts."

"Why not? Why is it that you choose to study only those areas that will help your cause, but not the other important areas that will affect the public? In this case, why will it not affect the psychological impact of the train?"

Why can't we comment on purpose, need, and desirability? Do you think ignoring an impact will make it go away?

SIGNIFICANCE QUESTION

Page 3-1: "...additional impacts were included to be significant as one or more of the following would occur:"

1. These rails are "nuclear certified"? That about the other rails in the state? Will they be certified?

EXISTING AND FUTURE BASELINE CONDITIONS

Page 4-8-7: EDUCATION. "Enrollment is projected to increase to 21,225 by 1990 and to 26,750 by 1995, and staffing may increase to maintain pupil-teacher ratios."

Why will pay for the additional teachers? Can the local communities withstand the increased tax increases? Will the qualified teachers come from? Why is it that you never mention that Arkansas ranks near the bottom of its "State" over measure than it seems in most other? Do you look for more from an already burdened state?"

Page 4-8:7: PUBLIC SERVICES. "...city staffing would have to increase from 1907 to 1978."

As with education, why pay? And if all the additional people are "irrelevant" then why will it all be in the already existing crime rate and health care system?

Page 4-8-7: IMPACTS AND IMPROVES. "The proposed actions would create new jobs..."

Will these jobs be skilled or unskilled go lobbies? Does the community have the necessary skill to support your effort? Will you buy into these efforts? And if the advertised "new" jobs have the project create? What do you have the creation of a new job, "new" jobs?"

Page 4-8-7: POTENTIAL WATER TREATMENT... "ADAPTED, SITE-SPECIFIC AND ANALOGOUS STUDIES..."

With the increase demands of these utilities, increased operating costs will probably occur. Will the Air Force for these increased?
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"Increases in existing neighborhood elementary school enrollment would result in pupil-teacher ratios that are larger than the state standards, thereby threatening accreditation."

Why are only the elementary schools looked at when applying this criteria? It seems that when a high school is mentioned to exceed pupil-teacher ratios, it is glossed over or ignored. This happened when you talked about Little Rock AFS, Barks AFS, Whiteman, and Wilmington AFS, high schools are even hit as important as elementary schools. Even more so as they prepare the teen to enter society. High schools can lose accreditation also. They too will need increased staffing. Impact in the education area is really lacking in this study and should be redressed to show impact on all schools.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Page 4-8-7: "The area between the garrison perimeter fenced (30-ft swath) plus two additional 15-ft clear zones immediately inside and outside of the fences will be kept clear of vegetation and will be graded."

What methods will you use to keep vegetation free? Will you use herbicides? Will you let the soil affect the well both here and long term? When the garrison is decommissioned, will you restore the land to its original condition?

LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS

Page 4-8-7: "The 3.7 miles of existing tracks would require upgrading."

"Is this rail an example of the rail system in Arkansas? What will the rails be used once be upgraded?"

Page 4-8-7: "...the effect of the additional pumping on the available quantity and quality of the local groundwater resources is expected to be minor."

"With the recent drought and reports from state officials that the groundwater levels have been dropping steadily, since the record back in 1949, Dodson Forest, doesn't this call that any increased water intake should be considered significant? Will additional, lusher vegetation in this area, easily hide this impact? What do to ensure better? All the state forests have to be able to return water to the streams? What effect will be the extra water?"
and the components of the high explosive materials. Paints, resins, and adhesives to be used should be included. All local public safety and health officials receive the Material Safety Data Sheets for these substances?

NATURAL RISKS

- What is the radiation risk to persons from high explosives and associated components? What is the risk of accidental release?

- What is the potential for soil contamination? What is the potential for ground-water contamination?

- What is the potential for atmospheric release?

- What is the potential for release to surface waters?

- What is the potential for release to subsurface waters?

- What is the potential for release to surface waters?

- What is the potential for release to subsurface waters?

- What is the potential for release to surface waters?
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<td>Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to provide you with the environmental consequences that may occur if the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program were to continue. Our goal is to ensure that the environment is not adversely affected. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5700 Summercrest
Kinston, NC 28501

August 3, 1983

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
Norton AFB, CA

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh,

I am writing to express my concern about the planned deployment of new missile systems in the European theater. I understand that the United States and the Soviet Union are still engaged in negotiations to reduce the level of nuclear arms in the region, but I believe that the deployment of new missile systems will only increase the risk of nuclear conflict.

The current situation is very dangerous, and I urge you to consider the implications of your deployment plans carefully. I hope that you will take my concerns into account and work towards a peaceful resolution to this crisis.

Sincerely,

John E. Petersen

DOCUMENT 57

LOCATION  WASHINGTON, DC

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER BALL, DARRELL PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this event. Your support for this program is crucial in advancing our efforts to promote peace. Please provide your feedback on how we can improve the program.

Date:

Name:

Phone Number:

Thank you for your participation.

John M. Elton
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Assistant Commissioner (Compliance)
Internal Revenue Service
Department of the Treasury
15th St. and Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20224

July 29, 1999

John M. Elton - Apt. 20
Kansas City, Missouri

Dear John:

I am writing to update you on the status of your case. We have received additional information that may affect the outcome of your case. I will provide you with a copy of the updated information and schedule a meeting to discuss the next steps.

Sincerely,

John E. Petersen

DOCUMENT 59

Jehovah's Witnesses featured in Beatles album in 1964 YATERMAN.

The reason can be found in these selected lines:

Theorists have suggested that the Beatles' album was meant to convey a message of peace and love, and that the lyrics were intended to promote a sense of unity and understanding.

In 1967 the album was released, and the lyrics were set to music by the band. The album's message of peace and love was well-received, and it continues to be a favorite among music lovers around the world.

60S-70S
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John W. Elton/Saturday, June 27, 1997

The witness decided to use an "open letter" in 1978.

Jehovah's Witnesses are featured in the Beatles' album in YATERMAN.

The reason can be found in these selected lines:

The witness believed that the Beatles' album was a call to action for peace and love, and that the inclusion of Jehovah's Witnesses in the album was meant to promote a sense of unity and understanding.

In 1964 the album was released, and the lyrics were set to music by the band. The album's message of peace and love was well-received, and it continues to be a favorite among music lovers around the world.

2-31
It does not take majority of new governments; it takes committed authority. While some could not live without some willingness to fight for self-defense, others were once illegal and persecuted; they could not have gotten justice for women without the means of force. Similarly, we should not have allowed America without a solid March and textile boycott. Martin Luther King Jr. could not have won civil rights legislation without a nonviolent and armed struggle for self-determination.

To think that saving our world from nuclear annihilation is going to require less of us is delusion.-fulfillment. And to think that we can predict effectively while continuing to pay the government whose policies we have no reasonable destructiveness to a fragile and costly self-destruction.

If one million Americans write letters, calls, or letters tomorrow, that can and will be ignored. If one million Americans refuse to pay their taxes, that will be the end of the game. If each member of Congress based from 1.200 to 100,000 constituent taxpayers that they were going to cease payment until the United States ends driving the arms race and leaves Central America alone, I think we could see some viable changes. It's up to us. If our days are already numbered, if our children look to us to win some freedom, can we do it any longer than less?

The Citizens' Tax Moratorium (CTM) is a nationwide network of people who after measuring the magnitude of the will toward which the present regime is leading us (destruction of humanity and enslavement of Central America) and after attempting all other peaceful moves for change, that it is justified to threaten the revenue base of our government. CTM is a network of potential tax refusers (T.R.'s) coordinated by a quarterly newsletter published in Los Angeles.

We are members of CTM are seeking to go beyond symbolic resistance by recruiting 10,000 potential T.R.'s to each Congressional district, a total of 1.200 people. We are acting on the assumption that if there were 1.200 potential T.R.'s, we could, when we choose, effectively demand a recommendation by Congress of how our tax money is being spent. This is because the IRS would not have the capacity to audit outnumber revenue tax payment of all those who an company with the 1.200 would be refusing to pay.

We belong to CTM know that the power of potential T.R.'s to demand can be more effective than all the trials and struggles of individual actual T.R.'s. Great necessity means that our move may never be able to help a "gaggle" organize. This is the power of the flight—sometimes it has to be used if you are strong enough. It's a point. We are acting those who believe that mass tax refusal could change our government policies to organize small informal groups within this district to register potential T.R.'s out to gather how and when to operate a tax moratorium. With discretion whether or not they are current T.R.'s, and without pressure to do so before any individual is ready, we are making those groups to network with others in this district and attempt to increase our combined membership to the 1.200 mark.

If you are interested in our progress and want to know how you can help, write Citizens' Tax Moratorium, P.O. Box 6931, Michigan, 48113.
LOCATION Little Rock APS

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to summarize for you the environmental consequences that we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters that may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to through an environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision is made. Our goal is to provide an opportunity for you to make a thorough environmental analysis that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Dear Sirs,

We strongly support the positioning of the MX Missile Rail Garrison here at Little Rock. The base is large, I designed to accommodate many more active duty personnel than are currently stationed here. I also believe that the quality of life is excellent, and the attitude toward military personnel is very supportive.

Sincerely,

Secretaryester 16 Donahue St, Steena, AR, 9618

NAME____________________________

Please hand this form in or mail to: Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFBRCflinders
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardiono, California 95609

NAME____________________________

Please hand this form in or mail to: Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFBRCflinders
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardiono, California 95609

NAME____________________________

Please hand this form in or mail to: Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFBRCflinders
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardiono, California 95609

August 4, 1980

To Whom It May Concern

The West Plains Association of Citizens wishes to go on record as supporting the reposition of the Rail Garrison Environmental Impact Report at Little Rock. We feel the report is economically balanced reflecting a fair and accurate report of the facts.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Lt Col Peter Walsh
Mayor, City of Corney
Chair, West Plains Association

NAME____________________________

Please hand this form in or mail to: Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFBRCflinders
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardiono, California 95609

NAME____________________________

Please hand this form in or mail to: Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFBRCflinders
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardiono, California 95609

NAME____________________________

Please hand this form in or mail to: Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFBRCflinders
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardiono, California 95609
A STATEMENT FROM HENRY COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL REGARDING RAIL GARRISON PEACEKEEPER NETWORK PRESENTED TO RAIL GARRISON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT HEARING HIGH SCHOOL, WARRENSBURG, MISSOURI AUGUST 3, 1988

My name is Lyle Cunningham, 100 S. 7th. Clinton, Mo. I am currently the chairman of the County Economic Development Council. The council membership is made up of a cross section of elected city-county officials, industry, business, and private citizens.

Our purpose is to work for Economic Growth in the Henry County Area. We are recognized as an E.D.R. County by the Federal Economic Development Administration.

My appearance on their behalf is to show support of the proposed Rail Garrison Location at Whiteman Air Force Base.

We further support the railroad spur concept as a 2nd connection as noted in 4.11 in "Environmental Concerns associated with a future railroad connection."

An inquiry was made to a qualified person regarding the environmental impact and no significant issues were foreseen in changes of wetlands.

Since 1980, Henry County residents have worked and lived among the Whiteman Air Force Base installations with no major objections from our local populace.

The Rail Garrison being based on Whiteman Air Base for the above reasons would not, in our opinion, be objectionable.

The "Rail Garrison" installation at Whiteman Air Force Base would also enhance our economic base here in Henry County, particularly the North East quadrant. The City of Warrensburg is located in the North East quadrant. Only 1-5 miles of new construction would give an exit route to Missouri-Kansas-Texas railroad away from large metro areas.

Lyle Cunningham
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LOCATION 3111W

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to summarize for you the environmental assessment that we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring in your attention at the time matters may we may inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision is made. Please use this sheet to bring issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I would like the first 2 to say, 1) a complaint against the description in item 4.1 of the hearing summary, that in referring to legal language, it refers to a force installation image in the plans, which is not the plan. To bring your attention to the plan, which includes the Air Force totally out of the area. I also have objections at של the noise and the traffic that the Air Force would bring with it, and I would like to know what type of support the public has been or would be giving to the railroad program. I would like to share some ideas to increase support.

Philip T. Kelly, 1451 E. Grand Boulevard

Please hand this form to my mail box.

La Caila Peter Walsh

AFRC-138353

ECONOMIC GROWTH

I am Edwin J. Dennison, Mayor, City of Clinton, Missouri located approximately thirty-seven (37) miles smoothly from Whiteman Air Force Base and within the confines of the area currently supporting the mission of the 351st Strategic Missile Wing.

Since the inception as a military facility engaged in securing the Peace of our Nation, State and surrounding communities, it has provided a positive economic impact thereby enhancing growth in the area. Our residents have had full knowledge of the mission of the 351st and have peacefully co-existed with the Deterring Forces.

The City of Clinton and Henry County, Missouri have a vital interest in the future, not only of our domain, but the surrounding communities as well. In addition to the current mission of the 351st Strategic Missile Wing and its positive economic impact from expenditures by Air Force personnel and the future Advanced Technology Bomber basing with its positive potential, we feel that the proposed Peacekeeper Missile Rail Garrison would be an added asset for the total community.

The Military personnel have been and will continue as Good Neighbors. Not only that aspect has been considered, but we readily recognize that it will be good for an economy that has suffered tremendously over the past few years due to the slowing Agricultural economy and decline in farming efforts. Expenditures brought about by basing the Rail Garrison in the area would have an affect on not only the communities contiguous to WAFB but to a wide area around it.

The Clinton City Council, on behalf of its constituents, has gone on record in support of the proposed Rail Garrison basing at Whiteman.
Air Force Base as evidenced by adoption of a supporting Resolution (copy attached) affirming that position. A similar action was taken and our position presented during a previous hearing 7 April 1988. We are cognizant of the great contributions that military personnel make in the area. They are readily accepted and encourage to interact in community programs and efforts.

It is the considered opinion that, through the present efforts of the Whitman Area Steering Council, the increased activities that may be brought about by locating the Rail Garrison at WAFB can be adequately, expeditiously and effectively dealt with to the positive benefit of all. We stand ready to do our part to absorb the problems as well as the benefits.

In summary, the City of Clinton wholeheartedly supports the concept of basing the Peacekeeper Missile Garrison on an additional Mission for Whitman Air Force Base. We will continue to strive to maintain cooperative and coordinated efforts of the Military community to minimize the obstacles in this undertaking which will act as a catalyst to overcome our struggling with an already depressed agricultural economy.

In reiteration, the citizens of Clinton do actively support the efforts to designate Whitman Air Force Base as a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and give assurance of cooperation, coordination and open communication to this effort.

On behalf of the Citizens of Clinton, I wish to thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of the Military Community.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWIN J. DENMAN
Mayor

Attachment
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The focus of this article was civil defense in Kansas City. The director of the Kansas City Emergency Management Administration characterized the civil defense program as "in disarray." The article notes that defense programs throughout the United States have been affected due to budget cuts and the withdrawal of federal funds.

According to the report, civil defense programs have been weakened, especially in the Kansas City area where the Defense Department is headquartered. The report states that the city's civil defense program has been left "in disarray," with little coordination between agencies and a lack of communication and planning.

The report also highlights the importance of community involvement in civil defense programs. It emphasizes the need for citizens to be informed and prepared to respond to emergencies, and encourages local governments to work together to improve their civil defense efforts.

The Kansas City Emergency Management Administration has acknowledged the challenges faced by civil defense programs in the area and is working to improve coordination and communication between agencies. The administration hopes to increase public awareness and involvement in civil defense efforts through outreach programs and community events.

In conclusion, the report highlights the need for continued support and funding for civil defense programs in Kansas City, and encourages local governments to work together to improve their efforts. The city's civil defense program remains a priority for the Kansas City Emergency Management Administration, and efforts continue to be made to improve coordination and communication between agencies.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI:

HEARING ON DEPLOYMENT OF ICBMS IN THE RAIL GARRISON AREA

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1989

The Kansas City office of the American Friends Service Committee is concerned that the deployment of ICBMs in the Rail Garrison Area as proposed by the Air Force will further target Midwestern populations for Soviet nuclear attack.

A July 12th Kansas City Star article stated that the Metropolitan Area is currently targeted by no less than five Soviet nuclear warheads. This because military bases, defense contractors, 1,000 silos in 200 miles and communications/transportation networks are located within the built-up Kansas City region.
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The deployment of the MX missile in a civilian area poses a clear violation of Article 52 of the 1968 Geneva Convention. The only purpose that could be served by moving the missiles off a military base and into civilian areas is to confuse the Soviets about the location of the missiles and to launch a preemptive attack on the missiles by placing them in civilian areas.

We believe that arms control treaties and a process toward incremental bilateral nuclear disarmament are the only way to provide security in the nuclear age. Therefore, we are deeply concerned that this new proposal not be viewed as a violation of the SALT II treaty, which we are aware that this is early the latest event in the Strategic Defense Initiative.

The deployment of the MX missile in a civilian area will decrease our national security. It is just one more scheme to deploy a new weapon that will result in additional Soviet weapons deployment. It will also further erode international confidence in the United States as a nation whose weapon deployment policy is conducive to a treaty to which the United States is a party and a destabilization of the START talks. The MX is incompatible with the US negotiating positions.

The need to modernize our nuclear weapon systems is a serious matter of public concern. We suggest that what we need is "modernization" in our genuine pursuit of policies to enhance our security through working for mutual, verifiable agreements to halt and reverse the arms race.

The attention of the spirit and letter of the treaty are being violated. It will amount to the use of the civilian population to protect the US arsenal from military operations.

We are very concerned over this specific proposal to violate a provision of the Geneva Conventions. We are aware that this is a direct threat to our national security as a nation in the nuclear age. Therefore, we are deeply concerned that this new proposal not be viewed as a violation of the SALT II treaty and that it is a clear violation of Article 52 of the 1968 Geneva Convention. The only purpose that could be served by moving the missiles off a military base and into the civilian areas is to confuse the Soviets about the location of the missiles and to launch a preemptive attack on the missiles by placing them in civilian areas.

In seeking the intent to make our weapons less accessible to Soviet attack. Both the intent and the effect of the rail garrison being made is a violation of the spirit and letter of a treaty that the US is a party to.

The deployment of the MX missile in a civilian area will decrease our national security. It is just one more scheme to deploy a new weapon that will result in additional Soviet weapons deployment. It will also further erode international confidence in the United States as a nation whose weapon deployment policy is conducive to a treaty to which the United States is a party and a destabilization of the START talks. The MX is incompatible with the US negotiating positions.

The need to modernize our nuclear weapon systems is a serious matter of public concern. We suggest that what we need is "modernization" in our genuine pursuit of policies to enhance our security through working for mutual, verifiable agreements to halt and reverse the arms race.
Let the record show that the City of Windsor fully supports the basing of the Nuclear Missile System on Whittemore Air Force Base, Missouri. Our City, along with many of the other cities near and around the base, have for many years supported the various military missions assigned to the base. The present responsibility of maintaining and controlling the Whittemore II Missile area is in every way compatible with accepting an additional missile mission.

There are other reasons that are of a positive nature, for basing the Nuclear Missile System on Whittemore Air Force Base. It is centrally located and readily accessible to the major nodes of transportation, both interstate and north-south.

This is especially true of the network of rail systems which would provide multiple opportunities of choice for deployment of the Nuclear Missile System.

The feasibility of adding the mixed rail or conventional, addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on pages 4.11-43, would greatly enhance the existing opportunities of the Missile System from the base. A further appraisal of these opportunities is graphically portrayed on the National Rail Network on page 4.1-4 Figure 4.1-2. No other base, being considered for this mission, can match these rail opportunities.

I have reviewed the Impact Charts on pages 4.11-42, Figure 4.1-31 and found that, in both the proposed and alternative action, with the exception of the land use and biological resources, the impacts on all other resources would not be significant.

Many of the military personnel and their families here, since the establishment of this base, elected to reside in the City of Windsor and the other communities surrounding this installation. They have not only contributed a service to this nation but also to the city in which they live. They have been a definite asset to our citizens.

Conversely, many of our citizens have been afforded the opportunity of employment at this installation thereby contributing to the economic well being of this area.

The security of this nation is the responsibility of every citizen of these United States, not just the Military. It is in this spirit of common bond of responsibility that we hereby support the basing of the Nuclear Missile System on Whittemore Air Force Base, Missouri.

Copy to: Col. Thomas E. Ramey, Jr. Commander, 501 Strategic Missile Wing Whittemore AFB, MO 65305-0000

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement indicates (result of some) significant impacts on two resources: land and groundwater. The military use here, as determined would be minimal in our opinion. Remaining waste will be re-deployed to the environment. Some wild life would be displaced, and it is also a known fact, that some of the wild life habitats in these post will not be well used. The amount of surface area the base would be minimal in our opinion. Remaining waste will be re-deployed to the environment. Some wild life would be displaced, and it is also a known fact, that some of the wild life habitats in these post will not be well used. The amount of surface area the base would be minimal in our opinion.

To the Public Officials, Commanders, Air Force Men and Women. I am John E. Brown, a representative of the White House Committee, which is a committee of the National Guard to present the Expansion, development and effectiveness of Whittemore AFB, Inc.

In an effort to receive and review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Nuclear Missile System, it must be said, "The Document is written in a nearly secret manner" This document provides evidence with the testimony of information needed to make an enlightened decision of the Perkeleker Rail Carrier Plant. The people of the United States must be lured for their effectiveness and of such a product.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement indicates (result of some) significant impacts on two resources: land and groundwater. The military use here, as determined would be minimal in our opinion. Remaining waste will be re-deployed to the environment. Some wild life would be displaced, and it is also a known fact, that some of the wild life habitats in these post will not be well used. The amount of surface area the base would be minimal in our opinion. Remaining waste will be re-deployed to the environment. Some wild life would be displaced, and it is also a known fact, that some of the wild life habitats in these post will not be well used. The amount of surface area the base would be minimal in our opinion.

To the Public Officials, Commanders, Air Force Men and Women. I am John E. Brown, a representative of the White House Committee, which is a committee of the National Guard to present the Expansion, development and effectiveness of Whittemore AFB, Inc.
Asnium

---

The Impact Statement has provided an accurate and factual view of the socio-economic, utilities, transportation, land use, cultural resources, biological resources, wildlife, water, soils, air quality, noise and community and the concerns associated with a viable Second Rail Corridor.

EBERTING CHIROPRACTIC CENTER

LEON E. EBERTING, D.C.

strategic view concerning the nuclear devices lends a controversial yet realistic role in the present day scenario of world peace. It would be ideal if by tomorrow everybody would come to the conclusion that our energy would be better spent if directed towards other objectives and the machines of war could be set aside. Yet realistically our nation does not exist as an isolated and autonomous nation and the threat of losing our way of life becomes ever so close and the advancement of communism in South America, Europe and Asia. I am in support of the efforts of our armed forces in their attempts and success in maintaining our or belief of world peace in order to preserve world peace. The rail transportation and the social security programs are but a reflection of our times. They are not a threat but a guarantee to our security and a promise that we shall not fall to the doom of those wanting what we have. Whether our nation, people or freedom are expendable or not, we must stand strong, ready and convincing to those who threaten us.

Arthur Eberting, D.C.

Arthur Eberting, D.C.
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The People of Missouri have based and the statement relative to National Defense since 1945. Missouri are strong, willing, hard working and fighting in the frontline of the freedoms of the society and the freedom of mankind as they choose. Missouri want to preserve and maintain a free world and a democracy.

It is important to participate in the role of national defense and the economy. All individuals have the right to security, freedom from witness and the freedom of choice.

Thank you.

Arthur Eberting, D.C.

DOCUMENT 73

EBERTING CHIROPRACTIC CENTER

LEON E. EBERTING, D.C.

Arthur Eberting, D.C.
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TRUMAN AREA AUDIT BUREAU

F. O. BOX 137

CLINTON, MISSOURI 64735

August 3, 1969

United States Air Force

AIR FORCE

Norton AFB, CA 92401-6448

RE: Peacemaker Rail Garrison (PMG)

As a former USAF weather observer at Whiteman AFB and in Vietnam, as well as an infantryman and infantryman in Clinton, Missouri, I wholeheartedly endorse the Peacemaker Rail Garrison concept and deployment at Whiteman AFB, Missouri.

In over twenty years in this area, and actively involved in all aspects of community life, I have noted only positive support by the citizens for the mission of this PMG. The people of this area are proud of the command and support forces that we meet in our daily lives.

The "Air Base - Community Council" concept has fostered a good environment and we are confident that the residents will continue to support this added mission should Whiteman AFB be selected.

In preparation for this letter, I spoke with Don E. shelter, 44th Congressional District, and a distinguished member of the House Armed Services Committee. He assured me that the people in the military complex area never complain about the military mission, and he feels that a good relationship will continue with the rail garrison.

Additionally, selection of Whiteman will have a strong positive economic impact, as will the F-11 Stealth Fighter. In fact, it is already helping all the communities in the west central part of Missouri.

Those that oppose this plan and implementation are, as you might assume, from outside the general area, and do so for their own personal reasons. They do not reflect the attitude of the local population.

In conclusion, I believe that those of us who "live with it" on a daily basis will welcome and support the Peacemaker Rail Garrison as a vital and necessary deterrent in our defense system. Not only here in Missouri, but throughout the United States as well.

Respectfully,

Robert J. Wilkins II

President

cc: The Shelter

Care TAbE on your business * Phone (314) 805-6966
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LOCATION

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

After reviewing your program, I fully support your Proposed Peacemaker Rail Garrison Facilities at Warrensburg, Missouri.

Eugene Barrette
Box 231
Warrensburg, MO 64093

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AIRCRAFT SQUADRON
Barksdale Air Force Base
Barksdale, Louisiana 71110

LOCATION

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Upon further review, I would like to go on record as supporting the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program. It is our understanding that this program will have an impact on the local community, and I believe it will be beneficial to the area.

Bill Spencer
262 E. Main St.
Warrensburg, MO 64093

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AIRCRAFT SQUADRON
Barksdale Air Force Base
Barksdale, Louisiana 71110
LOCATION: Warrensburg, Missouri
DATE: August 1, 1986

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to
encourage you to bring up any concerns you may have regarding the Peacekeeper
Rail Garrison program. We will provide you with an opportunity to express your
views and concerns.

Mrs. Smith
1. I was not able to attend the meeting at
Warren, Miss. on the 1st of June. Will
she be able to assist me with any
questions I have?

Mrs. Smith
2. I was not able to attend the meeting at
Warren, Miss. on the 1st of June. Will
she be able to assist me with any
questions I have?

Mrs. Smith

Eunice L. Beals

Please hand this form in or mail to
Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFRC-BB/00
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, CA 92408

Name
Department
City
State
Zip Code
Why has the Air Force restricted its investigation of environmental impact issues to only the areas immediately surrounding the proposed base, specifically here the Whitman Air Force Base? Do the hundreds of thousands of people along the tracks not count? In their health and safety not a concern here? Is that why there were no hearings in any areas except at the proposed sites?

The report with the charts and figures containing equations, ratios and percentages looks impressive to some. But where is the human element in all of this? Your report does not address the issue of human failability, human error, carelessness, momentary thoughtlessness, greed, disregard for the sanctity of life - whatever motivates or influences the people who operate the proposed system. These are human values and intangible but nevertheless highly relevant to the issue of environmental impact.

And the proposed system. There has never been a system of any sort developed and put into operation which did not experience serious flaws and mechanical or technical failures. On paper, in theory, in the report you've made it all sound fine. That there's less is in chance of even one person dying due to "mistake". This is absolutely impossible. According to your rep - Figure 4.1.2-1 labeled "Potential Accident for Initial Peacekeeper Rall Garrison Deployment". MX trains will be passing through or outside such major metropolitan areas as Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Memphis. Detroit are many more. As traffic increases, so does the likelihood of human error and an accident. In your estimation and analysis, what number of people will constitute a reasonable amount or expendable in an accident in order to implement this system?

The draft barely touches the environmental impact that would occur should an MX train have an accident in a relatively isolated area - and then there is no mention of illnesses, homelessness, misery and death. Furthermore, the report fails to examine the impact if such an accident should occur 10 or 20 miles in a vast metropolitan city with millions of people. The Air Force seems to ignore the fact that this system will leave the base. And when it does, where does it go?

How far are we willing to go as a nation, in putting ourselves against the Soviets? Why has the draft not examined and prepared a comparative study of the more than thirty bearing modes? Why have you considered the 100 MX Missiles as an alternative when Congress has specifically mandated 50 missiles? This is not a proper alternative. And why have you not considered the "No Action" alternative? Why, when we have the Trident submarines which are highly mobile, do we need a land-based mobile system which is daily more dangerous to us than to the Soviets?

In presenting this report as information to our Congress, upon which they are supposed to make an informed decision as to whether the rail Garrison is implemented or not. this report is incomplete and therefore inaccurate.

While I am for good defense, I am totally opposed to the MX Rail Garrison and weapon deployment systems which by their very character imply that areas of our country and segments of our population are expendable. This end does not justify the means.

Please respond to these questions and comments in the final Environmental Statement.

Thank you.

Karen Prins
Route I, Box 129, Columbia, MO 65201
(314)657-7967

MEMORANDUM

7-27-88

These statements were read at the public hearing last night in Barksdale City, LA, for Barksdale Air Force Base.

STATEMENT OF SEN. BENNETT JOHNSTON

Public Hearing on MX Rail Garrison Proposal
Barksdale Air Force Base
July 24, 1988

I send my greetings to those of you attending the public meeting on the proposal for an MX rail Garrison at Barksdale Air Force Base. Regrettably, the business of the Senate prevents me from being here with you to listen to your important concerns.

I feel strongly that the MX Rail Garrison proposal will be a net benefit for the state of Louisiana. It is a significant project for Barksdale and for Shreveport-Bossier City that will provide much needed jobs to our area. In addition, the Garrison will also bring untold millions of dollars into northwest Louisiana each year.

While this proposal is important for Louisiana, I agree that we in Congress must encourage the D.C. Air Force to alleviate the effect on the local environment. The Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Air Force for Barksdale states that "the design of the Garrison and alignment of the rail spur would minimize the total wetland disturbance at this location within the framework of engineering and safety requirements". Little adverse impact is foreseen for threatened and endangered species such as the American alligator and the red-cockaded woodpecker, I fully expect the Air Force to take the proper mitigation measures to insure that the impact on the environment is minimal.

I hope that this public meeting is successful in alleviating environmental concerns. The MX Rail Garrison is a strategically sound and sensible project that I hope you will join me in strongly supporting.

Thank you all for coming to this meeting.
July 26, 1988

Statement of U.S. Sen. John R. Mccain concerning the Barkendale Air Force Base MX Rail Garrison

I regret that I am unable to attend the meeting this evening due to a heavy legislative schedule in Washington at this time.

I am aware some concern has been expressed about the lack of habitat, effects on the natural environment of MX Basings, if the MX Rail Garrison is constructed, on the refuge at Barkendale.

As you know, I have a longstanding commitment concerning the conservation of endangered species and will work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other interested organizations to see that this area is preserved without endangering the continued existence of wildlife.

I look forward to continuing our collective efforts on this proposal. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

3.

These contaminants leached from underground storage tanks and have required extensive clean-up operations. In 1977, the Michigan Dept of Natural Resources ranked Wurtsmith as fifth out of the 532 toxic waste sites in the state. Then, a ranking according to the threat to the environment and human health.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.

Beams are being stored at Wurtsmith where 10 percent of the area contains radionuclides. The areas most affected by these radionuclides are the oil storage tank area, the fuel storage tank area, the chemical storage tank area, the water treatment area, and the water treatment area.

The supply wells are at least ten miles from the main military buildings. The supply wells are used by the base and the surrounding communities. The water is then supplied to the base through a network of pipes and pumps. The water is then distributed throughout the base and the surrounding communities.

All of these facts point to the conclusion that basing the MX Rail Garrison at Wurtsmith Air Force Base at Northeastern Michigan would be one more example of the lack of concern for the health and safety of the citizens of the region, and the well-being of many thousands of people through the country who need the natural benefits that this area has to offer.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.

The principal aquifer in the Wurtsmith area is a sand and gravel unit that extends from land surface to a depth that averages 51 ft., according to the U.S. Geological Survey. The aquifer is made up of water table and confining bed. The depth to water ranges from about 25 ft. to less than 50 ft. Most ground water flows in an eastward direction to Van Buren Lake and Van Buren Creek, a small part of which is southward to the Amable River. However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the natural direction of flow is significantly altered at several points toward pumped wells.
Until July 3 1968, the mishap record of the sophisticated radar technology of the type aboard the Yankee Clipper would have allowed inference to be drawn that the destruction of 250 civilian lives would never have happened.

As I stated in my previous testimony, a plane crash did occur in Thule, Greenland in January, 1968. The B-52 bomber carried four nuclear weapons, all were destroyed by fire. Radiactive contamination occurred over 230,000 cubic feet. There is evidence that would happen if one of the dangers mentioned above, and dismissed by assumption and inference in the DEIS, should occur as happened in Thule, Greenland. It is no longer a crash site of imaginative one. It is now used countryside, it is the very air we breath poisoned, and there is no escaping it. It is turning to the children we gave life to and watch them increase their risk of a terrible death with every breath they take. Two tables for calculating risk to the general population caused by the NW Rail Garrison plan are very impressive but not the least bit comforting. It takes a mighty power than the Air Force in control of the margin of error created by assumption and inference. The military mentality that computes for levels of acceptable losses of human lives does not apply to the civilian population. It only takes one time and the results would be catastrophic.

Please go back to your rooms tonight and consider how very important it is to recommend the No Action Alternative, to the final EIS. It is your responsibility as defenders of American lives.

Our views on these issues are tempered because we are keenly aware that the military also shares these concerns. Living as we do in the proximity of a missile base, we understand, accept, and appreciate that the military mission is one of peace. It is significant to note that the people most directly affected by the deployment of the Rail Garrison at Whiteman are affirmative in their support. Thank you for the opportunity to express these sentiments which represent the opinion of many of the people gathered at this hearing tonight.

Deborah Hunter
Chairman, Whiteman Area Steering Council

There are four major environmental concerns that need to be addressed. The first major affects the Blytheville area and has already been addressed by the DEIS. The potential impact from the earthquakes related to the New Madrid fault system. This could conceivably affect the Little Rock AFB area as well, although the Little Rock area is more threatened by tornadoes. It is our feeling that the earthquake threat alone should eliminate the Blytheville area and render the Little Rock area questionable. The frequency of tornadoes in the Little Rock area which could make those impossible and train wrecks more likely would be few if the area was to be utilized. The DEIS failed to consider the extent of the contamination caused by LEAPF. The reverse of this, whether the environmental assessors are so great as to make the placing of the LEAPF at the area is unbearable is also to be considered. DUG has located 12 areas in the base that are once or have been contaminated and a LEAPF for these areas has been submitted to the LEAPF. At least one of these areas would be directly in the path of the construction described in the DEIS. Since it will be impossible to build on top of these areas until restoration has been completed, the design involved should eliminate the LEAPF as a potential site. In addition to the usual contamination related to military activities, the base was at one time the site of a large production plant which operated and the area was heavily contaminated with diesel and a whole range of related chemicals and contaminants. The plant was abandoned many years ago and the area has been returned to natural conditions, which has been impaired heavily by the activities, and the discharge from extensive treatment plants of the base community and neighboring community. A fishing ban has been in existence for the last fifteen years and cleaning efforts are planned of that plant. There is no easy solution to the problem of restoring such sites. As the DUG (USAF) say, it will be two years before a plan is ready for the base. Actual cleaning will take up to thirty years. The area surrounding the base has been the site for some eighteen Titan missiles. The nearby Dumas area experienced one explosion caused by a dropped wrench that severed a substantial part of the site and caused environmental damage that has never been fully assessed. Neither have the effects on base personnel. Over the years there have been numerous minor spills on these sites, mainly of fuels, that have caused complaint from nearby citizens. The record of the military is so bad that now they could consider that the defense of the nation should include environmental damage. It is not acceptable, it is a major record and does not depend upon such services as the main component of their base effort. In addition to those directly related to military stresses to the environment, the area is one of the recent growing areas in the United States and is under virtual prohibition to the new availability of drugs in the state. Arkanas is one of the primary grain-growing states in the nation - right behind California. It is also one of the main drug routes into the
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country. Both the military and railroad workers in Arkansas have been necessary for their high drug use rates. Other systems, such as coal and iron ore, have also been affected by the influx of population. Major accidents involving trains and trucks have been a fact of life in this area. Some other toxic materials and chemicals are handled on a daily basis in nearby communities.

A catastrophic accident occurred in Little Rock when a truck carrying highly toxic mercury and lead to Arkansas had an accident on a highway that carried the national average that forty major accidents per year in the last four years. The point of all this is that the area should not be subjected to unnecessary environmental stresses. Since the rate is necessary and is a detrimental contributor to the possibility of nuclear war, we feel it should not be placed any more, not certainly not in Arkansas. In Arkansas, we have gone enough and have suffered enough from the presence of the military and their instruments of destruction.

LOCATION Little Rock Air Force Base
DATE 8-3-88

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

We are pleased to show you an opportunity to submit your comments on the program. We appreciate your attention to the environmental impact statement attached. The program will be made available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on being deployed. Please return the sheet to our attention. We are very pleased to see your comments on your environmental issues that you feel should be addressed in the environmental impact statement.

NOTE: THIS IS ONLY THE FIRST PART OF MY STATEMENT AT THE 8-1-88 HEARING.

I am a member of the National Coalition to Stop the War, and I am very opposed to the war. The appropriate time for peace by the side of peace is when you are safe and peaceful.

Just last week, there was a train出轨 accident involving the MX missile trains, one of which contained toxic materials, with an army on the train system and the documented use of drones by train operators, a train on the Mexico train system, and the documented use of drones by train operators.

There are over the present 1,500,000 miles of track on which the operators have trains. Each of these trains would be irreversible to the operator. The bill should address the consequences of a nuclear explosion at the times that the missiles are ready to be destroyed.

The environmental analysis for such a catastrophic accident should include the potential number of citizens who would be previously displaced and new living arrangements from the worst possible damage. If we have some disasters that are irreversible to the operator. The bill should address the consequences of a nuclear explosion at the times that the missiles are ready to be destroyed.

ADDRESS: The address is at the closest point to or in Arkansas' population center of Little Rock.

Georgie Satty 612 Mall Dr. Little Rock AR 72205

Please sign this letter to me in your name.
Director Environmental Planning
AFPE-BOG/VEY
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, CA 92406-6444

Subject: Review of Air Force Peacekeeper Site

Dear Director, Lt. Peter Walsh:

We are writing to you as residents of the community near the proposed Air Force Peacekeeper site located in the Los Angeles Basin.

As residents of the area, we are concerned about the potential environmental impact of the Peacekeeper site. We believe that the site may not be an appropriate location for such a facility.

We would like to address some specific concerns regarding the siting of the Peacekeeper site. The following are some of our concerns:

1. The proposed site is located in a sensitive ecological area, which could be damaged by construction activities.
2. The proposed site is situated near a residential area, which could be affected by noise and vibration from the Peacekeeper site.
3. The proposed site is located near a water source, which could be contaminated by runoff from the site.
4. The proposed site is located near a highway, which could be affected by increased traffic due to construction activities.

We ask that you consider these concerns and take appropriate action to address them. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these concerns with you and your staff.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]
LOCATION Grand Forks NA

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to summarize for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I support the construction of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Grand Forks. The standing development will benefit all Grand Forks. I see no additional risk to the community environmentally or otherwise. The Peacekeeper has always been a good neighbor. I believe this expansion will benefit us all. I want our community to be happy and peaceful. Peace is the key to our future. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Bill Moore

Name: Bill Moore
Address: Grand Forks, ND

Please sign this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRCE-BMS/DZV
Norton AFB, California 92409

DOCUMENT 94

LOCATION

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to summarize for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Now other side sheet... and attached comment... for my comments... we have no problems... we need real resources.

Dated: August 24 - Rm 37 - March 19, 1986

Name: Peter Walsh
Address: Norton AFB, California 92409

Please sign this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRCE-BMS/DZV
Norton AFB, California 92409
WE HEREBY, we all hope and pray for world peace, but must remember that the United States is regarded as an adversary by many nations and they would welcome the opportunity to render us helpless against their forces, and

WE HEREBY, we must all be against nuclear contamination but at this point in history, we must continue to allow our leaders to negotiate a position of strength instead of conciliation, and

WE HEREBY, Peacemaker II system has been chosen by Congress and the President for enhancing the nation's defense needs, and

WE HEREBY, the Peacemaker II system represents the most practical, cost-efficient system utilizing existing ICBM missiles and the ICBM warheads system, and

WE HEREBY, only in times of national emergency will the trains equipped with the operational peacemaker system be directed to leave the territories and deploy within the rail system, and

WE HEREBY, the Grand Forks Air Force Base plays an integral part in the nation's defense strategically located in the northern tier states, and

WE HEREBY, Grand Forks Air Force Base has the land and the people to deploy this system, and is ideally located on major rail lines with many additional miles of track located within miles, and

WE HEREBY, REPEAL THE PROPOSED Peacemaker II system being chosen as a deployment site for the proposed Peacemaker II system.

James E. Hall, Chairman
Grand Forks County Commission

THE EXCHANGE CLUB OF GRAND FORKS, NORTH DAKOTA

TO Whom It May Concern

Whereas, the Peacemaker II system would offer our nation increased national capability,

Whereas, Peacemaker II system is, the most cost-effective system, and

Whereas, we must provide our leaders the proper guidance for a position of strength, instead of conciliation,

Whereas, the men, women, and children, associated with the United States Air Force have been a wartime and peacetime asset to Grand Forks for many years,

Therefore, the Exchange Club of Grand Forks and Grand Forks pledge support in favor of the Peacemaker II system near our community.

The Exchange Club of Grand Forks

George Alexander, President
To Whom It May Concern:

The Associated General Contractors of North Dakota, wishes to go on record in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Project being proposed to be built at the Grand Forks Air Force Base.

The AGC of North Dakota is a Construction Trade Association representing 100 general contractors and 500 allied firms in North Dakota. Collectively these companies are capable and qualified to provide all construction services required of such a project.

While this project represents a sound investment in the defense system of the Nation, it would be the same time create a minimum of 2,500 jobs in North Dakota during the construction phase of the installation. The business activity generated and the benefits to the State as a result of this project would be $21 billion for the first four years and $36 billion over the life of the project. The study of the economic impact generated by North Dakota’s Construction Industry.

Again, we urge the completion of this project at Grand Forks.

Sincerely,

Curtis L. Peterson
Executive Vice President

American Progression Through Construction

[Letter from the North Dakota State Building and Construction Trades Council]

NORTH DAKOTA STATE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL
August 9, 1995

TESTIMONY FROM DAVID A. FUNSTON, PRESIDENT & EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE N.D. STATE BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL.

The Department of the Air Force on the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program Environmental Impact Statement.

I am David A. Funston, President and Executive Director of the North Dakota Building & Trades Council. I represent the Construction Unions of North Dakota.

We are here to give this project our full support. Members of the Building Trades have been a part of every major defense project in North Dakota. We are proud to have been included and proud of our record in the past and will be as long as we are involved in any project.

We have members who have helped build the B-52 Bomber in Grand Forks and built projects on the South Pole, and we still have to this day. Members going to those foreign places from time to time to perform maintenance and construction. We can and will supply workers for any construction project in North Dakota, there has not been enough work in North Dakota for our entire membership since 1984, but this project would certainly help us and the defense of this country.

We have a long history of being a part of the Department of Defense meetings here in Grand Forks. The participants in these meetings have been and still are the Federal Materials Service, Department of Air Force, Army Corp of Engineers, and the Construction Unions in North Dakota.

Again, for the record we are here to give our full support to this project and to assist in any way we can to see this project for North Dakota. If built, it will be successful completion of the project.

Thank you, and if you have any questions, I would be more than happy to answer them now or later.

Sincerely,

David A. Funston,
President & Executive Director

North Dakota State Building & Construction Trades Council

[Letter from the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Council]

PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON IS A FIRST-STRIKE WEAPON

Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is a system designed to provide mobility to our intercontinental ballistic missile forces. This mobility will make the missile difficult to target and therefore more survivable than land-based ICBMs. I can't see how opponents can label this system a first-strike weapon when its stated and designed intent is to survive a first strike by an enemy.
Garrison would cause NCR enemies to understand that our resolve to defend our great nation is unyielding. Commissioners continue negotiations to effect a verifiable reduction in arms but we must continue with our resolve to defend our great nation. I support Peacekeeper Garrison.

Peacekeeper would invite a strike by our enemies. Some have argued that moving the missile trains out of the Garrison would cause our enemies to believe that we could be defeated by a first strike against us. I propose that we invite our enemies to attack us by strengthening our resolve and making ourselves invulnerable. I support Peacekeeper Garrison.

Peacekeeper is a "Falling" Risk. Opponents have called the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison "Falling" Risk. They say missile trains leaving the Garrison would invite an enemy to strike. I propose that the opposite would happen. An enemy would be less likely to attack if it knew the trains had dispersed because our retaliatory forces can survive. I support Peacekeeper Garrison at Grand Forks at a cost effective way to ensure survivability of our strategic forces.

WHEREAS, The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System will promote world peace and security, and the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System will have a strong positive effect on the economies of Northwestern Minnesota and Eastern North Dakota.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of County Commissioners of Polk County that the Board supports the establishment and operation of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System at the Grand Forks Air Force Base.

Resolutions, by Commissioner Heitmeier seconded the foregoing resolution and it was declared adopted upon the following vote: YEAS: Mattson, Baken, Heitmeier, Gysensky RAYS: None. Adopted this 2nd day of August, 1988.
The Peacekeeper reference refers to possible environmental consequences, it is not an analysis of the effects of nuclear weapons. The Peacekeeper system is intended to be an alternative to strategic nuclear forces, and its development and deployment are consistent with U.S. national security policy. The Peacekeeper system is designed to be an alternative to the use of nuclear weapons in any future conflict.

If the purpose of a言 is to analyze possible environmental consequences, it is not an analysis of the Peacekeeper system. The Peacekeeper system is intended to be an alternative to strategic nuclear forces, and its development and deployment are consistent with U.S. national security policy. The Peacekeeper system is designed to be an alternative to the use of nuclear weapons in any future conflict.

To make environmental decisions, it is not possible to make free of human psychology, independence of our national security policy, and without consideration of social, economic, and political consequences of the Peacekeeper system and its implementation. A discussion of socially, morally, and politically acceptable, or infeasible, policies and psychological reactions to the Peacekeeper system is beyond the scope of this Study (1-2).

Therefore, as an issue (related to the physical and social environment), I suggest that the EIS look at environmental impacts that affect human health and the environment. This includes the potential for human health effects, their potential consequences, and the potential for environmental effects that may affect human health. The EIS needs to look at all possible health effects, not merely physical, but also psychological, mental, and emotional. All activities at the Peacekeeper site should be reviewed with regard to their potential for human health effects.

The Peacekeeper system is designed to be an alternative to the use of nuclear weapons in any future conflict. The Peacekeeper system is intended to be an alternative to strategic nuclear forces, and its development and deployment are consistent with U.S. national security policy. The Peacekeeper system is designed to be an alternative to the use of nuclear weapons in any future conflict.

To make environmental decisions, it is not possible to make free of human psychology, independence of our national security policy, and without consideration of social, economic, and political consequences of the Peacekeeper system and its implementation. A discussion of socially, morally, and politically acceptable, or infeasible, policies and psychological reactions to the Peacekeeper system is beyond the scope of this Study (1-2).

Therefore, as an issue (related to the physical and social environment), I suggest that the EIS look at environmental impacts that affect human health and the environment. This includes the potential for human health effects, their potential consequences, and the potential for environmental effects that may affect human health. The EIS needs to look at all possible health effects, not merely physical, but also psychological, mental, and emotional. All activities at the Peacekeeper site should be reviewed with regard to their potential for human health effects.
DOCUMENT 106

LOCATION: Dayton (WAC)

CURRENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for having this meeting is to

summarize for you the environmental assessment we have determined may exist if the

Peacekeeper Nuclear Weapons Program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to

the attention of the public any comments or suggestions you would like to make before a

final decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention the

environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft

Environmental Impact Statement.

I feel that the real way you were

to ship on isn't a safe

I have been told sometimes

before shipping on the rail way, why

should I say to an employee
to say and continue to do

so at any expense that

are business that way,

Thank you.

Ronald Smith 100 Parker Rd. Houghton, MI 49045

Please send this form to or mail to:
Lt. Col. Peter Haelic
APRC-BM/DY
Horton AFB
Bozeman, Montana
92204-4544
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August 6, 1985

Juan Dickinson
USAF
3333 Old Anacostia Rd.
Washington, DC

Dear Col. Haelic:

I am writing this letter in response to the Environmental Impact

Statement for the proposed H-12 missile system in the rail garrison

base.

The plan I have expressed is in opposition to the installation of an H-12

system in the rail garrison base. I have reviewed the Environmental

Impact Statement and feel that the statement does not fully address

the potential impacts of this missile system on the environment.

Specifically, I have concerns about:

1. The potential impact on air quality and noise levels.

2. The potential impact on wildlife and their habitats.

3. The potential impact on groundwater and surface water resources.

4. The potential impact on historic and archaeological resources.

I urge you to consider these concerns and take appropriate steps to

mitigate the potential impacts of the H-12 missile system in the rail

garrison base.

Sincerely yours,

Juan Dickinson
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LOCATION: Greenbrier (WAC)

DATE: 7 August 1985

CURRENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for having this meeting is to give you

an opportunity to express your concern on matters within the

environmental assessment. Our goal is to provide you with a thorough environmental document

that will be made available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on testing

and deployment is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention potential

environmental issues that you feel should be addressed in the environmental impact

statement.

I am concerned about the amount of local

impact, especially the impact on

Ronald A. Martin 201 Shady Grove Rd. LA

Please send this form to or mail to:
Director, Environmental Planning Division
APRC-BM/DY
Horton AFB
Bozeman, Montana
92204-4544
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TEXAS REVIEW AND COMMENT SYSTEM

REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Applicant/Originating Agency: U.S. AIR FORCE

Project Title: PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON SYSTEM

Funding Agency: DOD

Project Number: 102

Date Received: June 30, 1985

Date: 1990-07-06-0001-60-00

Data Submitted:

Data Comments by EOD: 06/13/88

******************************************************************************* REVIEW PARTICIPANTS *******************************************************************************

Texas Air Control Board
Department of Public Safety
Bureau of Economic Security
General Land Office
Texas Department of Health
State Dept. of Highways and Public Transportation
Texas Central Texas Council of Governments
Railroad Commission
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
Texas Water Commission
Texas Water Development Board

Special Note/Comments: We have provided copies to the reviewers

listed above.

[ ] No Comment

Return Comments to:

[ ] Review Agency

Signature

[ ]

Details

[ ]

City Address

[ ]

Zip Code

[ ]

Return Comments to:

[ ]

Details

[ ]

City Address

[ ]

Zip Code

[ ]
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Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to determine if you have determined my name if the Peacemaker Rail Garrison project proceeds, and for you to have the opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadequately evaluated. Our goal is to thoroughly evaluate environmental impacts that will be associated with this proposed project. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

This was supposed to be a forum to debate the environmental consequences that may occur if the rail Garrison program proceeds, not to debate the nuclear power issue. Nuclear arms are a reality, and basic common sense tells us to think of them as a point of understanding that they are part of our defense program. Good basic common sense also tells us to take an interest in this project. I am a resident of Grand Forks and a businessperson in this community. I strongly support the development of rail Garrison at Grand Forks, ND.

Don Fischer
478 Belmont
Grand Forks, ND 58201

Name:
Street Address:
City State:

Please send this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Wash
APRCE-DEV
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92410

Rearranged

Michigan has not been untouched by these water problems. Despite efforts to clean Michigan waters and wetlands, improvements are needed in some areas, namely phosphates and DDT. 40 toxic chemicals have been identified in the Great Lakes. Most recently, quantities of mercury have been found in Michigan sport fish. According to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), 1800 species of aquatic life from the lakes are endangered or threatened. 2,000 facilities pump waste water into the ground. 20,000 abandoned oil wells threaten water supplies along with thousands of leaking underground storage tanks.

Again, according to the MDNR, 1,000 places have known groundwater contamination, and estimates of 50,000 more where the water is fouled. Michigan has 2,000 superfund sites with 32 proposed. In addition, Michigan has 1,551 toxic waste sites.

1. Do we need more devastation of our forests? Do we need the leveling of 266 acres of jack pine as a result of the deployment of the rail Garrison project? Do we need the destruction of our scarce water supplies? Do we need the destruction of our wildlife and ecological systems?

2. In 1987, the MDNR ranked Wurtsmith as the fifth worst toxic waste site in the state. Because of the expanded water usage demanded by the missile system, contamination of the shallow aquifer supplying water to the Wurtsmith base, and the townspeople of Oscoda and Houghton, is a real possibility. Do we need the further contamination of groundwater in northeastern Michigan?

3. For what purpose? How much will be gained? Will/do these improvements serve the population or the environment? What are the long-term consequences of the rail Garrison project on our quality of life?

4. Do we need this plant that increase the likelihood of a nuclear accident and/or a nuclear exchange. A system that has been questioned repeatedly as vulnerable to attack, and a wasteful expenditure of tax dollars.

In September 1984, 19 Nobel prize winners issued a joint statement saying human faced extinction through either nuclear war or environmental catastrophe unless we changed our ways.

The statement went on to say, "what nuclear war could do in 50 to 100 minutes, an exploding population exhausting the earth's life-support systems could do in 50 to 100 years."

1. The rail Garrison project represents a threat to life from both perspectives, nuclear and environmental. Its existence will represent one more threat to the nearly instantaneous extinction of mankind.

2. According to the EPA, the cost of cleaning up the project would be between 

5.000 and 10.000 million dollars that could help attack the real problem of the global equation. In the destruction of our oceans, the devastation of our forests, the pollution of our waters, the loss of species, and the destruction of the earth's ozone layer, finally, its existence will represent a direct threat to the environment of northeastern Michigan.

For those reasons, the Long Tree Council wishes to go on record supporting life, not war, to the building of the rail Garrison system at Wurtsmith Air Force Base.

[Signature]
We should never forget that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything that the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Yes, I am sure that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have sided and comforted my Jewish brothers and sisters.

Martin Luther King, Jr.

Viktor Frankl, the Jewish psychiatrist and survivor of German concentration camps, said that in time of crisis people do one of three things: They deny it..., they despair..., or they commit themselves to ask critical questions. Perhaps you and I, being who we are can give the gift of Christian charity. By saying enough to say no, we can make it impossible for anyone who knows us to give others the knowledge that is to do the same.

Joan Chittister, OSB

STATEMENT OF AGREEMENT REGARDING MURTHIN AIR FORCE BASE PARTICIPATION IN A REGIONAL WATER SYSTEM SERVING EASTERN IOWA COUNTY, IOWA.

JULY 27, 1988

The following Statement of Agreement Regarding Murthwin Air Force Base Participation in a Regional Water System is intended to confirm the feasibility of Murthwin Air Force Base inclusion in a regional water system to serve the communities of eastern Iowa County. Further, this Statement is intended to clarify the current status of the proposal within the Department of Defense and to note the urgency of expediting current and associated reviews and approvals associated with Murthwin Air Force Base participation in a regional water system.

1. The communities of East Tawas and Texas City have experienced significant growth to the point that the current Tawas Area water treatment facility is no longer adequately serves the needs of their population. In late summer 1987, the Michigan Department of Public Health indicated to the Tawas community that a modernized, approved municipal water system must be constructed. At the same time, Mr. Francesco Scarchella, District Engineer of the Michigan Department of Public Health, corresponded with Texas City, East Tawas, Baldwin Township, Auburn Township, Oceana Township and Murthwin Air Force Base noting the State of Michigan's strong recommendation that the opportunity for a regional water plan to solve the problems and potential problems of air communities was clear and feasible. Shortly thereafter a regional water system study was commissioned and the firm of Michigan, Porter & Segal was hired to perform the study.

2. At this time it appears that the southern contingent, East Tawas, Texas City, and Baldwin Township are committed to a regional water project. They have no choice but to utilize the Lake Huron resource with a new water system. The northern contingent is dependent upon Murthwin AFB participation in a regional system. On 16 May 1988, an unlicensed proposal was provided to Murthwin AFB that proposed water service to the base as described in the regional water plan study. Since then, Murthwin AFB has been involved in a cost comparison analysis of their regional water plant study as compared to the following: maintaining status quo, a F-15 Military Construction Program (MCP) water plant serving the base alone or serving the Air Force Base and the townships of Oscoda and Auburn, a newly developed well field on the Air Force Base, or a deep well system on the base. This cost comparison analysis is done at the base level, but is then forwarded to HQ SAC for further analysis and eventually submitted to HQ USAF in Washington D.C.

3. The analysis process described above may eliminate current potential for success of a regional system. The Michigan Department of Public Health (MDPH) has stressed that both Tawas and Texas City must commence action in the immediate future to secure that a new water plant is brought on line in a timely fashion. It may take 60 to 180 days to complete the cost comparison process. Decreasing the length of time to complete the cost comparison process must be accomplished. Delay will result...
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in eventual significant additional costs to the total efforts for both Huron County Air Base and local governmental units. The highest and best use of tax dollars is a regional water system. Huron County Air Base's current ground water control problem addressed, but future costs associated with purifying, etc. would be avoided by a positive response to the regional water system. Huron County Air Base, currently has identified and installed a new well field and plans for the future by programming a $14 million MOP project to utilize the Lake Huron water resource. The fact that SAC has elected to not make this project a high priority on a year-to-year basis since 1984, suggests that it is being held in reserve for the time when capacity or quality may become an issue. The regional water system, if approved, alleviates current concerns inherent in Huron County Air Base current water facilities.

1. Cost-benefit studies are made to ensure that a good value is being received for the money spent, and recognizing that 100% is very often under intense public scrutiny in this area, recommend a cooperative effort. A municipal regional water system that draws water from an adjacent Great Lake provides a cost effective and long-term solution within reasonable parameters.

A cooperative effort appears to be a distinct advantage in finding a way to initiate the process. We are approaching the end of FY 98. The proposed dollar amount up front for Huron County Air Base to participate in this regional project adventure has been estimated at $6 million. If this money could be generated in FY 98 and "followed thru," it is very likely that this project could proceed with the immediate and major savings. The cost effective nature of Huron County Air Base participation in a regional water statement cannot be overstated.

5. In the future Huron County Air Base could never expect to purchase water from a plant provided by the local communities of Oscoda and Mc Coy City, alone since their 5,000 population and negligible tax base cannot afford to construct the initial plant. That is why in the future MOP process we anticipated that Huron County Air Base could and should in the unusual position of building the plant and then perhaps selling water to local communities. This has no precedence and would result in Huron County Air Base becoming a utility "authority" for local governmental agencies.

1. The local governmental units are prepared to provide the necessary guarantees regarding availability of water, implementation of security measures, etc. to assure all regular and emergency strategic considerations associated with a cooperative effort involving Huron County Air Base.

7. This correspondence has been generated through a coalition of local governments and the Huron County Air Base Military Affairs Committee with the knowledge and support of local military leadership and is directed to those levels and agencies that may be able to assist this process. Representing us, U.S. Senators:

Carl Levin and U.S. Congressman Robert Colby have been briefed in the past regarding the eventual need for a water source from Lake Huron. Their support has been pledged in the MOP arena and it is anticipated that a streamlined process as proposed herein would also gain their favor.

The local governmental units of eastern Huron County are prepared to provide all necessary information, data and documentation regarding the opportunity to creatively, cooperatively and cost effectively address the need for a regional water utility.

James D. Lucey, Mayor, City (1)

Robert C. Baker, Mayor, East Tawas

Robert E. Keeler, Supervisor

Robert T. Foster, Supervisor

Oscoda Charter Township

Oscoda Charter Township

July 29, 1988

Robert N. Foster

Oscoda Township Supervisor

Director, Environmental Planning
AFBCE-906/98R
Huron Air Force Base
San Bernardino, CA 92410-6434

The Peacekeeping mission of the United States Air Force is certainly critical to the free society and the life style we enjoy in this great country.

The Oscoda Community is very proud to be a part of that mission by being a host to Huron County Air Base.

Huron County Air Force Base has been part of our community for many years. The men and women of the Air Force have been friends and neighbors to us.

We will be proud to have the rail garrison located here in our community.

Thank you,

Robert N. Foster

Oscoda Township Supervisor
LOCATION: Okla 4104.7

COMMON SIGHT: U.S. AIR FORCE PRESERVER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to be able to answer any questions you may have about the environmental impact of the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program. We are going to try to bring you to our attention this morning. Our purpose is to be as open and as honest as possible. We have not been able to answer any of the questions asked by the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program. We are going to try to bring you to our attention this morning. Our purpose is to be as open and as honest as possible.

1. I have 5 miles of rail that is located near a river. It appears that the rail should be made of steel. Is this the correct material?
2. I have 5 miles of rail that is located near a river. It appears that the rail should be made of steel. Is this the correct material?
3. I have 5 miles of rail that is located near a river. It appears that the rail should be made of steel. Is this the correct material?
4. I have 5 miles of rail that is located near a river. It appears that the rail should be made of steel. Is this the correct material?

Endeavour, Oklahoma 73531

July 26, 1986

Good evening gentlemen,

My name is Glenn L. Soder, and I reside in Midland, Michigan. I have come here today because I have some urgent concerns about the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program that is proposed by President Reagan in 1983, and now being studied by the United States Air Force for implementation by 1991.

My concerns and observations are not those of a person with a background and training in science. But I have read portions of the Environmental Impact Statement, and also a program of the Environmental Protection Agency in the mid-1980s, plus several other articles, my concerns grew. They were concerned with the destruction of important wetland areas and of the wildlife population inhabiting these areas.

I feel that the citizens of Michigan, as well as citizens of the United States need to have more information before any decisions on implementing the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program are made.

Some of these are:

1. Has it been shown that the 150,000,000 acre miles of commercial railroads will be able to safely handle these missile cars, which are much heavier than normal cars, and at 70 plus ft. long, are a third longer than the usual 55 ft. for a normal car?
2. Has it been shown that a deployment time of 2 to 8 hours could be in any way survivable or even effective? When Soviet ICBM is 30 minutes after launch?

Another question: From our inquiries, it appears that the Michigan Department of Natural Resources has not in any way been contacted or notified of the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program, even though it is a construction and implementation plan which will damage and destroy important forested wetlands, and habitats of some already endangered species. Why not?

Now, some question about the future Second Rail Connector discussed on p. 10-43 to 10-45. It need not be made, and should not be. It is not needed, nor do I think it is even in the best interest of the general public. It seems to me that the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program was planned for an area that is not need. It seems to me that the Second Rail Connector is not necessary.

Thank you.
THE PEACEKEEPER MISSILE PROGRAM WILL COST THE U.S. TAXPAYERS IN EXCESS OF $30 BILLION DOLLARS. THIS COST IS MORE THAN THE B-1 BOMBER PROGRAM. IT IS THE MOST EXPENSIVE MISSILE PROGRAM IN AMERICAN HISTORY ON A PER UNIT BASIS. IT INVOLVES A NEW, UNTESTED DELIVERY SYSTEM. NEVER BEFORE IN U.S. HISTORY HAVE NUCLEAR MISSILES MOVED AROUND THE U.S. COUNTRYSIDE AND BEEN LAUNCHED FROM RAILROAD CARS. FROM A NATIONAL SECURITY PERSPECTIVE THE MILITARY MAY FIND THIS BASING SYSTEM VERY ATTRACTIVE, BUT FROM A PUBLIC SAFETY PERSPECTIVE IT IS FRIGHTENING AND LOADED WITH POTENTIAL DANGER. WITH THIS BASING MODE WE HAVE MORE TO WORRY ABOUT FROM OUR OWN AIR FORCE THAN FROM SOVIETS MISSILES!

THIS EVENING'S HEARING IS FOR CITIZENS TO RESPOND TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC JUST TWO WEEKS AGO. YOUR SCHEDULE SUGGESTS THAT IT IS NOT THE FINAL HEARING PLANNED. THE EPA WILL CONDUCT, I PRESUME, THE FORMAL HEARINGS.

THE PURPOSE OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT IS TO PROVIDE IN A SINGLE DOCUMENT EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE SPONSORS VIEWPOINT THAT THE SPONSORS PROPOSED ACTION IS ENVIRONMENTALLY SAFE. THAT DOCUMENT SHOULDN'T PROVIDE, BEYOND THE SHADOW OF A DOUBT, EVIDENCE THAT ALL REASONABLE AND MANY UNREASONABLE CONTINGENCIES HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED AND PLANNED FOR.

GENTLEMEN, IN THAT CONTEXT, WHAT YOU HAVE SUBMITTED AS AN EIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. IT FAILS TO SUPPORT YOUR PROPOSED ACTION.

AN EIS MUST CONTAIN THREE ELEMENTS:

1. A MAJOR SEGMENT DETAILING EVIDENCE AND INFORMATION COLLECTED FOR EVALUATION.
2. A SEGMENT SHOWING HOW YOU USED THE INFORMATION TO PREDICT WHAT WILL HAPPEN BASED ON THE ACTION YOU WANT TO TAKE.
3. A SEGMENT THAT COMPARES YOUR ACTION AGAINST THE "NO ACTION" BASELINE.

IF DONE WELL, AN OBSERVER CAN LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE COLLECTED AND HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT IT WAS ANALYZED INTELLIGENTLY AND AGREE WITH YOUR CONCLUSIONS.

IN THIS SINGLE VOLUME THE AIR FORCE HAS GONE TO SOME LENGTH REGARDING THE SECOND AND THIRD SEGMENTS. THERE IS, HOWEVER, LITTLE OR NO DATA TO SUPPORT YOUR CONCLUSIONS. YOU HAVE CHosen FOR SOME UNKNOWN REASON TO TOTALLY EXCLUDE THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION UPON WHICH YOU BASE YOUR DECISIONS. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THE SAFETY OF YOUR PROGRAM WITHOUT THIS INPUT. HOW CAN WE AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH YOUR CONCLUSIONS WITHOUT SEEING THE EVIDENCE COLLECTED TO SUPPORT YOUR CASE?

WE SHOULD EXPECT DOCUMENTATION FOR EACH BASE AT LEAST AS THICK AS THE SINGLE DOCUMENT YOU SUPPLIED FOR THE WHOLE PROGRAM.

THE ENTIRE EIS IS FULL OF GENERALIZATIONS THAT NEED SUPPORT. EXAMPLES INCLUDE:

1. FOR AN EXPANDED RAIL SYSTEM YOU ARE CONSIDERING CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SPUR. YOU SAY "THE MOST WESTERN THREE MILES (36 ACRES OF RIGHT-OFF-WAY) WOULD BE LOCATED NEAR THE URBAN AREA OF MIDLAND, MICHIGAN. SPILLAGE LAND USE IN THIS AREA IS UNKNOWN, BUT THERE COULD BE A CONFLICT WITH INHABITED BUILDINGS ON THE EASTERN EDGE OF THAT TOWN." WHAT KIND OF ANALYSIS IS THAT?
2. ON PAGE 4.6-2 THE DOCUMENT IS VERY FUZZY ON WHICH STATE AND LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS WILL BE FOLLOWED. WHICH EPA, STATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS WILL BE IMPACTED BY YOUR ACTIONS? WILL YOU COMPLY WITH THEM OR NOT? WE NEED YOUR DATA, AND IT IS NOT INCLUDED. IS YOUR ANALYSIS INCOMPLETE?

3. A CRITICAL PART OF THE ENTIRE ANALYSIS IS WHAT WILL BE THE PERFORMANCE OF THE MISSILE CARS IN THE EVENT OF A POSSIBLE ACCIDENT. STATISTICALLY, YOU WILL NEED TO PLAN FOR ROUGHLY ONE ACCIDENT PER YEAR. NOTHING IN THE EIS SUGGESTS THAT YOU WILL ACTUALLY TEST THE SAFETY OF THE CARS IN WORST CASE SCENARIOS. GENTLEMEN, WE NEED TO KNOW HOW THOSE CARS WILL PERFORM IF THEY DERAIL, IF THEY'RE IMPACTED BY A GASOLINE TRUCK OR IF A TERRORISTS STINGER MISSILE SHOULD STRIKE A MISSILE CAR. TEST THE CARS, DON'T GIVE US COMPUTER SIMULATIONS!

4. WHEN WILL YOU MOVE THE CARS? HOW WILL YOU ALERT LOCAL COMMUNITIES? WHAT EVACUATION PLANS HAVE YOU PREPARED AND DISCUSSED WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES? THOSE DETAILS ARE MISSING. IF YOU BRING NUCLEAR MISSILES INTO OUR COMMUNITY WE WILL WANT TO KNOW ABOUT THOSE MOVEMENTS. THE

YOUR EIS IS FULL OF COMMENTS ABOUT COMPUTER SIMULATIONS? WHERE IS THE OUTPUT OF THE COMPUTER SIMULATIONS? WHAT ASSUMPTIONS DID YOU MAKE TO RUN THE MODELS? WHAT IS YOUR DATA?

KEY SECTIONS GLOSS OVER DECOMMISSIONING AND TRANSPORTATION OF THE WEAPONS BY HIDING BEHIND REFERENCES TO NON-DOD AGENCIES. THIS MISSILE PROGRAM IS YOUR PROGRAM. THIS EIS IN YOUR STATEMENT. YOU CAN'T HIDE BEHIND OTHER AGENCIES AND NOT ADDRESS THOSE KEY QUESTIONS!

GENTLEMEN, MY SUGGESTION IS THAT YOU SCRAP THIS VERSION OF THE EIS AND COME BACK TO THE PUBLIC WITH MORE HEARINGS WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED YOUR TASK. WHEN YOU RETURN, PLEASE HAVE THE DATA - INCLUDING THE ACTUAL TESTING OF THE MISSILE CARS - IN YOUR DOCUMENT THAT WILL SUPPORT YOUR CONCLUSIONS. WHAT YOU HAVE PRESENTED US IS A WHITETWASH.
Dear Mr. Secretary:

The purpose of this letter is to offer my support of Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas, as the site for the Peasekeeper Rail Garrison which combines the existing Peasekeeper Missile with the U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system. Dyess is one of two sites in the country under consideration and the only one in Texas.

The Peasekeeper Rail Garrison combines a proven missile with a mature transportation system to provide a highly reliable mobile weapon system. The mobility feature produces survivability—a key ingredient in deterrence. It is a nation based on freedom, democracy protects peace without limiting the liberties we enjoy.

Abilene has a history of contributing to the free world's defense. The community actively promotes a close and strong relationship with Dyess AFB. The strong community support as well as its highly sophisticated facilities would make Dyess and Abilene an ideal site for the Peasekeeper Rail Garrison.

The people of Texas support this national program and enthusiastically urge the selection of Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peasekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chairman

June 9, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

It is my understanding that Dyess Air Force Base is one of two sites being considered for the Peasekeeper Rail Garrison. I would wholeheartedly like to voice my support of this vital strategic program. The Peasekeeper Garrison combines the existing Peasekeeper Missile with the U.S. railroads to provide a highly survivable and capable strategic defense system. I feel it would be a great asset to Dyess, the city of Abilene and our great state in general.

I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jerry J. Beauchamp
State Representative

District 119

June 8, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would wholeheartedly like to voice my support of this vital strategic program. The Peasekeeper Garrison combines the existing Peasekeeper Missile with the U.S. railroads to provide a highly survivable and capable strategic defense system. I feel it would be a great asset to Dyess, the city of Abilene and our great state in general.

I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
June 23, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Carlucci:

I strongly support Dyess Air Force Base as the home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

As a time when our country is faced with budgetary problems and you have a community that is already used to and needs the nuclear forces it just makes sense to go ahead with the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and locate at Dyess Air Force Base.

Abilene, and all of West Texas strongly supports this project and wants you to come on down and let us show you some true Texas Hospitality.

Yours truly,

FRANK COLLAO, JR.
District 16

June 18, 1988

June 2, 1988

June 6, 1988

June 6, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As the site selection draws near for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison, I respectfully urge your strong consideration of Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas.

In that Dyess Air Force Base already serves as a home to a part of the nation's nuclear forces, I feel it would be a practical and geographically advantageous site, which has the support of the people of Abilene.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Orlando L. Garcia
State Representative
District 115

State of Texas
House of Representatives

June 6, 1988

June 6, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Although the District that I represent is some distance from Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, I can encourage favorable consideration of Dyess as home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. As a Texas community, we have learned to appreciate the professionalism of our military and know that it is an excellent choice for the rail garrison.

Sincerely,

Orlando L. Garcia
State Representative
District 115

State of Texas
House of Representatives

John J. Goar

June 6, 1988

State of Texas
House of Representatives

John J. Goar

June 6, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wish to express the strong support of the citizens of Abilene, Texas, for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base.

The site is strategically located and has extensive facilities to support the deployment of the Peacekeeper missiles.

Sincerely,

John J. Goar
State Representative
District 115

State of Texas
House of Representatives
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The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci  
Secretary of Defense  
The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

June 9, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As I understand it, Dyess Air Force Base is being considered as a site for a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison unit. I believe Dyess AFB would be an excellent site choice, providing security for numerous Texas military installations as well as access to an extensive railway system.

Texas has a long history of enthusiastic support for U.S. military programs. The City of Abilene and the State of Texas fully support and encourage the selection of Dyess Air Force Base as a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

[Signature]  
State Representative  
District 83

P.O. Box 210  
Abilene, Texas 79606  
(915) 756-5652

June 7, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

In their endeavor to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison, I am pleased to enthusiastically support the efforts of the city of Abilene, its Chamber of Commerce and Dyess Air Force Base.

The people of Abilene and the citizens of Texas have long had a tradition of playing a key role in the defense of our nation. We welcome the potential of having the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at this site, to which Texas and the people of Texas have long been committed.

For your positive consideration of this strategic defense program at Dyess Air Force Base, I thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]  
Abilene, Texas

June 10, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci  
Secretary of Defense  
The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

June 7, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am writing in support of locating the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base. I think this is a vital program and would hope that Abilene, Texas, that has so actively supported Dyess Air Force Base in the past would be chosen for the site.

I hope you will give Texas your most favorable consideration in selecting a site.

Sincerely,

[Signature]  
Abilene, Texas
May 31, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This is to request that you give serious consideration to selecting Dyess Air Force Base at Abilene, Texas, as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. My understanding is that this project would combine the existing Peacekeeper rail system with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Although other sections of the country are competing for this project, Abilene would be especially appropriate for this purpose, and the site is receptive to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Its climate, its geography and its fine people combine to make the site ideal.

Sincerely,

Jim Horn

June 21, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Texas has long been supportive of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. For over 30 years, Dyess AFB has been a SAC base serving as home to the B-47, the B-52, and the B-1. This heritage tradition makes Dyess AFB an excellent home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

The Rail Garrison promises to provide a means of deploying the Peacekeeper which is low risk, low cost and fully stealthy and survivable. At a time when military pressures are threatening the peace, I believe it is critical to go ahead with the Rail Garrison.

I sincerely appreciate your valuable time. If I may ever be of service to you, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Jim Horn

State Representative
District 59

May 27, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Secretary Carlucci:

I would like to urge you to place the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene.

Not only do the people of Abilene support this program, but they also have a long tradition of contributing to the peace of the world's defense. The 5th Air Force has served as a SAC base, and the community actively promotes a close and strong relationship with Dyess. In fact, the base's original 1,000 acres were donated to the Air Force by the community.

I hope you will consider Abilene as the future home of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

Jim McWilliams

May 31, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am writing to express my strong support of Dyess Air Force Base as the site selected for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. The people of Texas are proud of the role that they have played in contributing to our country's defense system.

In particular, the installation is a natural area for the Peacekeeper. I hope that you and the Department of Defense will give Abilene and Dyess AFB the opportunity to provide the future home of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

Jim McWilliams
June 2, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Secretary Carlucci,

I am writing to you in regards to my wholehearted support of Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison, which combines the existing Peacekeeper missile complex with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Briefly, my reasons are two-fold. First of all, I think Dyess Air Force Base is in an extremely excellent location and secondly, this project certainly has the support of the people in this area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bob Melton
State Representative

June 17, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The citizens of the state of Texas support a strong national defense as a deterrent to foreign aggression.

In response to Congressional direction that a more survivable system be found for the 10 additional Peacekeeper missiles, the resulting Peacekeeper Rail Garrison plan is expanding the role our state plays in the strategic defense of our nation, is welcomed not only by the residents of Abilene but also by all Texans.

I appreciate your favorable consideration of Dyess Air Force Base as the future home of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

Mike Hillseap

June 16, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

It is my understanding that Dyess Air Force Base, which is located near Abilene, Texas, is one of ten sites in the country being considered for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. I would like to express my strong support for this vital strategic program to be located in Texas.

For over 30 years Dyess AFB has served as a SAC base serving as a home to the B-47, the B-52, and the B-1. Texas is proud to be a home to a portion of the United States nuclear deterrent and is committed to promote a strong relationship with National Security.

Your favorable consideration of Dyess AFB for the site of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Alejandro Moreno, Jr.
State Representative

June 19, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for Dyess Air Force Base as a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. I understand that the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison combines the existing Peacekeeper missile with U.S. railroads to improve our strategic weapons system.

Having once lived in Abilene, I know the citizens there are proud to have Dyess Air Force Base in their city and we would welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison with equal enthusiasm. I know that we would certainly be proud to have this important weapon system based in Texas.

I hope that you will give careful consideration to Dyess Air Force Base when selecting a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely yours,

Anna Howery
State Representative
June 1, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Just a short note to request that you give serious consideration to Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison which combines the existing Peacekeeper missile with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Thank you for your hard work on behalf of our country’s immensely important defense program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

A.H. (Augie) Oad Jr.
Oklahoma - District 11

June 7, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Secretary Carlucci:

This is to express my support for Dyess Air Force Base as the site for a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Abilene, Texas, home of Dyess Air Force Base, has in the past demonstrated its support for our nation’s defense, and welcomes the opportunity to serve as the home for the Garrison.

On behalf of the people of East Texas, I request your consideration of Dyess Air Force Base.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

P. H. (Pete) Patterson

June 2, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am pleased to learn of peacekeeper Rail Garrison being proposed for Dyess AFB, Texas. Not only will the plan be considerably less expensive than the initial location for Peacekeeper missiles, but the mobility of the Rail Garrison should provide an added degree of security.

While I understand there are other locations being considered, I, of course, believe you will find no better site than Dyess AFB. The wonderful, patriotic people of the “Big Country” stand behind you as you make the best decision.

I respectfully urge your selection of Dyess AFB as one of the new locations for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

Jim Parker

June 3, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am aware of the desire to locate Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB, Texas. I am confident that Dyess AFB would be a wonderful site for this facility.

Texas has a history of willingness to stand and defend against tyranny. We support the policy of peace through strength, as symbolized by the Peacekeeper missile. As you well know, Abilene is already home to a portion of America’s nuclear forces and would welcome this additional strategic program into our community.

Please be assured that your affirmative decision to base the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB would be greatly appreciated. I am sure you will find that the people of Abilene are living examples of the state motto, “Friendship.”

Respectfully,

Glenn Repp

June 3, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am aware of the desire to locate Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB, Texas. I am confident that Dyess AFB would be a wonderful site for this facility.

Texas has a history of willingness to stand and defend against tyranny. We support the policy of peace through strength, as symbolized by the Peacekeeper missile. As you well know, Abilene is already home to a portion of America’s nuclear forces and would welcome this additional strategic program into our community.

Please be assured that your affirmative decision to base the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB would be greatly appreciated. I am sure you will find that the people of Abilene are living examples of the state motto, “Friendship.”

Respectfully,

Glenn Repp

June 3, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am aware of the desire to locate Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB, Texas. I am confident that Dyess AFB would be a wonderful site for this facility.

Texas has a history of willingness to stand and defend against tyranny. We support the policy of peace through strength, as symbolized by the Peacekeeper missile. As you well know, Abilene is already home to a portion of America’s nuclear forces and would welcome this additional strategic program into our community.

Please be assured that your affirmative decision to base the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB would be greatly appreciated. I am sure you will find that the people of Abilene are living examples of the state motto, “Friendship.”

Respectfully,

Glenn Repp

June 3, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am aware of the desire to locate Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB, Texas. I am confident that Dyess AFB would be a wonderful site for this facility.

Texas has a history of willingness to stand and defend against tyranny. We support the policy of peace through strength, as symbolized by the Peacekeeper missile. As you well know, Abilene is already home to a portion of America’s nuclear forces and would welcome this additional strategic program into our community.

Please be assured that your affirmative decision to base the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB would be greatly appreciated. I am sure you will find that the people of Abilene are living examples of the state motto, “Friendship.”

Respectfully,

Glenn Repp

June 3, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am aware of the desire to locate Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB, Texas. I am confident that Dyess AFB would be a wonderful site for this facility.

Texas has a history of willingness to stand and defend against tyranny. We support the policy of peace through strength, as symbolized by the Peacekeeper missile. As you well know, Abilene is already home to a portion of America’s nuclear forces and would welcome this additional strategic program into our community.

Please be assured that your affirmative decision to base the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess AFB would be greatly appreciated. I am sure you will find that the people of Abilene are living examples of the state motto, “Friendship.”

Respectfully,

Glenn Repp
June 6, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to take this time to voice my support for Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison which combines the existing Peacekeeper missile with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jim D. Rudd

June 1, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wholeheartedly support the efforts of the city of Abilene, its Chamber of Commerce, and Dyess Air Force Base in their attempt to be selected as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Abilene has a long-standing tradition of contributing to America's defense. In looking over the proposed sites, I am sure you will agree that Abilene would make an excellent home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

It is my belief that the nation would greatly benefit from your positive consideration of this strategic defense program at Dyess Air Force Base.

Yours very truly,

Sam W. Russell

June 14, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

As I'm sure you are aware, the city of Abilene is a strong supporter of Dyess Air Force Base and our nation's defense system. I support the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison site because it is good for Texas and our national defense.

The citizens of Texas support the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and I'm sure the Rail Garrison looks forward to calling Abilene home.

Sincerely,

Curtis L. Sedalits, Jr.

June 1, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to take this letter in support of Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison which combines the existing Peacekeeper missile with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jim D. Rudd

June 14, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I wholeheartedly support the efforts of the city of Abilene, its Chamber of Commerce, and Dyess Air Force Base in their attempt to be selected as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Abilene has a long-standing tradition of contributing to America's defense. In looking over the proposed sites, I am sure you will agree that Abilene would make an excellent home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

It is my belief that the nation would greatly benefit from your positive consideration of this strategic defense program at Dyess Air Force Base.

Yours very truly,

Sam W. Russell
June 8, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am writing to urge your support for making the Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas the home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

As a State Representative for a very large section of West Texas, I can tell you that Abilene and all of West Texas has a long history of support for the strength of our armed forces. The Dyess Air Force Base for over thirty years serving as home to the B-52, the B-1 and now the Peacekeeper Base is a welcomed and strong support partner of the West Texas community.

I urge your support for locating the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison here at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas.

Sincerely,

Dusty Don Baker
State Representative

June 8, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense, Dept. of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to add my support to that of the people of Abilene and West Texas for the Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison which combines the existing Peacekeeper missile with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Dyess is one of the sites being considered in the country and is the only site considered in Texas. I would appreciate your support in bringing this important strategic program to Texas.

Sincerely,

Hugh D. Shine

June 8, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense, Dept. of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Secretary Carlucci:

I strongly support Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Your consideration for Abilene, Texas will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

John Smith

June 14, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense, Dept. of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Secretary Carlucci:

I strongly support Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Your consideration for Abilene, Texas will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

John Smith
June 1, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to go on record as strongly urging the Defense Department to support Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison which combines the existing Peacekeeper missile with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Abilene, Texas has had a long tradition of contributing to the free world's defense. The community is a strong supporter of Dyess Air Force Base and is proud to be a home to a portion of America's nuclear forces.

I respectfully request your support.

Sincerely,

Jim Tallass

June 14, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Secretary Carlucci,

I am in support of the Dyess Air Force Base in Texas as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. This particular region in Texas has previously welcomed several nuclear forces including the B-52, B-52 and the B-1 and would be an excellent location for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me if I can be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

Mark W. Stiles
State Representative
District 31

June 6, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I want to encourage you to select Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Abilene and the Fort Worth area, which I represent, have many financial and commercial ties since Fort Worth is known as the Gateway to West Texas.

Any program that brings more jobs to Abilene has a positive effect on the Fort Worth area and the entire State of Texas.

Thank you for your consideration of the Lone Star State for this project.

Sincerely,

Jim Tallass
State Representative
District 31

June 10, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to go on record as strongly urging the Defense Department to support Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison which combines the existing Peacekeeper missile with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Abilene, Texas has had a long tradition of contributing to the free world's defense. The community is a strong supporter of Dyess Air Force Base and is proud to be a home to a portion of America's nuclear forces.

I respectfully request your support.

Sincerely,

Jim Tallass
June 8, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to add my support to that of the people of Abilene and East Texas for the Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peasekeeper II Garrison which combines the existing Peasekeeper missile with U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

Dyess is one of ten sites being considered in the country and is the only site considered in Texas. I would appreciate your support in bringing this important strategic program to Texas.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Waterfield
June 1, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I enthusiastically encourage your favorable support for Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. As an eight-year member of the Texas House of Representatives, it is my judgment that the placement would be beneficial for the country and for Texas.

With kind regards,

Steven D. Holm

June 10, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am writing to voice my support of Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas, as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Dyess is strategically located in sparsely populated West Texas and expands our base in building our nuclear forces. Dyess is a large facility with adequate space which would enable it to be compatible with this national defense effort.

The citizens of Abilene and West Texas have an excellent reputation for supporting and working with Dyess AFB and its personnel. For more than thirty years, Dyess has contributed to our national defense posture and has played a key role in our nation's defense.

Sincerely,

Robert Earley
State Representative

June 9, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would respectfully urge your favorable consideration of Abilene, Texas, as the new home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Abilene has consistently been supportive of our nation's nuclear deterrent forces, Dyess Air Force Base was built on land contributed to the Air Force by the community, and a close cooperative relationship continues to be fostered by the community as a whole with the personnel and the purpose of the forces stationed at Dyess.

The people of Abilene have probably worked harder on base-community relations than any other municipality similarly situated in the country. The Air Force has on several occasions brought civilians in from other locations to see what an excellent job Abilene has done in maintaining an atmosphere of respect and support for its military installation. Should the department choose to locate the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison in our area, I feel certain the decision would be welcomed with open arms.

Yours very truly,

Grant Jones

Secretary

Chairman

Committee on Economic Development

The State of the State of Texas
The Senate of The State of Texas
June 30, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I understand that the Department of Defense is considering Dyess Air Force Base at Abilene, Texas as a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. I urge you to select Dyess AB for this installation.

Dyess AFB is situated in a strategic location for quick and easy dispersion of the missiles should the need arise. The qualities of the base are well-known. It is the community and the state that I would like to bring to your attention.

The people of Abilene and the military community have a long history of cooperation and concern for each other. The base was established due to a community effort at the beginning. The people are proud of Dyess Air Force Base.

The citizens of Texas have been very supportive of our country's efforts to build a strong national defense. They understand that a strong nuclear defense is a major deterrent to aggressive tendencies by other countries. Therefore, they welcome the opportunity to be a part of that defense.

In Dyess Air Force Base, I believe you have all of the ingredients for a successful installation of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. I sincerely hope that you will give it every consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci Secretary of Defense Department of Defense The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

The Senate of The State of Texas
June 9, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We are in strong support of Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Our investigation has revealed that the community of Abilene as well as the Chamber of Commerce are very supportive of this project and have pledged their support in the accomplishment of this endeavor. The track record shows that there has been a long standing rapport between the citizens and the military.

Our investigation also shows that geographically Abilene would rank very high against the other nine sites by being able to utilize their existing railroad capabilities in Texas for use in this particular strategic weapon system.

The State of Texas has long been recognized as a state that exhibits political support toward the Armed Forces. It is of utmost importance to locate the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base so that it will be the center of military and community support.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci Secretary of Defense Department of Defense The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

The Senate of The State of Texas
June 21, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to add my support for the location of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas.

I represent Senate District 22 in the Texas Senate. This District lies just to the East of Dyess Air Force Base, and I have worked hard to secure a favorable location for the base.

I believe this area offers all the benefits needed to support this program and work to make it a success.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci Secretary of Defense Department of Defense The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

The Senate of The State of Texas
July 14, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am pleased to wholeheartedly endorse the placement of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base at Abilene, Texas.

The Department of Defense could not find a more supportive community for this program. Abilene has had a long history of community and military cooperation, and this project would be no different. There is no question that the Dyess AFB location meets the technical needs for the program.

This defense system is vital to our national interest, and Dyess AFB would be an ideal location for a defense system of this nature.

[Signature]

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci Secretary of Defense Department of Defense The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

The Senate of The State of Texas
June 30, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I understand that the Department of Defense is considering Dyess Air Force Base at Abilene, Texas as a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. I urge you to select Dyess AB for this installation.

Dyess AFB is situated in a strategic location for quick and easy dispersion of the missiles should the need arise. The qualities of the base are well-known. It is the community and the state that I would like to bring to your attention.

The people of Abilene and the military community have a long history of cooperation and concern for each other. The base was established due to a community effort at the beginning. The people are proud of Dyess Air Force Base.

The citizens of Texas have been very supportive of our country's efforts to build a strong national defense. They understand that a strong nuclear defense is a major deterrent to aggressive tendencies by other countries. Therefore, they welcome the opportunity to be a part of that defense.

In Dyess Air Force Base, I believe you have all of the ingredients for a successful installation of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. I sincerely hope that you will give it every consideration.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci Secretary of Defense Department of Defense The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

The Senate of The State of Texas
June 9, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We are in strong support of Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Our investigation has revealed that the community of Abilene as well as the Chamber of Commerce are very supportive of this project and have pledged their support in the accomplishment of this endeavor. The track record shows that there has been a long standing rapport between the citizens and the military.

Our investigation also shows that geographically Abilene would rank very high against the other nine sites by being able to utilize their existing railroad capabilities in Texas for use in this particular strategic weapon system.

The State of Texas has long been recognized as a state that exhibits political support toward the Armed Forces. It is of utmost importance to locate the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base so that it will be the center of military and community support.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci Secretary of Defense Department of Defense The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

The Senate of The State of Texas
June 21, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to add my support for the location of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas.

I represent Senate District 22 in the Texas Senate. This District lies just to the East of Dyess Air Force Base, and I have worked hard to secure a favorable location for the base.

I believe this area offers all the benefits needed to support this program and work to make it a success.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci Secretary of Defense Department of Defense The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

The Senate of The State of Texas
July 14, 1988

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am pleased to wholeheartedly endorse the placement of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base at Abilene, Texas.

The Department of Defense could not find a more supportive community for this program. Abilene has had a long history of community and military cooperation, and this project would be no different. There is no question that the Dyess AFB location meets the technical needs for the program.

This defense system is vital to our national interest, and Dyess AFB would be an ideal location for a defense system of this nature.

[Signature]

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci Secretary of Defense Department of Defense The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301-1555
Document 167

The Senate of The State of Texas

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am writing in support of locating the Peacemaker Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas. For many years Texas and Texas have traditional relationships to the full support of the United States Military. Texas is blessed with many highly skilled civilian and service personnel who call Texas home.

Among those sites which have deep roots and long ties to Texas, and the Defense system of the United States, is Dyess Air Force Base. At Dyess the Peacemaker Rail Garrison would be a suitable home. I think there is a logical, as well as economical and effective, since it is a strategic military installation and is readily accessible to the many Air Force military personnel from Dyess Air Force Base.

I would hope that the people of Abilene, and all of Texas, would look to me to recognize the historical support we have provided to the United States Military and note that the Peacemaker Rail Garrison should be located in Texas.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Senator Grant Jones

---

Document 168

The Senate of The State of Texas

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

At the Pentagon

At Dyess Air Force Base, headquarters of the 12th Air Division, Strategic Air Command, and located 12 miles west-southwest of Abilene, Texas, is being considered as a site for the Peacemaker Rail Garrison.

Texas proudly has been one of the leading states in military presence in our state, and reciprocation by military personnel is evidenced by the large number who seek Texas their permanent home after they retire.

Abilene, an agricultural city of 100,000 people and strategically located on prairie land in central Texas with three nearby lakes and a state park, has played an important part in the state's military heritage. The city has two universities, one four-year college and a junior college branch. Annual recreational activities include the Texas Cowboy Reunion and the West Texas Fair.

Citizens of Abilene have been enthusiastic in their support for Dyess AFB, and they would welcome the honor of being home to the Peacemaker Rail Garrison. I feel, therefore, that Dyess AFB would be an excellent choice as a site for the Peacemaker Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Senator Grant Jones

---

Document 169

Texas State Senate
P.O. Box 12056
Austin, Texas 78711
(512) 463-0127

July 18, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

It is with confidence that I offer our support for the deployment of the Peacemaker Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base, Texas.

The people of Abilene and Dyess Air Force Base (AFB) have been and will always be committed to preserving our peace. This commitment coupled with the weapon capabilities of the Peacemaker Rail Garrison are sure to produce a weapon system of superior quality.

The great state of Texas and Dyess AFB would be proud to be called home by the Peacemaker Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Rep. Bob Hunter

Sen. Grant Jones

---

Document 170

Senate Chamber
Austin, Texas 78711

June 24, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
United States Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Oklahoma is the birthplace of military aviation when Lieutenant Benjamin O. Foulois flew an army airplane at Fort Sam Houston on March 2, 1910.

Citizens throughout Texas have embraced the strong military presence in our state, and reciprocation by military personnel is evidenced by the large number who seek Texas their permanent home after they retire.

Abilene, an agricultural city of 100,000 people and strategically located on prairie land in central Texas and nearby lakes and a state park, has played an important part in the state's military heritage. The city has two universities, one four-year college and a junior college branch. Annual recreational activities include the Texas Cowboy Reunion and the West Texas Fair.

Citizens of Abilene have been enthusiastic in their support for Dyess AFB, and they would welcome the honor of being home to a Peacemaker Rail Garrison. I feel, therefore, that Dyess AFB would be an excellent choice as a site for the Peacemaker Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Senator Grant Jones

---
June 10, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 2031-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This letter is written in support of making Dyess Air Force Base the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Dyess Air Force Base's original acres were donated to the Air Force by the community and it continues to receive strong support from Abilene and the surrounding area. For 10 consecutive years, Dyess has been a home of the Strategic Air Command and has served as the home of the B-47, B-52, and the F-111 bombers. It also also the people of Abilene and West Texas strongly support the location of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base. We greatly appreciate your support as well.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

June 9, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 2031-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This letter is written in support of making Dyess Air Force Base the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Dyess Air Force Base was chosen as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas. Dyess Air Force Base will provide the site of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. The People of Abilene and West Texas strongly support the location of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base.

We greatly appreciate your support as well.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

June 7, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 2031-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This letter is written in support of making Dyess Air Force Base the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison which will be the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison which will combine the existing Peacekeeper Missile with I.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system. It is my understanding that Dyess A.F.B. located in West Texas has served as a SAC base for over 25 years with strong community support. The People of Abilene and West Texas are strongly supportive of this strategic defense program and would welcome Dyess A.F.B. being chosen as the site. Your strong consideration of Dyess A.F.B. as the site would be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
June 1, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Secretary Carlucci:

As a member of the Texas Legislature and a former member of the U.S. military, I am writing to express my support of Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

If you bring the Peacekeeper critical new addition to our strategic weapons system to Texas, I can promise you perhaps the important thing of all - I have the full and total support of the patriotic and informed citizens of Abilene and the surrounding area. Texas will welcome the new military units as it has always done - with open arms and generous support. Nowhere in America will you find the receptive, pro-military environment you find in Texas. This is especially true of Abilene where the base and city have existed in harmony for decades. We are very proud of our military bases and try to show that fact anywhere and anyway we can.

I know other states in contention for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison also have good points. But they are not Texas and at the risk of sounding a bit proud, I think that just about says it all.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Alan Schoencraft
State Representative

June 27, 1988

TheHonorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I join my colleagues in the Texas House of Representatives and Texas Senate along with other business, governmental and civic leaders in supporting Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. This would combine the existing Peacekeeper missile with the U.S. railroads in our strategic weapons system.

It is my sincere hope that you will give every consideration to Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

Weldon Betts

June 16, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Texas has a long history of supporting deterrence as the best defense for ensuring peace. The Abilene, Texas area, has proudly raised funds to purchase and donate to the Air Force 1,500 of the original 3,500 acres comprising Dyess Air Force Base. For over 30 years, Dyess AFB has served as a SAC base and the peacekeeper missile headquarters for the surrounding community. The citizens of Abilene and West Texas are proud of their role in our nation's nuclear defense.

I don't think you will find a more hospitable area anywhere in our nation than Abilene for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and, once again, I heartily recommend Dyess AFB to you as the site for this integral national defense program.

Yours truly,

Weldon Betts

June 14, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As one of the ten sites under consideration I would like to encourage the selection of Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas as the home base of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

The entire community of Abilene is very supportive of this project and have a long history of involvement with Dyess Air Force Base. All of us in Texas recognize the importance of being committed to our nation's defense efforts.

Your favorable consideration of Dyess Air Force Base as home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Erwin Barton

June 1, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Secretary Carlucci:

Respectfully,

Alan Schoencraft
State Representative

P.O. Box 1561
Abilene, Texas 79603-1561

June 27, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Please consider Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

Weldon Betts
Dear Mr. Secretary:

I respectfully request your inclusion of my name to the growing list of those who support the relocation of Dyess Air Force Base and Abilene, Texas as the site for the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison.

In keeping with its tradition of contributing to the free world's defense, Abilene proposes an excellent home for the Peacekeeper. Through the strong community support of the military base, including the original donation of 5,000 acres to the installation, Abilene is ready to go forward once again in their sincere effort to bring the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison to Texas.

Following the example of the former Mr. Dyess Air Force Base was renumbered as the Peacekeeper Air Command installation. Operating as a DRAC base, Dyess has served as the home to the F-4, the B-1, and the B-52 whose mission was to provide a deterrent force in the event of war. The Dyess community has worked hard to support the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison's capability to house a portion of the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base as a provider of worldwide tactical nuclear forces.

Texas' history shows that Texasians are proud of our free world. We offer our home as a home for the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison to reestablish our commitment to the free world's defense.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chet Edwards
State Senator

[Note: The content is incomplete and contains some redaction marks.]

---

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Please accept this letter as an indication of my full support for locating the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas.

Abilene has long exhibited a tradition of contributing to the free world's defense through its full support of Dyess Air Force Base. The community and all of West Texas has actively promoted a close and strong relationship with the air base and its personnel.

Citizens of the Lone Star State are proud of the many defense installations located here. We would welcome the opportunity to be home to this vital strategic program and ask for your favorable consideration.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Judith Zaffirri

---

As Public Affairs Rep of General Dynamics Abile

Fac. 50, the largest manufacturing complex in Abilene. We would welcome the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison in Abilene.

General Dynamics strongly supports a strong defense for our nation. We believe Abilene would be the best site for the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison. Abilene offers an excellent home site. We are open to a variety of ideas to bring the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison to Abilene to assemble the world's most advanced strategic nuclear weapon.

General Dynamics has served and supported community needs for over 16 years. We believe in a strong defense and defense program. We support the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison in Abilene.

[Signature]

Brave R. Condit
140 Waterway
Abilene, TX
The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci  
Secretary of Defense  
Department of Defense  
The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Secretary Carlucci:

The purpose of this letter is to support the application of Dyess Air Force Base as a possible site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Throughout the years, Dyess Air Force Base has done a fine job for the United States of America and the people of Abilene have been strongly supportive of each and every program which has been conducted by the Air Force.

I would appreciate your consideration and support on behalf of Dyess Air Force Base in locating the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess. Thank you very much for your consideration and support.

Very truly yours,

Jim Mattox  
Attorney General of Texas

July 20, 1980

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci  
Secretary of Defense  
Department of Defense  
The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301-1555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As Chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission I want to express my strong support of Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System.

Dyess Air Force Base offers the ideal location for a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System. The base is located in close proximity to Abilene, Texas, which has a long history of supporting the military, including tactical and strategic units and missile installations. Because of the strategic and environmental contributions of the area, I hope you will select Abilene and Dyess AFB, Texas for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System.

I grew up in the San Angelo area not far from Abilene and am well acquainted with the strong patriotic nature of the people of West Texas. The Abilene area is in a central location for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System. Our railroad network in West Texas is in good condition and is accessible for moving or static deployment.

The people of the Abilene area support this vital part of our national defense and I join in their enthusiasm and support of the selection of Dyess with the Peacekeeper.

If there is anything my office can do please call. We will be happy to assist you.

Sincerely yours,

James S. [ illegible ] August

July 25, 1988

Colonel Michael McShane,  
Staff Judge Advocate,  
United States Air Force,  
United States of America.

Dear Colonel McShane,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you in support of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. These words are spoken humbly, yet they come from deep inside my heart and mind. I volunteered to represent the thoughts and ideas of my service club, the Abilene Cactus Lions Club. We are one of some 38,000 clubs in over 160 countries throughout the free world. Our motto is "WE SERVE". L.I.O.N.S stands for Liberty, Intelligence, Our nation's Safety.

This area is surrounded by old forts that were built and maintained by the military to protect and help the early settlers of the western part of this nation. We are extremely proud of this early heritage and have done and will do to extreme measures to preserve this tradition.

It was my good fortune to have been born and raised here in Abilene by Christian parents who took an active interest in a great church. We are blessed with many faiths and numerous denominations here.

Sincerely yours,

William T. "Bill" King

July 25, 1988

Our city has many fine Boy Scout troops. It was in one of these troops that my son and I attained the rank of Eagle Scout. The worldwide Boy Scout motto of "BE PREPARED" was indelibly imprinted in our lives.

So it is with this insight, that I encourage your consideration to bring to fruition Dyess Air Force Base as one of the sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

Sincerely yours,

William T. "Bill" King
June 1, 1988

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1336

Dear Secretary Carlucci:

I support locating the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas. Should Congress make this decision a high priority, I believe that locating the Garrison at Dyess would enhance the effectiveness of our nation's strategic weapons system.

Abilene's Dyess Air Force Base has served the nation well as a SAC base for over 20 years. This base's contribution to our national defense is due in no small part to the support of the community which welcomed it to Texas.

The people of Texas have always advocated a strong national defense as a deterrent to war. I urge you to rely on Abilene and Dyess AFB as a key element in preserving peace.

Sincerely,

Col. Richard A. Hansen

Col. Hansen is one of the United States Air Force welcome Abilene.

My name is Samuel D. Latta, I currently serve as Justice of the Peace for Taylor County, Pct. 1, Pct. 2, and as the only hispanic elected official in the Big Country. It is with great honor that I address you on the issue before us.

Gentlemen,

We live in a moment of danger on the face of the Earth, and

We are faced with issues that are determined to change that fact by constantly threatening American and World Peace alike, and

We as Americans are charged with defending the honor of our forefathers who gave their all, so that we might enjoy peace and freedom for ages to come, and

We are citizens of Abilene who love our country and all it stands for, and

Abilene and Dyess have, what we consider, an mutually excellent and unique relationship in our joint peace building efforts to keep the peace of our beloved nation, and

The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is a weapon system which all America can be proud of, as a deterrent of enemy aggression.

The people of Abilene gladly and strongly support its implementation and, of course, as always, we welcome the project into our home with open arms, for there is no greater honor or sense of patriotism than to be part of the defense of "the land of the Free and the home of the Brave."

If I might add, as a representative of the people of Abilene and Taylor County, Gentlemen, you may search "from the mountain, to the valley, to the ocean white with foam," but nowhere will you find a more supportive or patriotic People than the citizens of Abilene and the Big Country.

Col. Hansen, the late president John F. Kennedy challenged us with the words: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country." Well Sir, we have asked the letter of the two questions and have been given the opportunity to provide a home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison, and all I can say is "We stand ready and committed to the task before us."

Thank You!

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1336

Dear Frank:

I had the pleasure of receiving a copy of the United States Air Force's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program. This program promises a safe, reliable, and secure mobile barrier for the 50 Peacekeeper ICBM missiles which have been authorized by Congress. Certainly, this method of employment will allow any Congressional committee concerned about the survival rates of Peacekeeper missiles, as any army would be faced with the formidable task of successfully defending them against the threat of counter-attack.

The DEIS lists Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene as a potential rail garrison site. The DEIS explains that a rail garrison could be placed at Dyess without any adverse impact to the community, unlike many other sites which pose serious environmental difficulties. The rail garrison construction program would directly create over 500 local jobs, with total long-term direct and indirect program-related employment of 135 jobs. Project employment will pump $50 million into the local economy during the construction phase and will result in an increase of $20 million in personal income to the Abilene area over the long-term operation of the garrison facility.

This type of economic impact would be a tremendous boost for this west Texas city. I am committed to expanding the number of federal facilities in our state at they provide substantial direct and indirect economic benefits.

I urge you to consider the findings of the DEIS on this program, which indicates that Abilene's Dyess Air Force Base would be one of the best possible sites for a Rail Garrison unit. I enthusiastically support the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program and am confident that the Congress will appreciate the benefits of this significant addition to our overall national defense.

The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1336

Col. Hansen and other representative's of the United States Air Force, welcome to Abilene.

My name is Samuel D. Latta, I currently serve as Justice of the Peace for Taylor County, Pct. 1, Pct. 2, and as the only hispanic elected official in the Big Country. It is with great honor that I address you on the issue before us.

Gentlemen,

We live in a moment of danger on the face of the Earth, and

We are faced with issues that are determined to change that fact by constantly threatening American and World Peace alike, and

We as Americans are charged with defending the honor of our forefathers who gave their all, so that we might enjoy peace and freedom for ages to come, and

We are citizens of Abilene who love our country and all it stands for, and

Abilene and Dyess have, what we consider, an mutually excellent and unique relationship in our joint peace building efforts to keep the peace of our beloved nation, and

The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison is a weapon system which all America can be proud of, as a deterrent of enemy aggression.

The people of Abilene gladly and strongly support its implementation and, of course, as always, we welcome the project into our home with open arms, for there is no greater honor or sense of patriotism than to be part of the defense of "the land of the Free and the home of the Brave."

If I might add, as a representative of the people of Abilene and Taylor County, Gentlemen, you may search "from the mountain, to the valley, to the ocean white with foam," but nowhere will you find a more supportive or patriotic People than the citizens of Abilene and the Big Country.

Col. Hansen, the late president John F. Kennedy challenged us with the words: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country." Well Sir, we have asked the letter of the two questions and have been given the opportunity to provide a home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison, and all I can say is "We stand ready and committed to the task before us."

Thank You!
The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci
July 14, 1988
Page 2

The citizens of the State of Texas are proud of the role we play in preserving our national security and look forward to this opportunity to make additional contributions.

Sincerely,

William P. Clements, Jr.
Governor

cc:
The Honorable Lloyd Bentsen
The Honorable Phil Gramm
The Honorable Charles Wilson
The Honorable Morris Leach
The Honorable Schlauch Ortila
The Honorable Albert C. Bagley
The Honorable Tom Delay
The Honorable Tom Springer
The Honorable Bob Hunter
The Honorable Dale C. Ferguson
Mayor
City of Abilene

From: "The Honorable Frank C. Carlucci"
To: "William P. Clements, Jr., Governor"
Subject: "Texas's Role in National Security"

The citizens of the State of Texas are proud of the role we play in preserving our national security and look forward to this opportunity to make additional contributions.

Sincerely,

William P. Clements, Jr.
Governor

cc:
The Honorable Lloyd Bentsen
The Honorable Phil Gramm
The Honorable Charles Wilson
The Honorable Morris Leach
The Honorable Schlauch Ortila
The Honorable Albert C. Bagley
The Honorable Tom Delay
The Honorable Tom Springer
The Honorable Bob Hunter
The Honorable Dale C. Ferguson
Mayor
City of Abilene

One final word: A recent survey indicated that a majority of voters favor the Peace Keeper. If Bush is elected, it would be a great day for the Peace Keeper.

Thank you.
1. My freedom costs more than your freedom.
2. The children of the world want the children of the world to live.
3. Note the historical view that freedom means the freedom of speech.

Support for Peacekeeper:

The most basic national security objective of the United States is to preserve today's peace and prevent tomorrow's war. Determination of nuclear attack, based on the quality and preparedness of our strategic forces, and our nation's ability to employ them, is necessary. The nation is now deliberating deployment of Peacekeeper missile defense.

To set the stage for the Peacekeeper, we must consider this concept from a "back to basics" approach. We need to decide why we need Peacekeeper, and why our nation's strategic forces should be "good enough" strategically, militarily, and economically.

Peacekeeper's provide capabilities that strengthen our strategic defense and contribute to deterrence. These factors have a major role to play in our strategic offensive forces.

Peacekeeper's are based within our borders. They are within our borders, and their target is clearly an attack. Peacekeeper's provide the "least cost" strategic deterrent. The cost is about 75 percent of the total interstate and support funding for our strategic offensive forces.

Peacekeeper's provide strategic deterrence just to soften the impact of any attack. Peacekeepers must be able to carry out our nation's strategy for deterrence of the Soviet threat.

Peacekeeper's provide the accuracy and the rapid response needed to hold back the threat of Soviet nuclear forces, therefore we have the ability to

Sincerely,

Terry Nolan
Nolan County Judge
SUPPORT FOR PEACEKEEPER
"RAIL GARRISON"

The most basic national security objective of the United States is to preserve today's peace and prevent tomorrow's war. Deterrence of nuclear attack is based on the quality and preparedness of our strategic forces, and our nation's ability to employ them if necessary.

The nation is now deliberating deployment of PEACEKEEPER missile in "Rail Garrison" being.

To set the stage for the rail garrison we must consider this concept from a "back to basics" approach. We need to consider why we have ICBM's and why it's important to keep that force effective; why we need PEACEKEEPER; and why rail garrison makes "good sense" strategically, militarily, and economically.

ICBM's provide capabilities that strengthen our strategic defense and contribute to Soviet deterrence. The Soviets know our ICBM's capabilities, and that knowledge strengthens our defensive posture.

ICBM's are based within our borders. Any attack against them on our territory is clearly an attack upon the United States.

Sincerely,

Jerry Johnson

perspective, we in Nolan County Texas, neighbors to west of Dyess AFB, support the PEACEKEEPER Rail Garrison System.

Sincerely,

Jerry Johnson

Nolan County Judge

The Honorable Frank Carlacci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The City of Abilene, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbors, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Initiative. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Walker M. Bertel, City Admin.
Box 38, Abilene, Texas 79601

In regular session of the Monday City Council on April 17th, 1989 Honorable Mayor orange resolution be passed. Andrade seconded the motion. Voting for were Brown, Andrade, Tidwell, Tucker and Alba. Move, Mine, Carried.
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The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The County of Callahan, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional one to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MAYOR

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The City of Abilene, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional one to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mack Kiffen

April 4, 1980

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The County of Callahan, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional one to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mack Kiffen
The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The County of Runnels, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavor to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael B. Murchison
County Judge
Runnels County, Texas

PHONE 915-363-2633

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The County of Stonewall, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the city of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavor to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ed Woloch
County Judge
Stonewall County, Texas
The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The County of Comanche, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Ball (SAC) missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Ball (SAC) as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bob Allen
County Judge

APRIL 1, 1988

COUNTY OF COMANCHE

The County of Comanche, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Ball (SAC) missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Ball (SAC) as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bob Allen
County Judge

City of Ranger

City of Ranger

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The City of Ranger, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Ball (SAC) missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Ball (SAC) as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Johnny C. Caruth
Mayor
City of Ranger
Comanche, Texas 76442
April 5, 1988

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The City of Abilene, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and the Chamber of Commerce in their endeavor to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

P.C. Call
Mayor, P.C. Call

Cc: /me

Shackelford County

April 6, 1988

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The City of Abilene, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavor to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Maurie Smith
County Judge
Shackelford County

April 5, 1988

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Stephens County, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, Texas, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavor to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile.

We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

J.B. Tuttle
County Judge

cc: Mr. Brad Balbree
Executive Director
West Central Texas Council of Governments
P. O. Box 319
Abilene, Texas 79604
The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The City of Coleman, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation, and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which Texas has already committed. Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mayor
City Council

April 6, 1988

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

The City of Abilene, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of its neighbor, the City of Coleman, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position of Dyess Air Force Base in the defense of our nation, and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which Texas has already committed. Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mayor
City Council

WHERE A PROUD PAST GREET A PROMISING FUTURE
The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary,

The City of Coleman, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mayor

City of Coleman
Post Office Box 502
Coleman, Texas

April 6, 1988

City of Brownwood
April 5, 1988

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary,

The City of Brownwood, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mayor

City of Brownwood
Post Office Box 693
Brownwood, Texas 76801

April 7, 1988

The City of Snyder, Texas

The Honorable Frank Carlucci
Secretary of Defense
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1115

Dear Mr. Secretary,

The City of Snyder, Texas enthusiastically supports the efforts of our neighbor, the City of Abilene, and its Chamber of Commerce in their endeavors to be selected as one of America's sites for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison missile. We are aware of the strategic position Dyess Air Force Base plays in the defense of our nation and welcome the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison as an additional arm to the peace keeping mission to which West Texans have already committed.

Your positive consideration of Abilene and West Central Texas for this project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mayor

City of Snyder
Post Office Box 902
Snyder, Texas 79549

April 5, 1988
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TO THE UNITED STATES COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

CITY OF ABILENE

WHEREAS, the City of Abilene, the City of Taylor, and the surrounding region have long been served by the petroleum resources of the State of Texas, and specifically those of the West Texas area; and

WHEREAS, with the advent of petroleum industries, the unemployment rates of Abilene, Taylor County, and the surrounding region have increased significantly; and

WHEREAS, the diversification of the economy in this area is vital to the survival of many West Central Texas towns and communities; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of the West Central Texas area already recognize and appreciate the mission and goals of Dyess Air Force Base, both for its vital role in the defense of our nation and for its tangible contribution to the region's economy; and

YOU, therefore, be it resolved by the Executive Committee of the West Central Texas Council of Governments to support the efforts of the City of Abilene and the Abilene Chamber of Commerce - Military Affairs Committee in their endeavors to gain full and favorable consideration from the United States Department of Defense to become a site for a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison in Abilene, Taylor County, Texas; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council would most encourage the United States Department of Defense to seriously consider locating a site for a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison in Abilene, Taylor County, Texas, and further the local governments of West Central Texas as an opportunity to further serve the United States in a number of advantageous to all involved.

Sincerely,

Mayor Robert Nations

City Manager, Mayor

Richard Bruesch

Larry C. Brinkley

Robert Motley

Bette Swearngan


The City of Abilene, the City of Taylor, and the surrounding region have long been served by the petroleum resources of the State of Texas, and specifically those of the West Texas area. With the advent of petroleum industries, the unemployment rates of Abilene, Taylor County, and the surrounding region have increased significantly. The diversification of the economy in this area is vital to the survival of many West Central Texas towns and communities. The citizens of the West Central Texas area already recognize and appreciate the mission and goals of Dyess Air Force Base, both for its vital role in the defense of our nation and for its tangible contribution to the region's economy. In order to further serve the United States in a number of advantageous to all involved, it is resolved that the Council would most encourage the United States Department of Defense to seriously consider locating a site for a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison in Abilene, Taylor County, Texas.
Dear LTC Walsh,

During the recent public hearing held in Jacksonville on August 1st, I questioned why the amount of mileage and accessibility of the national rail system was not included in the environmental impact statement. I was particularly concerned that several of the bases were located immediately adjacent to foreign borders and I pointed out that Little Rock Air Force Base was centrally located in the country with a total of 360 degrees of accessibility, as opposed to environmental impact. I forgot to mention my question about tariffs imposed by the national railroad. Is there a lease cost imposed upon the use of the national rail system by the Air Force? If so, this becomes a very relevant figure and should be computed into the economic impact portions of the environmental statement. For example, if a tariff is lower for the Cotton Belt and Union Pacific, this would make Little Rock Air Force Base more attractive than several that may have a higher tariff on the Burlington Northern or the Southern Pacific lines. Or, have the tariffs been assessed under federal law or is there no requirement to pay for the use of the track since it is a national emergency? I think this should be covered in the environmental impact statement.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

August 8, 1988

Col. Walsh
Director of Environmental Planning
AFPSC-EN/REV
Horton Annex, California 92409-6448

Dear Sir,

I attended the hearing on the "Peacekeeper" Rail System last week in Warrensburg, MO. I heard it mentioned how safe the world if the rail cars would be, how much it would cost, and how many other interesting and informative questions and answers to this program are used.

I ask that your committee look more closely at these and other important questions and plan a stop to this most expensive and important program.

A concerned mother and grandmother,

[Signature]

August 8, 1988

G. Walsh
Director of Environmental Planning
AFPSC-EN/REV
Horton Annex, California 92409-6448

Page 2

Please let me know if this will be considered in the final impact statement.

Best regards,

[Signature]

August 8, 1988

DOUG WOO

cc: Honorable Tommy Robinson
Amtrak wreck blamed on heat-warped tracks

The Kansas City Star, Sunday, August 7, 1983, Page 17a

Amtrak wreck blamed on heat-warped tracks

In the heat wave of 1980, the metals that make up the rails expanded and contracted, warping the rails and causing them to break apart. This accident was one of several that occurred during the heat wave. The track was cut by a machine that is unable to make the proper cuts. The engineer then had to cut the track by hand, which he did not have the proper equipment to do. This accident was caused by the incorrect sign and the incorrect information that was given to the engineer. The engineer then had to cut the track by hand, which he did not have the proper equipment to do. This accident was caused by the incorrect sign and the incorrect information that was given to the engineer.

LOCATION Waterdown, ON 9746

COMMENT SHEET U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to be heard by you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and offer you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have overlooked. A thorough environmental analysis will be conducted and published before a decision is made on the proposed project. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention matters that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

1. What would you consider adequate defense? In those situations, what would you consider adequate defense? In those situations, what would you consider adequate defense?

2. When was the current administration in the Soviet Union supposed to be in place? Can it be forced to consider the impact on the total world environment and all findings of the report on environmental concerns? How much could be considered adequate defense? In those situations, what would you consider adequate defense? In those situations, what would you consider adequate defense?

3. What has been done to ensure all those dollars to protect and improve our environment in Johnson and Perkiomenville? Any problems with落实 a program of Peace studies for dollars with defense spending, would the environmental impact be less? Thank you.

4. Name: Street Address: City: State: Phone:

M. E. location of No. 1 spur Baker AFB

1. Location is 10 miles north of the Baker AFB. (Location B)
2. Located across from the north of the Baker AFB. (Location B)
3. Location is 5 miles north of the Baker AFB. (Location B)

The only difference is that it is a partially 5 mile north of the Baker AFB. (Location B)
4. The route proposed is shorter to the trains.

5. The route proposed is shorter to the trains.

6. The route proposed is shorter to the trains.

7. The route proposed is shorter to the trains.
July 27, 1988

Mr. James Johnson, Mayor
City of Adams
Adams, WI 53910

Dear Mayor Johnson:

On August 8, 1988, a public hearing will be conducted at 7 p.m. at the Grand Forks City Hall multipurpose room to receive public comment about the new 38200 rail facility at Grand Forks Air Force Base. The rail facility is designed to increase the survivability and reliability of our nation's strategic weapon. The new rail facility will also have a positive economic impact on our community. The new rail facility will be designed to accommodate a variety of rail systems, including long-range weapon systems, and the construction will be required to protect the national security of our nation.

At the hearing, we anticipate that many people will attend to hear about the new rail facility. If you have any questions about the new rail facility, please contact me at 701-775-7250.

Sincerely,

Frank T. Glaeser, Chairman
Community Rail Garrison Committee

2-88
QUESTION:
I am generating the concept of a rail-basedmarsusl work. For us,
IS NOT PLANNED. With the National Safety Board of the rail networks
AEROSPACE AREA SUCH AS NUERSE, FEMININE, AND POSSIBILITIES OF
SAFETY WHERE THE AIR FORCE MAY NOE CONTROL OF THE MOON

1

LOCATION

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL CARRIAGE PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to
address your concern. We have determined that one of the rail networks in the
National Safety Board program provides an opportunity for us to bring to
your attention. We may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
environmental analysis that will be available to the public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our
attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

1

The Air Force should address the psychological
impact upon Groves's population, and
three persons who might relocate here.

The purpose other than building the
tail gunfire at having a high profile
future with the delivery system less
than ten miles from the center of town.

Will anyone really want to live here for
any length of time more than an interim
flying typical equipment of Groves?

Brenda Johnson, 1744 Shann Oak Avenue

I note that the entire system will be built
somewhere else and moved here. Why not
deploy this system in San Bernardino?

6

The product outside in heavy protective
coating in 95 degrees.

The security systems will be
implemented to safeguard the rail
facilities and limit those affected
the lifestyle of the area.

7

What is the alternative to rail
transmission including no action option

Yours for the moment of
our planet,

Carol O. Day

FEB 1970
Rogers at every

2-90
in the state return only about 30% of this money. Thus, re-
spending approximately $300 million a year due to largely unnecessary
military expenses, or about $200 for every man, woman
and child in the state. In Cascade County alone the proportions
are reversed. Millions spent here, you know, are $200 million a year.
and we pay only about $30 million. Incidentally, the figures
which头疼simulations based on income multiplier and the
like have also been questioned, and other areas where space
has been closed down have actually experienced a source of
income. In the case of Missoula, for example, the Air Force
departed. One need only compare the economic
well-being for lack of it of Great Falls with the other large
cities in Montana to realize that rather than being an
economic boon to us, the Air Force has actually undermined
our local economy. Light manufacturing, agriculture, education,
and other traditional strengths of the local economy have actually
dwindled during the period when Air Force expenditures here
have increased.

The production of nuclear weapons, hidden within
the civilian budget of the Energy Department, is probably
the most environmentally harmful, destructive, and costly
environmental threat. Right now, it is estimated that
nearly 100% of the nuclear weapons
every year. Decommissioning and disposing of
all the civilian nuclear plants associated with nuclear
power production will cost hundreds of millions more, why
the costs of the $2 billion allocation for cleanup
will be paid. This is one of the fundamental issues
surrounding the development and deployment of nuclear
weapons, yet the government continually stalls and puts off
giving any answers to these questions. The Air Force would be
doing a major public service by drawing up plans to clean
up and dispose of all the nuclear facilities which have,
created nuclear weapon systems have produced. Spend the $20-70 billion
which left us nothing but $300 million, and by 1989 as the
and then come back and ask for more, when everything is
finished, look at the international situation. If we
are thinking in terms of the next war, then the
most prudent course of action would be to build a
new strategic weapon system. Much of us doubt that this
will ever happen if it does, we are prepared to listen
and carefully consider your proposal.

Thank you. This concludes my testimony.

Paul Stephens
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The production of nuclear weapons, hidden within
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environmental threat. Right now, it is estimated that
nearly 100% of the nuclear weapons
every year. Decommissioning and disposing of
all the civilian nuclear plants associated with nuclear
power production will cost hundreds of millions more, why
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will be paid. This is one of the fundamental issues
surrounding the development and deployment of nuclear
weapons, yet the government continually stalls and puts off
giving any answers to these questions. The Air Force would be
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created nuclear weapon systems have produced. Spend the $20-70 billion
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are thinking in terms of the next war, then the
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will ever happen if it does, we are prepared to listen
and carefully consider your proposal.

Thank you. This concludes my testimony.

Paul Stephens
LOCATION: Medical Lake, WA

COMMITTEE SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to announce to you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and offer you an opportunity to bring to our attention actions we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to obtain a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this forum to bring to our attention any concerns you may have. We have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

1. I hope you can live from the last two letters from your original testimonial and from the second screening by the government.
2. I hope you can live from the last two letters from your original testimonial and from the second screening by the government. If you have any questions, please contact our office at 1-800-555-1234.

Plains and plateau areas are most likely to be affected by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. Please note that the plain is located in the United States.

You have been organized properly during your use of the landing in Spokane in 12 to 30 years, Please Group 1.

We are not sure if the Peacekeeper/Rail Garrison is a program that will provide a positive public/economic impact to Minot. About 3,700 more military, 1,700 more civilian jobs, $7.5 million in initial construction, and over $200 million in annual economic impact. It is a large scale, Peacekeeper/Rail Garrison contribution to national security—something the community has always been proud of in the past and will continue to be proud of in the future. I strongly support the selection of Minot AFB for deployment of the Peacekeeper/Rail Garrison.

Sincerely,

G. J. W. ABLETT
President

August 19, 19...
THE OUTLYING URBAN COMMUNITIES AROUND MINOT AFB ARE BEING MORE AND MORE DEPENDENT UPON THE ACTIVITY OF THE MILITARY INSTALLATION IN OUR MIDST.

NO LONGER IS THERE ANY CHANCE FOR EMPLOYMENT COMPANIES OR OTHER ACTIVITY RELATING TO AGRICULTURE LOOKING TO LOCATE IN THE SMALL COMMUNITIES. NO LONGER CAN THESE SMALLER COMMUNITIES RELY ON SUPPORT FROM THE OIL INDUSTRY AS IN THE PAST. IT'S BEEN A LONG TIME SINCE EITHER THE AGRICULTURAL OR OIL ECONOMY HAS DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY BOUGHT EVEN ANY RESIDENCIAL REAL ESTATE IN THESE SMALL COMMUNITIES.

TODAY IN THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES SUCH AS GLENBURN, DEERING, LANGFORD, CAMPOU, ETC., RESIDENTIAL REAL ESTATE IS BEING MARKETED PRIMARILY TO MILITARY FAMILIES WHO DESIRE TO LIVE OFF THE INSTALLATION IN A QUIET SMALL TOWN ENVIRONMENT.

THE COMMUNITY OF GLENBURN LOCATED ONLY TEN MILES FROM THE BASE WOULD BE VERY HARD PRESSED IF THE MILITARY BASE WERE NOT HERE OR IF THE MISSION KEPT GETTING SMALLER IN SCOPE. THE OPENING OF THE NEW HOSPITAL AND THE POSSIBILITY OF ADDING RAIL GARRISON TO THE MINOT AFB MISSION WILL BENEFIT COMMUNITIES SUCH AS GLENBURN. THE POSSIBILITY OF DRAWING SOME PEOPLE TO OUR COMMUNITY, EITHER MILITARY OR CIVILIAN, FROM THE JOB MARKET THAT WILL BE CREATED BY RAIL GARRISON, WILL CONTRIBUTE IMMENSELY TO THE SURVIVAL OF OUR TOWN. THE UPGRADING AND MAINTENANCE OF THE RAIL SYSTEM AROUND US AS A RESULT OF RAIL GARRISON COULD VERY EASILY PROVIDE THE AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY A BOOST BY POSSIBLY REDUCING COSTS FOR SHIPPING CHAIN BY RAIL. THESE BENEFITS WOULD BE POSITIVELY FELT IN THE SMALLER COMMUNITIES MUCH SOONER THAN IN THE BIG CITIES.

OUR SCHOOLS WOULD PROBABLY BENEFIT THE MOST. THERE HAS BEEN A STEADY DECLINING ENROLLMENT IN THE RURAL AGRICULTURAL AREAS.

HERE IN GLENBURN THE MILITARY PEOPLE WHO CHOOSE TO LIVE IN OUR SCHOOL DISTRICT OR HAVE FOUND THE COMMUNITY OF GLENBURN, HAVE HELPED OUR ENROLLMENT CONSIDERABLY.

RAIL GARRISON SHOULD ADD TO THAT ENROLLMENT WHICH IN TURN WILL STRENGTHEN OUR DISTRICT AND KEEP OUR DOORS OPEN FOR A LONG TIME INTO THE FUTURE.

TONY ALF
MAYOR OF GLENBURN

I thank you for this opportunity to comment on the environmental impact statement.

I think it's clear from the number of people here tonight that there's a great deal of interest in the MX missile and its potential impact on North Dakota.

I think it's also clear from the detailed environmental impact statement that we are commenting on tonight, that there is little cause for concern if Minot is chosen to host the rail-based MX missile.

I think the impact that we need to be most concerned about is the impact on the lives of all Americans if the MX is not deployed, here or anywhere else.

We need to be concerned about how the Soviets will view such an action. We need to be concerned about the impact that would have.

I am quite sure the impact would not be desirable.

We've learned in the past several years that peace and security come through rational strength. That's what the rail-based MX would provide -- strength to protect our peace and security.

Those who would oppose us understand strength. They respect strength. And, it is becoming apparent that it is our commitment to strength that has convinced them to seriously work with us toward arms reductions.

STATEMENT BY
STEVE SYDNESS

MX E.I.S. HEARING
MINOT, NORTH DAKOTA
AUGUST 11, 1988

We need to be concerned about how the Soviets will view such an action. We need to be concerned about the impact that would have.

I am quite sure the impact would not be desirable.

We've learned in the past several years that peace and security come through rational strength. That's what the rail-based MX would provide -- strength to protect our peace and security.

Those who would oppose us understand strength. They respect strength. And, it is becoming apparent that it is our commitment to strength that has convinced them to seriously work with us toward arms reductions.
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I think it's clear from the number of people here tonight that there's a great deal of interest in the MX missile and its potential impact on North Dakota.

I think it's also clear from the detailed environmental impact statement that we are commenting on tonight, that there is little cause for concern if Minot is chosen to host the rail-based MX missile.

I think the impact that we need to be most concerned about is the impact on the lives of all Americans if the MX is not deployed, here or anywhere else.

We need to be concerned about how the Soviets will view such an action. We need to be concerned about the impact that would have.

I am quite sure the impact would not be desirable.

We've learned in the past several years that peace and security come through rational strength. That's what the rail-based MX would provide -- strength to protect our peace and security.

Those who would oppose us understand strength. They respect strength. And, it is becoming apparent that it is our commitment to strength that has convinced them to seriously work with us toward arms reductions.

I thank you for this opportunity to comment on the environmental impact statement.

I think it's clear from the number of people here tonight that there's a great deal of interest in the MX missile and its potential impact on North Dakota.

I think it's also clear from the detailed environmental impact statement that we are commenting on tonight, that there is little cause for concern if Minot is chosen to host the rail-based MX missile.

I think the impact that we need to be most concerned about is the impact on the lives of all Americans if the MX is not deployed, here or anywhere else.

We need to be concerned about how the Soviets will view such an action. We need to be concerned about the impact that would have.

I am quite sure the impact would not be desirable.

We've learned in the past several years that peace and security come through rational strength. That's what the rail-based MX would provide -- strength to protect our peace and security.

Those who would oppose us understand strength. They respect strength. And, it is becoming apparent that it is our commitment to strength that has convinced them to seriously work with us toward arms reductions.
We all pray for the day when weapons like the MX and the other missiles scattered across our prairie won't be needed. Today, for the first time, we can envision such a world.

We can envision such a world because our leaders were wise enough to invest in a strong defense for our country. We told the world, "We value our peace and our freedom and we will protect it."

We must continue to send the world that same message until we can all agree to rid our planet of these weapons.

I think most of the people here understand the need for the MX and are willing to accept it into our communities so long as we have reasonable assurances of the safety of the system.

I think, with the environmental impact statement that we are considering tonight, we have that assurance.

Others have already commented, and more will, I'm sure, talk about the beneficial economic impact the MX rail-transport would have on this region if the decision is made to put it here. That consideration is not a small one.

We welcome the jobs and the people the MX would bring to our state. More than 400 construction jobs and almost 360 permanent jobs mean a lot in a state like ours.

We are well aware of the beneficial impact of an additional several million dollars a year in payroll would have to our area businesses and we would welcome that as well.

But we know that the MX is not an economic development project, although it may serve that worthy goal. It is a project to secure our peace and our security. And that is a most worthy goal.

I can think of no more beneficial impact.

Thank you.
To Whom it May Concern:

I have read the Bail Garrison Impact Statement as an interested life-long resident, a Minot Park Commissioner, a Minot High School Biology teacher, and as a tax-payer who has taught for many years at the Minot High School. As a Geology Teacher I conducted many field trips in the area concerned with Bail Garrison.

On reading the portion of the Impact Statement concerning Cultural Resources page 4.1-4.3, I notice that Minot Garrison will not affect those resources as there is little to disturb.

Lloyd B. Hueser
Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to
ascertain for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peachemper Rail Corridor program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

I am convinced by the arguments that
regarding the need for north-south rail.

further development of a local agricultural
that development is not justified.

I am convinced by the arguments that
regarding the need for north-south rail.

further development of a local agricultural
that development is not justified.

The Peachemper Rail Corridor program
is consistent with strengthening North Dakota's economy. New wealth creation
(increasing income and jobs) is the number one priority of the Association.

The two Air Force bases in North Dakota are important complements of
North Dakota's economy. North Dakota is an ideal location for deployment of the system.

A strong defense system is also consistent with the Greater Dakota
Association's objectives of supporting freedom -- freedom of country as well
as individual freedom.

The impact of not being awarded the Peachemper Rail Corridor in our
state would be by far more determinate then any present threat to our
environment. Therefore, the Greater Dakota Association urges the
Air Force to bring Peachemper Rail Corridor to North Dakota and urges
priority be given as a first selection site.
COUNTRY AND I HOPE THE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON MISSILE IS DEPLOYED AT MINOT AIR FORCE BASE SO WE CAN CONTINUE TO MAKE THAT CONTRIBUTION.

I HAVE OBSERVED THAT THE LATEST HEARINGS AT OTHER CANDIDATE BASES REGARDING PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON HAVE BEEN RECEIVED WITH MIXED SUPPORT. YOU HAVE HEARD SOME OPPOSITION TO THE MISSILE COMING TO THE TOMBSTONE BUT, BY AND LARGE, THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT MINOT WANTS PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON. I TOTALLY SUPPORT A STRONG MINOT ECONOMY BUT, MORE THAN THAT, I SUPPORT A STRONG MILITARY PRESENCE FOR OUR NATION'S DEFENSE.

**********

MY NAME IS LARRY THOMPSON. I AM THE DIVISION MANAGER FOR MONTANA-DAKOTA UTILITIES CO. IN MINOT. THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT HAS INDICATED THAT THE ADDITION OF THE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON MISSILE AT THE MINOT AIR FORCE BASE WOULD INCREASE NATURAL GAS CONSUMPTION BY APPROXIMATELY 3.1 PERCENT.

I WISH TO REAFFIRM THAT THIS SLIGHT INCREASE IN NATURAL GAS CONSUMPTION AT MINOT AIR FORCE BASE WOULD NOT HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON MONTANA-DAKOTA'S SYSTEM OR ITS ABILITY TO CONTINUE TO PROVIDE SAFE, RELIABLE NATURAL GAS SERVICE TO MINOT AIR FORCE BASE, OR THE CITY OF MINOT AND SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES.

MY COMPANY DOES HAVE ADEQUATE FACILITIES AND RESERVES TO SERVE THIS AND OTHER NEW LOADS IN THE AREA TO PASS THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

MY COMPANY ALSO HAS THE FACILITIES AND RESERVE CAPACITY TO ACCOMMODATE SUBSEQUENT ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE AREA.

AS A CITIZEN OF MINOT, I AM PLEASED MY CITY IS ABLE TO MAKE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEFENSE OF OUR
The Minot Area Development Corporation is dedicated to assisting those companies locating, relocating or expanding in Minot and the surrounding area to support the Minot Garrison project.

In summary we support the project for reasons stated - plus we believe a strong deterrent is the best defense.

The Minot Area Development Corporation is dedicated to assisting those companies locating, relocating or expanding in Minot and the surrounding area to support the Minot Garrison project.

In summary we support the project for reasons stated - plus we believe a strong deterrent is the best defense.
Again, for the record the North Dakota Building Trades are participants here for the first time in the building of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program Environmental Impact Statement.

I am David A. Fossum, President and Executive Director of the North Dakota Building and Construction Trades Council. I am here tonight representing the Construction Council of North Dakota. Under the umbrella of the AFL-CIO, we are here to give this project our full support. Members of the North Dakota Building Trades have been part of every major defense project in North Dakota. We are proud to have been included and proud of our record of getting the work done on time and/or ahead of schedule. This has been a record in the past and will be as long as we are involved in any project.

Members of the North Dakota Building Trades have been involved in major defense projects around the world for many years. We have and were a part of the construction of the Minuteman Missile base, and are still a part of the construction projects in Greenland and the North Pole to this day.

We can and will supply skilled workers for any construction projects in North Dakota. There has not been enough work in North Dakota for our entire membership since 1984, but this project would certainly help us and the State of North Dakota and we feel it would also help the defense of the country.

We have a long history of being a part of the Department of Defense Labor Management Meetings in Grand Forks and Minot, North Dakota. The participants here in Minot have been the Federal Mediation Service, the Air Force Civil Engineer Command, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Construction Union in North Dakota.

Again, for the record the North Dakota Building Trades are here to give our full support to this project and we will assist in any way we can to get this project for North Dakota and Minot and if it is built, work for the successful completion of the project.

I want to thank you for allowing me to testify here tonight and I will accept questions now or at any time in the future. Thank you.

David A. Fossum, President & Executive Director
North Dakota Building and Construction Trades Council
Grand Forks, North Dakota

---

TO: COL. MICHAEL McNAME AND LT. COL. THOMAS WALSH
FROM: ART ERALAO, PRESIDENT, MINOT AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
DATE: TUESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1988

I am Art Eralao, President of the Minot Area Chamber of Commerce and I wish to express the Chamber's unqualified support of the environmental impact statement draft as presented.

All of the testimony testifies to the fact that the Minot Air Force Base and the community of Minot are in a very good position to handle the implementation of rail garrison here at the Minot Air Force Base.

We at the Chamber are very pleased.

Again, the community of Minot and the Minot Air Force Base will be proud to host rail garrison.
LOCATION U.S. AIR FORCE PEACOCKER BALL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to

announcing to the public the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacocker Ball Garrison program proceeds, and allow you an opportunity to bring to

our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a

final decision is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

By completing the lower form and returning it now, we solicit your comments and complete written comments of 51 lines or more in size or print toward the ULTIMATE

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT PROJECTED and begin a healthy System of Public Comment.

The below is an initial outline of the areas affected and approximate acreage of the site which will be affected toward the ultimate environmental impact.

1. NORTHERN WYOMING
2. SOUTHERN WYOMING
3. MONTANA
4. IDAHO
5. D.C.
6. ALASKA

Please fax this form to or mail to

Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFPO-ED
Morten Air Force Base
Travis, California 95631
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Mr. Peter Walsh
Army - DOD-DSP
Bornton AFB, California 93040-6440

Dear Mr. Walsh:

We are requesting that our agency be added to your list of recipients for the forthcoming Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the "Peacekeeper Rail Deployment Program", as recently announced in the Federal Register.

We will be looking forward to providing comments from a public health perspective on behalf of the U.S. Public Health Service, as preparing the DEIS is a critical milestone in constructing any perceived safety and health impacts posed by the project. This section could include, but not be limited to comments on any of the public health concerns we have listed on the enclosure in this letter.

Please ensure that we are included on your mailing list for further documents which are developed under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Sincerely yours,

David S. Charp, Ph.D., F.I.H.
Environmental Health Scientist
Special Programs Group
Center for Environmental Health
and Injury Control

 enclosure

VII. OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY
9 A. Evaluation of the occupational and public health hazards associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project.
B. Evaluation of any occupational and public health hazards associated with the operation of a proposed program (e.g., pesticide application, disposal of toxic chemicals, etc.).
C. General worker safety/injury control provisions.

VIII. LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT
11 A. The provision of adequate ventilation, heating, illumination and lighting.
12 B. Water conservation provisions.
13 C. Impact of a project upon the displacement and/or relocation of persons.

DOCUMENT 263

LOCATION - Clithorne, Arkansas

CURRENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to inform you of the environmental impact statements we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and offer you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to develop environmental analysis that will be acceptable to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

As a citizen of Clithorne living in the Golf Links area, I would like to express my support for the Rail Garrison Program. My family and I support the concept of peace through a strong national defense system.

After due consideration is given to the Environmental Impact Statement, please give equal consideration to the overwhelming local acceptance and support of this program at Joint Air Force Base.

Sincerely,

Roma Clark
100 Park Avenue
Clithorne, AR

Name Street Address City State

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Wash
APRC-MAP
Nurance Air Force Base
7000 Barrington Drive
Clithorne, Arkansas 91049

2-102
"WHERE'S THE BOMB?"
PREPARED TESTIMONY OF MARK HAIN, DIRECTOR MID-MO NUCLEAR FREEZE

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the MX Rail Garrison Program ignores or glosses over the most serious environmental impacts of the proposal. The increased risk of nuclear war—the ultimate environmental problem—is not addressed, because the EIS looks only at present impacts.

Another set of environmental concerns—those associated with manufacturing the nuclear warheads to be used on the MX missiles—is also quite neatly swept under the rug, ostensibly because the warheads are produced by the Dept. of Energy. This "there's-no-impact" mentality is all too prevalent in large, complex, and ongoing programs of this magnitude. We have been searching for "WHERE'S THE BOMB?" We are presented with a DEIS for a nuclear weapon system that has been neatly sanitized of its central feature. Where is the bomb?

NEPA mandates an examination of the impacts of a proposed action, and comparison with alternative actions, including a "no action" alternative. Should the MX Rail Garrison be authorized it would necessitate the manufacture of at least 350 nuclear warheads which would not otherwise exist. We must look at the full impact of the action. This obviously includes the production of the warheads.

The public and our elected officials must demand accountability. Before we allow MX to be authorized we must be given clear answers to the serious questions raised by the environmental issues listed above. These issues must be addressed if this course of action is taken. We do not ask for all the answers, we ask for the questions to be asked and answered.

Public hearings on the DEIS are scheduled for late Nov and we urge you to attend. We will also distribute information on the MX at the hearings and are available to answer questions.

We are opposed to the MX Rail Garrison Scheme. We do not want production of any more nuclear weapons on our soil.

He requested that no action be taken on the MX Rail Garrison Program proposed for installation.

Jenise and Abraham Kays

LOCATION: Beatrice, NE

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to determine for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before the final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention all environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft EIS.

The population of NE is predominantly rural citizens. This is due to the lack of economic and cultural opportunities and the low population density. We feel our concerns would be best addressed in some way. We urge that you allow us to present these issues and provide documentation to the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues with you.

The above I. G. Glenn 7001 NE 14th Street Beatrice, NE 68310

Name of Citizen

This statement is to be signed by the citizen.

I hereby certify that the above is true to the best of my knowledge.

Li Col Peter Walsh
AFMD/ERB
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

2-103
GOOD EVENING. MY NAME IS CHUCK DUKE, AND I AM PRESENTLY SERVING AS PRESIDENT OF THE MINOT CITY COUNCIL.

I WISH TO COMMENT THIS EVENING ON THREE AREAS THAT ARE MENTIONED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT:

FIRST, THE DRAFT EIS STATES THAT TO MAINTAIN THE CURRENT SERVICE LEVEL OF 6.2 PERSONNEL PER 1,000 POPULATION, CITY STAFFING WOULD HAVE TO INCREASE FROM 283 TO 288 PUBLIC WORKERS BY 1995. THE EIS ALSO STATES THAT IF NO ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL WERE HIRED, THE NUMBER OF PERSONNEL PER 1,000 POPULATION WOULD DROP FROM 6.2 TO 6.1. THE EIS NOTES THERE WILL BE A SMALL INCREASE IN THE DEMANDS FOR PUBLIC SERVICES, SUCH AS FIRE, POLICE AND PUBLIC WORKS. THIS INCREASE WILL BE VERY SMALL, AND WILL NOT RESULT IN DETERIORATION OF THE QUALITY OF SERVICES RECEIVED BY THE PUBLIC.

SECOND, THE EIS DRAFT STATES THAT WATER IS DERIVED FROM A SERIES OF WELLS IN TWO AQUIFERS, AND THE SOURIS RIVER. THE AVERAGE DAILY USE OF WATER IN 1987 WAS 6.4 MILLION GALLONS PER DAY. BY 1990 AND 1994, DEMANDS ARE PROJECTED TO BE 6.3 AND 6.5 MILLION GALLONS PER DAY, RESPECTIVELY. PEOPLE CONCERNED ABOUT WATER SHORTAGES ETC. TO EXHAUST HEAT CONDITIONS HAVE NO NEED FOR CONCERN DUE TO THE ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AND RESERVES OF FRESH WATER.

THIRD, THE EIS DRAFT STATES THAT SOLID WASTE GENERATION WOULD INCREASE BY ONE TON PER DAY OR LESS THEN ONE PERCENT FOR THE CITY OF MINOT IN 1994. ALONG WITH GREAT SUPPORT FROM FIVE REMOVAL FIRMS AND A LANDFILL LIFESPAN OF 28 YEARS, THE CITY OF MINOT CAN HANDLE THIS SMALL INCREASE IN SOLID WASTE WITHOUT HIRING ANY ADDITIONAL MANPOWER OR PURCHASING NEW EQUIPMENT. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO MY COMMENTS.

My name is Chuck Duke, President of the Minot City Council.
LOCATION: GREAT FALLS

COMMENT BRIEF

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

This goal for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
subordinate for you the environmental information that has been described below.
If the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and offer you an opportunity to bring it
attention matters we may have not been adequately considered. Our goal is through
this hearing to bring to your attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

1. How will the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program
be managed and monitored throughout its development phase?
2. What is the nature of the Good Information Exchange Program, and how will it
impact the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program?
3. What are the potential environmental impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program, and how will these impacts be mitigated?

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The Air Force has received a part of the concerns raised at its
earlier hearing meeting to the Governor's Interagency task force.
Examinating that list and the DEIS itself, the Committee of the {in one line - no indent}
- that the following issues were either totally ignored or only

1. How much will the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program impact the
Cascadia region, and what mitigation measures are being considered?
2. What is the relationship between the Peacemaker Rail Garrison
program and the existing base at Great Falls?
3. What are the potential economic impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local community?
4. How will the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program impact the
surrounding wildlife and natural areas?
5. What are the potential health impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local population?
6. What are the potential safety impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local community?
7. What are the potential economic impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local economy?
8. What are the potential environmental impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the surrounding communities?
9. What are the potential social impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local community?
10. What are the potential cultural impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local community?

The Air Force has received a part of the concerns raised at its
earlier hearing meeting to the Governor's Interagency task force.
Examinating that list and the DEIS itself, the Committee of the {in one line - no indent}
- that the following issues were either totally ignored or only

1. How much will the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program impact the
Cascadia region, and what mitigation measures are being considered?
2. What is the relationship between the Peacemaker Rail Garrison
program and the existing base at Great Falls?
3. What are the potential economic impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local community?
4. How will the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program impact the
surrounding wildlife and natural areas?
5. What are the potential health impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local population?
6. What are the potential safety impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local community?
7. What are the potential economic impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local economy?
8. What are the potential environmental impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the surrounding communities?
9. What are the potential social impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local community?
10. What are the potential cultural impacts of the Peacemaker Rail
Garrison program on the local community?
State of Arkansas
Department of Energy, Mines and Natural Resources

July 22, 1986

Patrick F. Carraher, Col., USAF
Deputy Director of Strategic, SDV and Survival Programs
Assistant Secretary (Acquisition)
Department of the Air Force
Washington, D.C. 20330-1000

RE: DEIS: PEACEKEEPER BALL GARRISON PROGRAM.

Dear Colonel Crawford:

The State Clearhouse has received the above Environmental Impact Statement
for Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

To carry out the review and comment process, this document was forwarded to
members of the Arkansas Technical Review Committee, resulting comments
received from the Technical Review Committee which represents the position
of the State of Arkansas are attached.

The State Clearhouse wishes to thank you for your cooperation with
the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

2G/SECR
Enclosure
cc: Randy Young
Arkansas Soil & Water
Conservation Commission

In a nation that already suffers irreversible damage.

I first noted from the Congressional Hearings of 1959 Vol. 1, pp. 617-618 very intriguing
andengineering --- it indicates that atmospheric scientists and Congress did not have full
information in 1959 to determine the actual extent of fallout, and that scientists today
are working to get information on where the fallout was and to develop better risk
assessment tools to be used to assess and "predict" the effect of fallout on the United States.

In its analysis, I believe the exact extent of risk was not accurate, but it indicated that
the danger of fallout in the United States was not as great as it was believed.

The period from bomb tests to 1955 is full of bomb tests that we consider as
thermonuclear tests. In 1985, Helen Boe, deputy manager of 'H-bomb', said that her
people were "testing" the bomb itself, which is the right idea, but the bomb.

I believe the bomb tests were conducted in a safer manner, as there were no
nuclear weapons tests in the United States during that period. The tests were
conducted in a safer manner, as the bombs were not detonated.

The period from bomb tests to 1955 is full of bomb tests that we consider as
thermonuclear tests. In 1985, Helen Boe, deputy manager of 'H-bomb', said that her
people were "testing" the bomb itself, which is the right idea, but the bomb.

The period from bomb tests to 1955 is full of bomb tests that we consider as
thermonuclear tests. In 1985, Helen Boe, deputy manager of 'H-bomb', said that her
people were "testing" the bomb itself, which is the right idea, but the bomb.

You have the "truth", but you still believe it.

HUMAN RACE ARE FUKED UP!

All the careful planning of H-bomb does not eliminate the destructive damage to the
environment and to the genetic pool of the world, with the danger of human
error and terrorist attacks.

We must find ways to reduce the risk of nuclear war.

Thank you for your time and attention.

[Signature]

Environmental Coordinator

[Signature]

Environmental Coordinator

CIA/Weather Underground

CIA/Weather Underground

CIA/Weather Underground
An Example of Double Talk

"The incineration of the radioactive material generated in such accidents at a rate of 50% of its volume per day is not possible for the sake of the risk of the total evacuation." - A 1971, Vol 1, 1959

Transport, mining, and disposal of spent products from nuclear reactors (November 1958) p. 1967 Vol 2, Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Radiations of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Congress of the United States Eighty-Ninth Congress May 3, 4, 5, and 6, 1959
PERILOUS VAPOR: NATIONAL RADIATION

Is there a Connection with Fallout?

So Far Radon Has Been Detected in 30 States—And at Elevated Levels in 10

Highest radioactivity, measured in picocuries per liter, has so far been in the East. The middle west is under investigation.

Is radon a result of mining? "No," said Dr. Frank Prime, Aug. 30, 1957, and others.

Permit for Perilous Vapor

"Radon --- invisible, tasteless and odorless --- is now the most dangerous source of radiation in America." "Radon levels have been monitored in uranium mines for decades. But no one suspected the extent to which natural release of radon could imperil homes far away from mining activity until late 1954." --Newsweek, Aug. 18, 1958

Overlapping Shots of

Franklin Prime, Aug. 30, 1957 p 2103

Galileo, Sept. 2, 1957 p 2105

Wheeler, Sept. 6, 1957 p 2106

Coulomb B, Sept. 5, 1957 p 2107

Le Place, Sept. 8, 1957 p 2108 of Hearings, Vol 3-1959

Overlapping Shots of

Fiziev, Sept. 14, 1957 p 2109

Newton, Sept. 16, 1957 p 2110

Whitney, Sept. 23, 1957 p 2111

Charleston, Sept. 28, 1957 p 2112


S. A. T. M., Feb. 1959, p 210
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LOCATION: March 15

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to

assure you that the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the

Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring
to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough

environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a

final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention

environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft

Environmental Impact Statement.

I am a retired U.S. Air Force veteran and

grandfather of a son who served through

four overseas deployments, and believe that

we should never have to send our men to

fight again for anyone but our own

country. I hope you will continue to

consider the objections I have made.

George Longwell

Please send this form to:

Lt. Col. Peter Hulka

AFPE-DRM/DV

Morton Air Force Base

San Bernardino, California 92405

LOCATION: Fairchild

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to

assure you that the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the

Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to

our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough

environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a

final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention

environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft

Environmental Impact Statement.

We are opposed to the AFRC-III

being located at Fairchild Air Force

Base.

Nuclear weapons are environmental

pestides to the entire world, and we do not need any more.

Name: John Smith

Address: 123 Main St

City: Anytown

State: Any

Please send this form to:

Lt. Col. Peter Hulka

AFPE-DRM/DV

Morton Air Force Base

San Bernardino, California 92405

WOMENS ACTION FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

August 12, 1981

Dear Dr. Charles Welch

Please take no action,

that is Rx 2 any nuclear

weapon he deployed to

Michigan or anywhere.

Thank you.

Rebecca Moore
LOCATION: Grand Forks, North Dakota

DOCUMENT 279

DOCUMENT 278

DOCUMENT 280

DOCUMENT 281

Dear Sir,

I would like to request the following action be taken regarding the MX rail Garrison. As a resident of Michigan, I am most concerned over the safety of our citizens.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]

[City, State]

[Date: August 10, 1988]

---

LOCATION: Grand Forks

COMMENTS:

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to summarize for you the environmental issues we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention any issues we may have inadvertently left out. The environmental analysis that will be presented to public officials and citizens before a final decision will be included with this hearing to bring our attention to such issues. It is our policy as a public official to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Our purpose is to provide an update about the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. In this hearing, the rail Operations Area, Air Operations Area, and the Military Operations Area (MOA) are discussed. These areas are important to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project.

In the Area Operations Area, air traffic is predominant over land traffic. The Air Force may use this area to operate its aircraft. The Air Force has been directed by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program to limit land traffic to other land users. The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program has been directed by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program to limit the use of the MOA to the extent necessary to limit land traffic.

[Signature]

[Address]

[City, State]

[Date: May 1, 1988]
August 9, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
Director of Environmental Planning
AFBCE - 988/587
Horton Air Force Base, CA 92409-0446

My name is Arden Grandinig, Area Representative for the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 49 and President of the Grand Forks Building and Construction Trades Council.

I speak for a few of working people throughout this area who support and believe in the peaceful resolution of the Grand Forks area. The city of Grand Forks and the Grand Forks Air Force Base have worked together for several years to ensure our safety and the preservation of our democratic way of life. We will continue to support any military work that will keep our nation strong and free society and will be proud to be a part of any work that will help that cause.

A Peacekeeper missile defense system already in place through our area and stand ready to do what ever is necessary to help preserve our freedom from oppression.

As the environmental impact study has shown to have little adverse effect to the surrounding communities, there is no need for any surge protection personnel or help to enhance the environment in our area will give us full support to the system should this area be selected.

Arden Grandinig
Area Representative
I.U.O.E. Local 49
P.O. Box 177
Grand Forks, ND 58206-1775

DOCUMENT 283

LOCATION
Grand Forks, North Dakota

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to summarize for you the environmental management we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our task is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before final decisions on the project are made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The management of the Peacekeeper Program has worked together with the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project to ensure that the environmental impact statements are consistent with our country’s defense and economic goals.

Patricia Ann Gynning
Project Manager

DOCUMENT 284

LOCATION
Grand Forks, North Dakota

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to summarize for you the environmental management we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our task is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before final decisions on the project are made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I'm glad to see there have been no objections to the installation of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project.

Patricia Ann Gynning
Project Manager
Director of Environmental Planning
AFRCE-BK/DEV
Morton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409-6448

August 12, 1986

Dear Director:

For purposes of identification, I'm a sociologist, a professor, and Chairperson of the American Indian Studies Department at University of North Dakota. My large family and I have lived here for more than seven years and are well established in this setting. Although I was unable to attend the Environmental Impact Hearing on the KX Rail Line earlier this week, I did want to register my strong opposition to the project (and my large family joins me in this opposition). I understood from Senator Kent Conrad (ND) that you're receiving written comments on the matter through this month of August.

I understand from the Impact Statement that the KX project will necessitate a new rail line which will cut through American Indian burial grounds. Such desecration of those grounds would be indefensible for two basic reasons: the primary reason is simply that such an incursion would be immoral. (Ask yourself, "What would happen if white graves were involved?" "What would happen if Indian graves were involved?"). An important corollary reason involves the fact that a number of us have worked systematically through the years to develop positive racial/cultural relations between Indians and whites in this area -- and, thus far, we have been substantially successful. If you build a railroad across Indian burials, you will sow seeds of discord which could lead to a bitter harvest.

Once again, we strongly hope you do not go through with the KX/rail line project.

Sincerely,

John R. Saltz, Jr.

cc: Senator Kent Conrad
Ms. Virginia Miller

---

Dear Sir:

I am opposed to placing the 'Peacekeeper' KX Missile and its rail system at Dyess Air Force Base.

Abilene is already burdened with the B-1 Bomber. The bomber has never lived up to its reputation as a plane, or as an economic boon for Abilene. Our area is still dotted with abandoned missile sites left from an earlier missile deployment system. I feel the KX is just another albatross the Air Force can keep somewhere else.

Sincerely,

Beckie Cox

---

Greg Lombardi
1816 Washington, Apt. 3-6
Kansas City, MO 64111

August 24, 1988

CERTIFIED MAIL
Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
Environmental Planning Division
AFRCE-BK/DEV
Morton AFB, CA. 92409-6448

Be: Comments on Proposed KX Rail-Garrison at Whiteman AFB

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

Enclosed you will find the following which are to be considered in preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement regarding the proposed deployment of the KX Intercontinental Ballistic Missile in the Rail-Garrison Basing Node at Whiteman Air Force Base in Warrensburg, Missouri. This is my original testimony submitted in regard to the draft environmental impact statement for this project. I want to make sure that the Air Force, and its consultants, respond to all of the issues raised in these comments when they prepare their final environmental impact statement. Most of the issues that were raised in these comments were not addressed in the draft environmental impact statement. This omission is a clear problem of the DEIS.

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Regarding the Proposed Deployment of the KX Intercontinental Ballistic Missile
in the Rail-Garrison Basing Mode (these comments deal with specific deficiencies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement).

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. However, I would note that I did not receive the DEIS until July 30, 1988, and thus did not have sufficient time to prepare detailed comments either for the hearing at Whiteman Air Force Base on August 3 or for the August 30 comment deadline. (For example, there is a great deal of research in regard to railroads and railroad regulations that I was unable to do, and I was unable to obtain and review the numerous environmental impact statements and Air Force regulations that were incorporated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement by reference, but which are not available to the public.)

I know of numerous other people in the Kansas City area who did not receive their copy of the DEIS until well after I did. Indeed, some individuals still have not received the DEIS.

Accordingly, I would ask request that you extend the deadline for filing written comments on the DEIS until at least 45 days after you have sent, to every individual who has requested it, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and all of the information that is incorporated into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement by reference, but which information is not available to the public.

I would also note that as with the Scoping hearings, there was clearly insufficient time for public comment at the August 3 hearings concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. All told, the public general was given only 9 minutes to respond to the numerous problems in the Air Force's more than 250-page Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Clearly, this was inadequate. Also, hearings should be held in all communities where a population greater than 50,000 which are located within five miles of the rail lines to be used by the MX missile railers. These hearings too should provide ample time for public comment.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment and look forward to receiving the additional materials I have requested and having the opportunity to prepare testimony in regard to that information.

Sincerely,

Gregg Lombardi
Whiteman Air Force Base
August 30, 1988

Let...
SUGGESTION
2. Under the proposed program at least six MX missiles, with approximately 60 warheads, will be stored at Whiteman Air Force Base in Warrensburg, Missouri. A comprehensive environmental impact statement must consider:

- a. The risk and consequences of accidental detonation of one or more of the warheads while they are in storage;
- b. The risk and consequences of accidental ignition of the fuel for the MX missiles in storage;
- c. The risk and consequences of accidental launching of an MX missile in storage;
- d. The risk and consequences of sabotage of the MX missiles in storage. This consideration should include, but not be limited to, the consequences of having warheads in storage at Whiteman Air Force Base falling into the hands of terrorists either through direct attack on the missiles in storage or in the more likely event that an enlisted person would decide or be coerced into cooperation with terrorists;
- e. The risk and consequences of accidental decoration of warheads, firing of missiles, or ignition of fuel due to earthquakes, flooding, earthquake, tornado, or any other natural disaster while the missiles are in storage;
- f. The fact that more than 60 nuclear warheads would be stored at Whiteman Air Force Base, makes Warrensburg, and western Missouri in general, a likely target for attack from Soviet missiles. The MX missiles are "first strike" weapons (in other words, they are capable of destroying Russian missiles, making it impossible for Russia to respond to American attacks, unless they did so before the American missiles hit their targets in Russia). The risk of an American first strike may well cause the Soviets to launch a pre-emptive first strike, and attack the MX missiles at Whiteman with Soviet nuclear weapons, while they are still in storage (in other words, during their peacetime operation).

Accordingly, a comprehensive environmental impact statement must consider:

- a. The risk and consequences of a Soviet nuclear attack on Whiteman Air Force Base or upon western Missouri in general, while the MX missiles are in storage at Whiteman Air Force Base;
- b. The increased risk of nuclear war and the consequences thereof due to the deployment of MX missiles in the Rail Garrison Basing Mode.

Risks Inherent in Transporting the MX Missile by Railroad

4. Railroads are one of the most dangerous modes of transportation available in the United States today. On the average, there are more than five derailments every day on U.S. rail lines; 5/ because of its tremendous weight (a single MX missile weighs approximately 105,000 pounds) and because of its gigantic size (an MX missile is 71 feet long). An average box car is 54 feet long, the MX missile poses serious risks if it is to be transported by rail. There are grave questions as to whether local railroad tracks and bridges, many of which are more than 60 years old, can support the weight of a railroad car or cars carrying an MX missile. Thus, the risk of accident is extremely high. Even during peacetime operations, the MX missile rail cars will have to be tested on area rail lines. Thus, there are risks even in times of peace. A comprehensive environmental impact statement must consider the following problems:

- a. The facts and consequences of an accident involving a train carrying an MX missile with or without warheads. Risks that must be considered include: the risks due to the tremendous weight of the missile; risks due to the tremendous size of the missile; risks due to the age and strength of the railroad tracks and bridges in the area; risks due to the fact that the train operators will probably be Air Force personnel and therefore not well-trained in the operation of trains; risks of accident due to blizzard, thunderstorms, flooding, earthquake, tornado, or other natural disaster; risks due to the possibility of sabotage (because the MX missile is larger than a railroad car, it is more difficult to check if the cars are loaded correctly); risks due to the fact that the trains are carrying MX missiles. Because the missiles are so valuable, and because the trains, by definition, must go in a single direction at a slow speed (the maximum speed for trains carrying the MX missile is 35 mph), these trains will be an easy target for saboteurs;

- b. Consequences that must be considered regarding rail safety include, but are not limited to, damages to area rail lines and bridges due to the transportation of MX missiles over them (whether armed with warheads or not); the consequences of accidental ignition of the rocket fuel for the MX missiles due to a rail accident; the consequences of accidental launching of the missile due to a rail accident; the consequences of accidental detonation of a warhead due to a rail accident. In considering these consequences, the Air Force must also look at plans for evacuation of area communities in case of an accident involving a train carrying, or purported to be carrying, MX missiles (whether armed with warheads or not), as well as the health and economic costs to residence who might have to be evacuated. Each of these considerations must be taken into account even if the environmental impact statement considers only "peace time operation" of the MX missile in the Rail Garrison Basing Mode.

5/ In 1980 there were 2,005 commercial rail derailments in the United States or 5.64 derailments per day.
If the risk of nuclear warheads falling into the hands of terrorists is small, and even if terrorists were to have difficulty detonating these weapons, the possible consequences of nuclear warheads falling into the hands of terrorists within the state of Missouri is obviously extremely grave. An environmental impact study must consider these risks and consequences:

d. The risks and consequences of Soviet nuclear attack once the MX railcars are deployed on public tracks. The MX missiles traveling around the state of Missouri at 35 mph on railroad tracks will be a very likely target for Soviet nuclear attack. Because they must travel on rail lines, and because they must travel at slow speed, the MX railcars will be like ducks in a
nuclear shooting gallery, and the Air Force's plan to deploy these MX railcars at Whiteman Air Force Base in the state of Missouri, particularly the cities of Kansas City, Columbia, Jefferson City, and St. Louis, which is along the major rail lines, into the
city of even a [blurred text]

The consequences of a electromagnetic pulse from an exploded nuclear weapon are dire. Traditional engines are rendered useless by the electromagnetic pulse, and an explosion by the nuclear weapon. If the MX railcars are vulnerable to an electromagnetic pulse, a similar explosion would leave all of the MX railcars, with their scores of nuclear warheads, stilled and without protection throughout the Missouri

Railroads, which this would leave them particularly vulnerable to sabotage or terrorist attack. Also, because radio silence is not possible and an electromagnetic pulse, the risk of accidental firing, or firing caused by panic of the people operating the MX railcars should be seriously considered in the environmental

The risks of accident, and damage inherent in the firing of MX missiles from railcars. Currently, the Air Force has no idea of how it will launch the MX

A major rail line, which this could be directly caused by people who are insurmountable engineering problems. Furthermore, the risk of accident in firing

Slain billion the government plans to spend on the MX missile system, which Congress already

Soviet attack. Furthermore, there is no logical reason why the MX missile which is supposed to be designed for the purpose of surviving a Soviet nuclear attack, needs to be a first strike

A first strike weapon in one that could destroy Soviet missiles while they are still in their missile silos. First strike weapons are considered by the Soviets to be offensive weapons which could be used in a surprise attack by one country to take over the other country before the latter could have a chance to strike back with its own nuclear weapons. The United

An MX missile from the gravel bed of a railroad track would be extremely high for the missiles around the track (if it was the whole state). Also, the damage to railroad and surrounding countryside from firing an MX missile from a railcar would be potentially severe. An environmental impact statement must consider each of these potential consequences.

Economic Costs

6. With a two trillion dollar national debt and more

than 20% of the federal budget going to pay interest alone on that
debt, the United States now faces an economic crisis. The
government should take now to prevent the hard-earned money of

the United States should not be exempt from this rule. A comprehensive environmental impact statement must consider the specific economic consequences to the city of

Warsaw upon the deployment of the MX missile railcar

a. The tremendous strain on local schools, hospitals, police forces, and utilities from the sudden influx of personnel to construct a MX rail Garrison at Whiteman,

b. The damage to local economy after the workforce leaves. By the time construction personnel depart from Whiteman, the city would have to have been expanded its school, hospital, and private businesses, etc. The departure of the workforce could have a severe economic impact on the

c. The waste of $2 billion nationally because military spending, partially on weapons systems, is extremely inefficient (in other words many more jobs are created by a million dollars spent by private businesses than by a million dollars spent by the

States has insisted that it would refrain from making a first

strike in the Soviet Union, (if the Soviet Union believed that the

United States had launched first strike weapons aimed at Soviet's

soil, they would almost certainly fire at least some of their

nuclear weapons prior to the time that the American missile would hit Russian soil (this is referred to as launching on warning). Because first strike weapons would require the Soviet Union to launch on warning, they shorten the amount of time that the

Soviet's have to respond to a real or even mistakenly perceived

American nuclear attack. Thus, first strike weapons greatly

increase the risk of nuclear war and make it possible that there

would be an accidental nuclear war. Accordingly, because the MX

missile is a first strike weapon, it will greatly increase the

risk of a pre-senptic Soviet nuclear attack. Numerous

alternatives exist to putting these extremely expensive, extensive, and dangerous weapons on railroad cars in Missouri. A comprehensive environmental impact study must consider the

following alternatives:

a. The no action alternative. Because the United States already has more than sufficient nuclear arms to deter a Soviet attack, no additional weapons are needed. The Air Force has no good reason to increase the risk of nuclear war and gravely endanger the people of Missouri, the state of Missouri in particular, and the whole United States in general, by deploying these MX Missiles on railcars at Whiteman Air

b. The use of Trident II Missiles as an alternative to the MX rail Garrison being built in Missouri. If Congress should decide that it is absolutely necessary to have mobile

first strike weapons, it can use the Trident II missiles. This missile system, which Congress already
Fundamentally, puts first strike missiles on United States submarines. These submarines are much less vulnerable to sabotage, 2. An incident, and less likely to do so than MX missile rail garrison. Because these missiles are kept at sea, the risk to the civilian population is substantially less than the MX missile rail garrison.

c. Use of non-first strike weapons and alternative modes of transportation. Deterrent which is to say non-first strike) nuclear weapons are smaller, lighter, and less expensive than the MX missile. If Congress decides that it must have a mobile land-based missile system, it should use these smaller weapons. Not only would this decrease the risk of nuclear accident or sabotage, economically unsound, and likely to increase the risk of nuclear attack by accident at Whiteman (thereby decreasing the environmental impact of the program).

Lack of Sufficient Notice and Opportunity to be Heard

6. The Department of Defense's own regulations require significant public participation in preparation of the environmental impact statement. The amount of public participation in environmental impact statement is to be determined by several factors, including magnitude of the proposal; likelihood of public interest; need to act quickly; and national security classification issues.

The Air Force's proposal to put MX missile railcars in Warrensburg, Missouri is of monumental magnitude. If implemented, the proposal would make western Missouri a top priority target for Soviet missiles, and would greatly increase the risk of a surprise Soviet pre-emptive nuclear attack on the state.

32 C.C.R. §214, enclosure l(C)(3).
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This has caused delay in the federal Register. Furthermore, even that notice was not given the date, time or location of the Whiteman Air Force Base hearings.

Now has the Air Force provided sufficient information for the public to evaluate the proposal. It has been extremely difficult to obtain written material on the proposal from the Air Force, and the material that the Air Force has provided fails to deal with the vast majority of significant environmental issues raised by the possible deployment of the MX missile-railcar program. Finally, the hearing themselves are clearly insufficient. The public was given less than two hours to testify in regard to this monumentally dangerous and expensive program.

For the Air Force to comply with its own regulations and with NEPA it must do the following:

a. Hold hearings in all communities with a population greater than 50,000, which are located within five miles of rail lines to be used by the MX missile railcar, as well as any similar communities through which the MX missiles and their warheads would pass on the way to Whiteman Air Force Base.

b. Provide adequate public notice of these hearings. This would include taking out advertisements in the most widely read newspaper in each of these communities, as well as advertisements on popular radio and television stations in those communities;

c. Provide readily accessible written information in regard to the program, more than 30 days prior to the time at which the hearings are scheduled. This information should briefly address all significant environmental issues including those discussed above;

d. Provide adequate opportunity to be heard at public hearings. People wishing to testify should be allowed at least 30 minutes to do so, and at least six hours of public hearings should be held in each community with a population of more than 50,000.

I am very much concerned about the potential environmental impact of the proposed deployment of the MX missiles in the rail garrison base at Whiteman Air Force Base in Warrensburg, Missouri. The program is dangerous, extremely vulnerable to sabotage, economically unsound, and likely to severely increase the risk of nuclear war.

Although these hearings have been seriously deficient, I very much appreciate the opportunity to submit written testimony. I hereby formally request that I be provided with the draft environmental impact statement as soon as it is publicly available. The OCE should be sent to my home address as shown on this statement.
Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Regarding the Proposed Deployment of the MX Intercontinental Ballistic Missile in the Rail-Garrison Basing Mode

There are numerous problems with the proposed MX intercontinental ballistic missile rail-garrison basing mode which the Air Force's Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS") does not sufficiently address. A comprehensive final environmental impact statement must consider each of the following topics:

1. Rail Safety

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement claims that the MX railcars are "expected to be substantially safer than those of ordinary freight trains." DEIS at 5-6. The Air Force goes on to base its calculations of risk on the assumption that the MX railcars would be as safe as ordinary freight cars. There are numerous reasons why this assumption is wrong. The calculation of rail transportation risk in the Final Environmental Impact Statement must take into account the following facts which make the risk of damage for the MX railcars substantially greater than for ordinary freightcars:

a) Heavily loaded: the maximum load capacity for an average railcar (excluding the weight of the car itself) is approximately 100,000 pounds. The MX missile by itself, however, weighs 195,000 pounds. The launching canister, hoisting apparatus, and other launching and protective hardware may well weigh an additional 200,000 pounds. Furthermore, because of its extreme length, and because of the load it must carry, the MX railcar itself will be substantially heavier than a normal railcar. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must state the weight of each component that the MX railcar would be expected to carry, including the weight of: the canister surrounding the missile; the launching apparatus; all other materials to be carried by the railcar; and, the weight of the car carrying the missile itself. The FEIS must also state the entire weight of the fully loaded MX railcar and calculate the increased risk of accident due to this mammoth weight. See diagrams attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

b) Center of Gravity and Weight Distribution: The weight problem is exacerbated by the fact that the distribution of weight will make the MX railcar prone to accidents. Normally when a railcar carries a substantial weight, that weight can be distributed evenly on the car usually with the greatest weight directly over the wheels and with the center of gravity of the railcar. This uneven distribution of weight will put a severe strain on that section of the railcar that must carry Stage 1. Similarly, this will put severe pressure on the rail lines as the wheel that carry the weight of Stage 1 bear down on the rail ties.

Furthermore, the center of gravity of the MX railcar would be dangerously high. Rule 89 of the American Association of Railroads ("A.A.R.") interchange rules provides that the combined center of gravity of a railcar and its load must not exceed 9 inches above the top of the rail. Because an MX missile is nine feet high, and presumably the weight of the missile is distributed symmetrically, when the missile is on its side, its center of gravity is 14.5 feet off the ground. Assuming that the launch canister has a radius that is just one foot wider than the missile itself, the center of gravity of the MX missile and its canister is likely to be at least 15.5 feet above the bed of the railcar. The fact that the MX railcar will be 17 feet high (a normal railcar is approximately twelve feet high) suggests that the missile's center of gravity will be substantially more than five and one-half feet above the bed of the MX railcar. Given that the bed of the railcar will be approximately four feet off the ground, the center of gravity of the missile and its canister is likely to be well over nine feet above the rail bed, and perhaps substantially more than ten feet above the ground, in violation of A.A.R. regulations. This would present an extremely dangerous condition both when the railcar goes around curves and when the cars rock from side to side, as railcars are prone to do.

An example illustrates this point. The torque ("tipping force") exerted by a load with a particular weight equals the force as the car rocks or goes around a curve multiplied by the height of the center of gravity. Thus, assuming that a typical load has its center of gravity two feet above the bed of a railcar (and therefore six feet above the rail lines themselves) if this load exerts a 100,000 pound force to the outside as the car goes around a corner the tipping force exerted on the track would be 600,000 ft/lb (6 feet X 100,000 lbs). For an MX missile, with its center of gravity 9.5 feet above tracks, the tipping force is substantially greater. Assuming that the missile would exert a 100,000 pound force going around a hypothetical curve, the tipping force that the tracks would have to bear would be 950,000 ft/lbs. (100,000 lbs X 9.5 feet).

Also, the angle to which the MX railcar could tip before falling over would be smaller because of the higher center of gravity of the train.
The Final Environmental Impact Statement must state the height of the center of gravity for a fully-loaded MX railcar, analyze the uneven distribution of that load, and determine how these factors, particularly given the extreme weight of the load, increase the risk of rail accident.

c) Length: An average railcar is approximately 50 feet long. The longest single piece railcar in use today is 89 feet long. The MX railcar, however, which the Air Force is proposing, is 89 feet long.

The MX railcar will not only be at least as long as the longest other railcar on the tracks, it would be 89 foot long railcar that is fully enclosed. This means that the MX railcar would be extremely vulnerable to accidents (because of the length combined with the tremendous weight the MX railcar must carry and its high center of gravity). It would also be easily identifiable for anyone who sought to sabotage or track the MX train.

Given that the Air Force still does not know how it will launch the MX missile, it may be that the final design of the MX railcar, including launching apparatus will be substantially longer than 89 feet. If it is feasible that the MX railroad would be longer than 89 feet, the Air Force must consider the potential additional risks inherent in this greater length in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Launch canister and between the canister and the car structure), the MX railroad would be at least 12 feet wide and would constitute a wide load under AAR regulations. This means that the railcar would not only be unstable because of its width, but there would also be an increased risk of accident due to the chance that the railcar would collide with oncoming rail traffic. This also extremely increases the risk of sabotage, because the railcar would be required to either inform the entire rail community of where it intends to travel (thus essentially informing would-be saboteurs where to watch for it) or, it must clear all commercial rail lines on which the railcars could possibly travel (this would be contrary to the Air Force’s promise not to disrupt commercial rail traffic). The Final Environmental Impact Statement must state the width of the MX railroad and consider the increased risk of rail accident and sabotage or terrorist attack due to the width of the railcar.

d) Inexperienced Engineers: The Air Force plans to use military personnel to operate its trains. Thus, it is unlikely that the railroad operators will have significant experience in operating railcars. Even if these operators are exhaustively trained, there is no substitute for on-the-job experience. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must consider the increased risk of rail accident due to the inexperience of the Air Force personnel who will be operating the trains.

The only other railcars that are in the range of 88 feet are either flatbed cars or open air cars (like the railcars that transport automobiles). None of those cars carry weights that approach anything close to the weight of the fully loaded MX railcar.

Its length obviously would make the MX railcar more unstable than an average freight car. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must consider the increased risk of accident due to the tremendous length of the MX railcar.

d) Loading: The average railcar is approximately nine feet wide. The MX missile alone is 92 inches wide. The regulations of the American Association of Railroads ("AAR") provide that any railcar more than 12 feet in width is a wide load. When a wide load passes along rail tracks, all adjacent tracks, under AAR regulations, must be cleared to avoid accidents. In order to make sure that this is done, trains with wide loads must give advance notice of where they will travel.

In its Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Air Force boasts that the MX missiles on their railcars would be protected in the case of misfire by their launch canister and by the missiles launch car structure. DEIS at 5-1. However, even if the launch canister and car structure together were only 27 inches thick (and this includes the space between the missile and the

3. Risk of Sabotage or Terrorist Attack

The Air Force largely ignores the risk of sabotage or terrorist attack in its Draft Environmental Impact Statement, discussing it for only four sentences under the heading "Unauthorized Access." DEIS at 5-1. Terrorism and sabotage, however, pose an extreme threat to the MX railroad, and the environmental impact of a terrorist attack could be catastrophic. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must consider this risk seriously.

The MX railcars would be very easy for terrorist or saboteurs to spot for several reasons. First, it would be almost twice as long as a normal railcar, and would be the only completely enclosed 89 foot long railcar that would be on the tracks. Second, to bear the tremendous weight of its load, MX railroad would be required to have more wheels than a normal railcar. ""; the MX railroad would be required to have at least eight axles (a normal railcar has four axles). Third, the railroad would be wider than a normal railcar. Fourth, whereas an average train includes approximately 40 boxcars, the MX trains would have only six or seven cars. Fifth, because the Air Force would be using state of the art equipment and, supposedly, would be constantly maintaining this equipment in top shape, it is likely that the railcars would look significantly different from normal railcars. Sixth, the MX
railcars would bypass normal rail line interchanges, where all normal freight cars are shifted from the engines of one rail carrier to another.

Furthermore, the MX railcars will be particularly vulnerable to terrorist attack for numerous reasons. First, because the MX railcars must travel in one direction, and at a set speed, it would be easy for terrorists to know where they are going. Second, the rail lines themselves are vulnerable to sabotage: a few well placed sticks of dynamite on a train bridge would destroy an MX railcar and its billion dollar cargo. Third, it would be impossible for the Air Force to adequately patrol the approximately 10,000 miles of rail lines that the MX trains are expected to travel. Terrorists could choose when and where to strike the trains. Fourth, because the Air Force plans to move the trains for only four hours each day when they are on alert, terrorists would have substantial time to prepare ambushes several miles down the tracks from the resting MX train.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement must consider not only each of the risks, discussed above, and consequences of a terrorist attack, but also the environmental impact of the Air Force's safety measures to avoid such an attack. For example, would the Air Force be required to fire on anyone who comes near the tracks as the MX railcar passes. Further, would it require adjacent landowners to remove trees and other objects that might provide cover for terrorists.

The Air Force glibly states, "even in the event of a successful attack on the system, no impacts worse that those described in Section 5.4... are expected." Such consequences cannot be shrugged off lightly. Section 5.4 refers to the "cataclysmic destruction that would occur if the MX exploded..." Given that terrorist attacks are likely to occur in heavily populated areas (where protective cover is plentiful and the military response would have to be subdued) the results of a terrorist attack could be devastating. Thus, the Air Force's summary of risks, and summary of mishap-induced and mishap-free risks contained on pages 5-26 and 5-27 of the DEIS, because they do not include the risk of terrorist attack or sabotage, are extremely misleading. They should be revised in the Final Environmental Impact Statement to reflect the probability of mishap due to terrorist attack and the consequences of such potential mishap.

**Additional Problems With the Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

A. "Public Interface"

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not deal at all with "public interface" problems that the MX Rail-Garrison program would have. Public interface problems include everything from peaceful law-abiding protest to acts of civil disobedience ranging from having demonstrators lie down on the track to having them remove rail ties or otherwise sabotage the rail line to prevent the MX training car from passing.

I do not intend either to encourage or condone acts of civil disobedience. They are, however, a serious concern and they were one of the things that Congress specifically wanted the Air Force to address in its Environmental Impact Statement. The Air Force has failed to do so.

Acts of civil disobedience tend to be very costly to the local community. The Air Force will not provide security personnel to help the local community deal with civil disobedience. Accordingly, local communities will have to pay police to monitor protests and to make arrests when there is civil disobedience. Furthermore, the prosecution of acts of civil disobedience will put a strain on the local courts, as well as local prosecutors. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should consider these costs, including the risk of injury and property damage due to both lawful and unlawful protests, and all costs to the community of policing against such protests and acts of civil disobedience.

B. Air Transportation Risks

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement states that, "the Air Force special cargo squadron that handles the shipment of nuclear warheads has transported nuclear materials for 25 years and has never experienced a mishap which created possibility of damage to the weapon system." DEIS at 5-2. There is, however, a history of air transportation accidents with nuclear weapons. On June 17, 1966, a U.S. plane crashed in Spain while carrying numerous nuclear missiles. One missile was missing for several months and 2,809 tons of radioactive soil had to be removed from Spain. Thus, the F... Environmental Impact Statement must consider both the risk and consequences of radiation leakage from an airplane accident, as well as the risk and consequences of having a nuclear warhead missing for several days, weeks or months.

C. Incorporation By Reference Of Materials To Which The Public Does Not Have Access

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement makes reference to numerous materials to which the public does not have access. I hereby request that I be sent a copy of all documents, plans and
Center and from the DOD Explosive Safety Board. This statement, by itself, is meaningless. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should state what criteria will be used in making system certification and what sort of tests will be run on the system.

6. PERSONNEL PROGRAM

Section 5.1.2 of the DEIS states the various efforts that the Air Force will make to prevent Air Force personnel from sabotaging the MX missile in the Rail-Garrison Basing Mode. Nowhere in the DEIS, however, does the Air Force evaluate the risk of sabotage of Air Force personnel or the consequences of such sabotage. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must do so.

The MX trains both when deployed on training runs, and when deployed while armed with live MX missiles, must communicate with civilian railroad lines. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not consider how the Air Force intends to do this while keeping the identity of the MX train secret. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must consider the increased risk of rail accidents due to problems with communication between the MX trains and civilian trains, as well as the increased risk of sabotage that would accompany good communications (i.e. if the MX trains made their location clear to civilian commercial trains, they would probably also be making their location clear to any one interested in sabotaging the trains).

F. Failure to Define "National Need"

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement repeatedly states that the MX railcars would only be deployed carrying MX missiles in times of "national need." The DEIS, however, although it contains more than twenty pages of definitions nowhere defines what constitutes a "time of national need." As the Air Force explains in its Environmental Impact Statement, the risk of adverse environmental impact is a function of the distance traveled by the MX railcars. See DEIS at 5-16. Because the distance traveled is a function of the frequency and duration of "times of national need" must be approximated by the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Otherwise, there is no way for the public, or the Air Force, to evaluate the risk of accident.

G. Disbandsal

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement states that, when the railcars are disbursed, they will be moving only approximately four hours out of every twenty-four hours. DEIS at 5-8. The fact that the MX trains will be immobile for twenty hours of the day, will make them particularly vulnerable to sabotage. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must evaluate this risk.

H. Risk of Mixed or Prominent Containment

It is my understanding that the propellants proposed to be used by the Air Force for the MX must be stored under carefully controlled environmental conditions and can only, safely be exposed to a limited range of temperatures. If the fuels are allowed to freeze or become overheated, their containers are likely to crack, thus leading to the catastrophic consequences discussed in Section 5.4 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The DEIS does not deal with this issue. The railcars are likely to be exposed to extremes of temperature. In the summer, the missiles would virtually bake in the steel encased railcars. whereas, in the winter, the railcars not be tested to deal with temperatures well below zero. Thus, the heating and cooling systems for the MX railcars would subject to extremely adverse conditions. Should one of these systems fail, the consequences could be catastrophic. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must deal with this risk and the consequent consequences.

1. System Integrity

The DEIS states: "An analysis was performed on both head-on and rear-end collisions involving the MX railroad and commercial trains at various speeds." The DEIS, however, does not state whether this analysis was done just with computer simulation or through the use of the actual railcars that might be involved in such accidents. Computer simulation is infamous for its
failure to take into account all potential problems. Thus, if the Air Force solely conducted computer analysis, it should so state in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and, it should increase the risk factor to take into account the fact that computer models virtually never consider all potential risks.

J. The Security Vehicle Intensity

The DEIS states: "A propellant fire would not likely last (long enough) to breach the RV and begin aerosolization of plutonium." DEIS at 5-12. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should quantify this risk as that the danger of plutonium aerosolization can be evaluated.

The DEIS goes on to say, "the pressure generated in the fire would likely cause the RV to be expelled from the fire..." 18. Indeed, when the Titan II explosion occurred in Arkansas several years ago, one or more of the RV's were thrown from the missile silo and it took the Department of Defense several days to recovery one of the warheads.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement should evaluate the risk that one or more nuclear warheads would be lost by the Air Force and examine the consequences of having one of these lost nuclear warheads fall into the hands of someone with bad intentions.
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the five people who received high doses will die. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should consider how many people would be exposed to fatal or disabling, or even adverse, affecting radiation doses.

W. Aircraft Transportation

As with rail accidents, air transportation accidents are much more likely to occur in urban and suburban areas (near runways) than in rural areas. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should take this fact into account.

W. Evaluation of Consequences Secondary Fires and Nuclear Chemical spills

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not seriously consider secondary consequences of rail accidents or sabotage.

These consequences are particularly disturbing. The propellants used for the MX missile burn at extremely high temperatures. They are therefore very likely to cause severe secondary fires. This problem would be compounded by the fact that firefights would have grave difficulty dealing with the fires first, because they are not sufficiently equipped to deal with fires involving the chemicals used as propellants for the MX. And, second, because of the toxicity of these chemicals, they would not be able to approach the fire for significant periods of time. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should seriously consider the risk and consequences of secondary fires.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement admits that hydrochloric acid, nitric acid, monomethylhydrazine ["MMX"], and nitrogen tetroxide can enter the water system in case of an accident. DEIS at 5-31, 5-32, 5-34. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should seriously consider the consequences of fouling of individuals' and communities' water systems with MX propellants.

In regard to MMX, the DEIS states that "concentrations of MMX exceeding the 2 ppm 8 hour ACGIH recommendation" would occur along the centerline of the plume, but that this exposure would not exceed ten minutes at one location. This statement, however, assumes that there would be constant movement in the plume. As the Air Force's scientists well know, air will frequently settle in one area. This is particularly true for chemicals that are heavier than air as MMX appears to be. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should consider the risk and consequences of the MMX settling in one area and thus creating exposures well above the ACGIH recommendation for relatively long periods of time.
The DEIS also states: Although aqueous solutions of NNX have been shown to be toxic to biological resources, the amount involved in the accident is not likely to result in concentration high enough to have any long-term toxic effects. DEIS at 5-32. The DEIS fails, however, to define what is a long term effect. Furthermore, it does not state what the short term affects would be. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should consider these risks and consequences.

C. Problems for Firefighters

The nitrogen tetradioxide that could be released in a mishap involving the NNX railcars would cause "burns, ulcers, and damage to eyes and mucous membranes to people exposed to it more than a mile away from the accident and for up to 30 minutes after the release of the nitrogen tetradioxide. DEIS at 5-35. /\ The release of nitrogen tetradioxide would lead to a mortality rate of up to 50% of the people within 600 meters of the accident. DEIS at 5-35. Thus, rescue personnel would not be able to approach an accident for a significant amount of time. Again this problem is aggravated by the fact that pockets of nitrogen tetradioxide may be trapped near the accident. Another risk-compounding factor is the fact that frequently, people exposed to the chemical are not aware of their exposure. DEIS at 5-34-35. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must deal with numerous questions regarding these issues.

/\ As with NNX, nitrogen tetradioxide is heavier than air. Thus there is a strong risk that heavy concentrations of the gas would be trapped in valleys, trenches or other low lying areas. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should consider this problem.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement states that radioactive material chin... 

D. Problems for Farmers

The statement goes on to say, "radioactive materials..." The Final Environmental Impact Statement should define what is a "long-term impact" and should consider the significant short-term impacts created by the radioactive materials.

One of the consequences of radiation exposure referred to by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is contamination of water supplies:

Surface water runoff from contaminated soil prior to cleanup and the settlement of airborne radioactive particles on surface waters. /\ pose a limited risk to bioa, depending on the amount and concentration of radioactive material reaching the surface waters. DEIS at 5-36. "Bioa" presumably includes human beings. The Air Force does not quantify this risk and to be accurate, the Final Environmental Impact Statement must do so.

The statement also says, "no measurable human health effects would occur as a result of ingestion of food contaminated by radioactive material from an NNX missile." DEIS at 5-37. The Final Environmental Impact Statement should consider: the cost of removing and destroying radioactive food, and, the cumulative effect of exposure to radiation from radioactive food, along with exposure from other potential sources of radiation.

/\ The DEIS says that the party would be dispatched within an hour of the accident, but does not estimate how long it would take the crew to actually get to an accident, particularly in remote areas.
The Draft Environmental Impact Statement Does Not Seriously Consider the No-Action Alternative.

The risk and consequences of taking no action are obviously much less than those of the proposed project. The Final Environmental Impact Statement must seriously consider this alternative.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement should also seriously consider the risk and consequences of the several viable alternative actions including the use of sea-based missiles: smaller land-based missiles: land-based missiles with fewer warheads: land-based missiles that are not first-strike weapons.

The Air Force should also seriously consider the economic effects of the no-action alternative. It is well-known that military spending is much less stimulating for the economy than typical industrial, commercial or even non-military, government spending. If Congress were not required to dump the $11 billion into the MX Rail-Garrison program that the Air Force proposes, that money could be much better spent on education, health, or even retiring the national debt.

The Air Force in its Final Environmental Impact Statement must consider the profound economic and social benefits of the no-action alternative.

Without all of the information discussed above the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed MX Intercontinental Ballistic Missile in the Rail-Garrison Basing Node would be incomplete and in violation of NEPA, CEQA and Department of Defense regulations.

Please send me a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement along with all supporting documents as soon as possible.

[1] It is my understanding that along with the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Air Force proposes numerous supporting documents, including, but not limited to, copies of transcripts from all hearings, copies of all written comments submitted, designation of where in the FESI each specific criterion or request for information is answered, detailed supporting environmental impact analysis, calculations and formula to prepare the FESI, and/or other relevant information that the supporting information is not generally distributed with the Final Environmental Impact Statement, unless specifically requested. I hereby specifically request that I receive all documents and information of the type referred to in this footnote.

It is my understanding that, at times, the Air Force has required individuals to request this supplemental information by specific name. Because, to my knowledge, the Air Force does not publish the names of these documents anywhere, this requirement can only be intended to frustrate citizens' attempts to obtain information which the Air Force has made public. I request that I receive this information regardless of its name.
Total Weight: 450,000 to 600,000 lbs.

Average Freight Car

Easy Identification for Terrorists or Trackers:
- Longer than any other Car on the Tracks;
- More Wheels;
- Fewer Cars in Train.

Length: 100 ft.
Unloaded Weight: 175,000 lbs.
Load:
- MX Missile: 195,000 lbs.
- Launch System: 100,000 lbs.

Air Force now says the rail car will be 89 feet long and 17 feet high (see detailed views)

Dangers: Weight Problems:
- Rail or Tie Failure;
- Excessive Rocking;
- Too High Center of Gravity; and,
- Tipping.

Length Problems:
- Weight Distribution;
- Flexing;
- Turning Radius
**LOCATION Little Rock Air Force Base**

**U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM**

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to discuss with you the environmental considerations we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

1. I support the Peacekeeper Program for the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lt Col Peter Walsh</td>
<td>AFRCE-BRICK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Air Force Base</td>
<td>Ben Bernardino, California 92306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAME: Jackson, John**

**Street Address: 1234 Jackson St, Little Rock, AR 72203**

**COMMENTS:**

- I support the Peacekeeper Program for the area.
- I have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
- I believe the program will benefit the community.
- I have no concerns with the program.

**SIGNED:**

[Signature]

**DATE:**

[Date]
Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

Regarding the public hearing held August 9, 1966 at Great Falls High School, I am in support of the following:

If the Administration and the Congress conclude that deployment of the Peacekeeper small missile or the Peacekeeper rail garrison is one in the national interest, and if the military, for environmental, strategic, and tactical reasons, selects the State of Montana as the optimal deployment site, the State administration, legislature, local government, and the citizenry should welcome the mission.

The project will require but one community relationship which Great Falls and Montana have had for the past 45 years with Malmstrom Air Force Base and the Minuteman ICBM complex already here.

I regret that I could not attend the meeting. However, I would have come and put it on file.

Thank you,

[Signature]

--

Ira W. Kaufman, Jr.

---

August 10, 1966

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh

HREIC (H)-WC

Norton Air Force Base

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

Thank you for standing this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to assure you that the environmental measures that we have taken and the sound environmental impact analyses that will be provided to public officials and citizens before a Final Decision on the program in made. We hope that the actual, related element of the environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We should not be in generality, one vague promises, but in actual, they have made to the community by the Air Force. A complete study should be included in the Final Draft, with it, it is impossible to evaluate the effects of the project on the community.

All data's and one should be included in the** the figures can be certified, what is a dependence of statistics that are there simply to meet these goals. The study is not of the effects of the project but one for the convenience of the Air Force.

A draft of at least one missile explosion (Remote Systems) in a site killing the crew members in the area, yet you tell me of the safety of the system, as this is from a reliable source. I can conclude that you are not presenting an honest face but one that is made up of deliberate dishonesty. As for reports of cities well maintained systems have come to me: I have reports of fires in existing systems again that are you trying to hide, until the safety record of the Air base with all the incidents are exposed so we have a viable document.

There is no opposing if the environmental and other issues including the safety of communities through these types must pass are not even examined and are not on issue with which the Air Force wants to examine, as it would lead towards a real problem in legislation.

In the Public hearings the Air Force stated that the Troops of no would be going or no any more near rail switching systems. I do not see how that could be possible as the two are part of the same system. Especially since in the past it has often only a sliding rail. One ever is supplying this information is totally deceiving you.

Train speed is help not to exceed 30 mph, and that this is totally within reason for working the system and would not interfere. As I have driven tractor trailer units for a number of years, I have observed the speed of the Trains to vary from 35 mph to 50 mph — compared as they were traveling faster than my truck which has a top and 70 mph. Again the system figures are wrong. 30 mph figures are un realistic and misleading.

I am still enclosing the draft that the system is not really a mobile system but a stationary system. I never have to leave the control of any, I have come to the conclusion that it is an attempt to violate treaties that are in place of an are being negotiated by the time letter.

Until the document gets away from the generalities which say that the system is feasible until you look at all sides of the coin, not just the size that is for your benefit, I can not see why we would oppose such a waste of money that is allowed.

In assessing the total evidence for the conclusion that the Air Force is trying to describe the public it is the extent of the evidence to be considered by a court marshals' trial judge to see the procedures. As there is much more to the question than can be covered.

The President of the United States often said the Russians 'Trust but verify' the same not true for you.

Allen Hahn, 707 John St. N. Great Falls, Montana 59001

May the Lord Bless you?

P.S. I am sorry.
DOCUMENT 295

LOCATION: LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE KEEPERS RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined to occur if the
Rail_Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide
environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

I feel that having the Keepers Rail at Little Rock Air Force Base would
not have any adverse effect on the environment or the community. The community
would receive great benefits from it being located at Little Rock Air Force Base.

NAME: James A. Jacksonville, Arkansas 72202

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRC-SKSISM
Benton Air Force Base
Little Rock, AR 72209

DOCUMENT 296

LOCATION: MACB

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE KEEPERS RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined to occur if the
Rail_Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide
environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

NAME: James A. Jacksonville, Ar

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRC-SKSISM
Benton Air Force Base
Little Rock, AR 72209

DOCUMENT 297

LOCATION: LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE KEEPERS RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined to occur if the
Rail_Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide
environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

We support deployment of the Keepers Rail at Little Rock Air Force Base. The impact on the
environment is not as important as the impact on the community.

NAME: Amber Taylor

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRC-SKSISM
Benton Air Force Base
Little Rock, AR 72209

DOCUMENT 298

LOCATION: LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE KEEPERS RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined to occur if the
Rail_Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide
environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

NAME: Amber Taylor

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRC-SKSISM
Benton Air Force Base
Little Rock, AR 72209
LOCATION: Jacksonville, Florida

COMMENTS:

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to announce for you the environmental assessment we have determined may occur in the event that the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and offer you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to conduct an adequate analysis of and environmental concerns that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention concerns that have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Our local contact person for this hearing is Mr. Peter Walsh. Please see below for contact information.

Name: Peter Walsh
Address: 92400 Barton Rd.
City: Rancho Cucamonga
State: California
Zip: 91730

Please hand this form in or mail to:

Li Col Peter Walsh
AFRCE-BSM/SID II
AFRCE-BMS/DZV AFRCE-FOR
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

COMMENTS:

Please name and address:

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
City: [Redacted]
State: [Redacted]
Zip: [Redacted]

Please hand this form in or mail to:

Li Col Peter Walsh
AFRCE-BSM/SID II
AFRCE-BMS/DZV AFRCE-FOR
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

LOCATION: 1310 John Hendrickson, Jacksonville, FL

COMMENTS:

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to announce for you the environmental assessment we have determined may occur in the event that the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and offer you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to conduct an adequate analysis of and environmental concerns that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention concerns that have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Strong defense means a peaceful

Confidence in our world's might

Please return this form to:

John Hendrickson
1310 John Hendrickson
Jacksonville, FL 32207

LOCATION: 2635 East 14th, Cheyenne, WY 82001

LOCATION: 1409 John Hendrickson, 1310 Jacksonville, FL

COMMENTS:

Please name and address:

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
City: [Redacted]
State: [Redacted]
Zip: [Redacted]

Please hand this form in or mail to:

Li Col Peter Walsh
AFRCE-BSM/SID II
AFRCE-BMS/DZV AFRCE-FOR
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

LOCATION: 2635 East 14th, Cheyenne, WY 82001

COMMENTS:

Please name and address:

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
City: [Redacted]
State: [Redacted]
Zip: [Redacted]

Please hand this form in or mail to:

Li Col Peter Walsh
AFRCE-BSM/SID II
AFRCE-BMS/DZV AFRCE-FOR
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

August 16, 1988

Dear Col. Walsh:

Again, I would like you to take a closer look at what you and your committee are doing to the people of our country.

These kind of accidents are happening more and more each day. We see you to stop this terrible concept of a so-called "Peacekeeper" Rail Garrison!

Thank you for your concern.

Sincerely,

Kay Ellis

3900 W. 39th St.
Cheyenne, WY 82003

Sincerely,

Kay Ellis
3900 W. 39th St.
Cheyenne, WY 82003

2-128
Train dumps coal on Harrisonville

Mid-America

Train derails, spills coal on highway

25 cars derail at crossing

LOCATION

Jacksonville, Ark.

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to determine for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for your dedication and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFRCE-RIDGWAY

Morton Air Force Base

San Bernardino, California 92409
Our national security does not necessarily increase with an increase in military spending. Our national security is based on a healthy economic expanding strong economy and a secure and strong military. If we need to increase our military, we should focus on improving our economic policies and infrastructure rather than funding a larger military. If we try to make every dollar of our defense budget count, we can achieve a healthier economy without adversely affecting our national security.

WASHINGTON, D.C. - Soviet espionage has been taking place in the United States for years, and it is not recent. Intelligence reports have shown that the USSR has been engaging in espionage activities in the United States for decades. Soviet agents have been successfully penetrating U.S. government and military facilities, gaining access to classified information, and passing it on to the Soviet Union. The reports are based on information from various sources, including intercepted communications and surveillance operations.
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LOCATION: Assistant
U.S. AIR FORCE PACIFIC REEFS GUARDIAN PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for holding this meeting is to discuss the environmental impact of our Military presence in the United States. We will also discuss how we can work together to protect our environment and the lives of the people who live here.

3

We are committed to the protection of our environment and the health of our communities. We will work together to find solutions to the environmental challenges we face.

ATTEN

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for holding this meeting is to discuss the environmental impact of our Military presence in the United States. We will also discuss how we can work together to protect our environment and the lives of the people who live here.

3

We are committed to the protection of our environment and the health of our communities. We will work together to find solutions to the environmental challenges we face.
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The Minot Public School District will be able to absorb the students into the schools who arrive as a result of the construction, phasing in and operation of Rail Garrison.

It has already been noted that the Minot Schools serve the city and the Minot AFB with 13 elementary schools, 3 junior high schools and 1 high school on two campuses. The enrollment which is just under 6000 students is served by ample certificated staff to maintain a pupil-teacher ratio of approximately 24 to 1. The district is supported by P.L. 81-574 as a "Super A" district which means appropriate financial support for serving students in a federally impacted area.

The fact that the Minot Schools will be able to absorb the additional students is important. It is also noteworthy that the schools are pleased to have the opportunity to serve. The Minot School District is prepared to serve students in regular and special education. It is a well respected district. Many parents who have been assigned to the Minot AFB share their pleasure at having had their children in the Minot Schools.

The impact of additional students is not seen as a handicap but as an opportunity. Youth are served by having other students join them who have had experiences in another part of the nation or world. The student relationships and interaction enhance the learning in a classroom. The teaching staff is served by the opportunity to employ the spouses of some of the Rail Garrison work force. These teachers come with varied experiences and serve to keep the Minot teaching staff aware of teaching ideas and strategies used in other school districts.

The fiscal impact of providing education to additional students will enable the school district to continue the education improvement process. Any student can mean more opportunities through diversified offerings. The impact on budget can also improve the continued growth of the teaching staff through inservice activities.

The schools welcome the opportunity to serve. We are eager to meet the needs of additional youth.
I have been a resident of Grand Forks for 15 years. Motivated by my concern for this community, I have read with interest the many news stories and opinions that have appeared in the local press in the last month. Many of the arguments favoring the proposed system have centered on the economic benefits to the community not being an economist, I wanted to understand these arguments better, so I sought additional information from the DEIS.

In examining the DEIS, I learned of the increased number of jobs and general economic expenditures that would result in Grand Forks if the proposed system is located here. That's good, I thought, but further reflection led me to wonder if there are two important concerns: First, the economic benefits will not be distributed equally, but will be limited to certain parts of our economy, such as the retail business and service sectors. Over one third of the work force in Grand Forks county is government employees. There are no foreseeable direct benefits or major indirect benefits to these people. In addition there are substantial numbers of other citizens not in the work force, such as retired people, who will not benefit.

Second, the DEIS fails to adequately discuss the economic impacts of the so-called alternatives. My understanding of the process is that if the impacts of no action must be seriously weighed as well as the impacts of the proposed action. The DEIS does not consider what the economic impact would be on Grand Forks if the $10 to $15 billion proposed for the FTX is put into the Defense budget, and therefore not taken from the citizens in the form of taxes. Since I could not find the information in the DEIS, I went to other reputable sources. I found that because of the sectors of the economy that Defense spending impacts, money left in the civilian economy generates more jobs than the same amount of money spent for military purposes. In fact for every $1 billion spent for military purposes rather than civilian purposes there is a net loss of 6,000 jobs. For the FTX system that means a loss of 60,000 to 90,000 jobs nationwide. In other words, because of the normal economic impact of military spending, it is not a good economic investment.

Thus looking at the proposal from a purely economic perspective, it seemed to me that not only would the benefits be to a limited part of our community but also provide a poor return on our tax money at that. But, I thought, economics are certainly not the only consideration. We also buy cars for safety and comfort as well as for a low sticker price, so there certainly must be other reasons why we should have the FTX system.

If there is any other reason it must be military, will the system make us safer? I researched that question too, and while...
designed to knock out a defender's ability to retaliate. By threatening Soviet land-based missiles, MX missiles practically invite a preemptive strike in a crisis.

The only prudent way for the U.S. to protect its land-based strategic missiles is by reducing the number of Soviet missiles that threaten them. In other words by arms control.

We have a clear choice. We can build costly mobile MX missiles that will accelerate the arms race. Or, we can stop the arms race by dramatically reducing the risk of nuclear war by negotiating verifiable agreements with the Soviet Union such as a nuclear weapons test ban, a 50 percent reduction of long-range nuclear weapons and a ban on space weapons.

Citizens concerned about plans to build mobile MX missiles should attend the environmental impact hearings on the Grand Forks MX missile project planned in the Grand Forks Civic Center.

August 8, 1988

Testimony of Bonnie Diane Rosenberg
420 Jackson Avenue
Crookston, MN 56716
The Air Force has not released transcripts of the scopmg hearing when requested to do so.

7. There has been insufficient time for this hearing given the fact that the Air Force has taken up time with their presentation. A number of people wish to speak about this project and will not be able to or will have to limit their remarks. Given the magnitude of this project and the public interest, additional time on another day should be allocated.

8. The DEIS fails to adequately present the alternatives, including the no action alternative.

9. The DEIS has not included the impact of building an AMI system to protect the MX.

10. The DEIS is premised on the assumption that the MX Horizon Backscattered Radar project is coming to Grand Forks. If this does not occur, the entire DEIS is flawed because all the demographic projections are based on an influx of 1000 people who would immigrate with the MX program. The Air Force is utilizing a DEIS based on no over the Horizon Backscattered Radar project at Grand Forks.

11. The Air Force has greater confidence about the size of opposition plays in the process. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 1506.27(b)(4), the DEIS must clearly state the extent to which the proposed project is controversial. At page 3-2 of the DEIS, it is stated that controversy was not considered. Thus the Air Force has failed to do that which is charged by federal law to do. Air Force spokespersons have been quoted in the media, namely the Grand Forks Herald, stating that the Air Force will not put the project where it is not wanted.

12. The DEIS fails to address the degree to which this action establishes a precedent for future actions. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 1506.27(b)(4), the DEIS must do so. Furthermore this issue was specifically raised at the scoping hearing.

For all the above-mentioned reasons and in keeping with the spirit and letter of the National Environmental Policies Act and its implementing regulations and Department of Defense regulations and in the interests of justice, the DEIS must be modified to address these.

Statement on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
Peacekeeper Ballistic Missile Program
by
Lonny B. Winslow, Chair
Agassiz Basin Group
Sierra Club

The Agassiz Basin Group of the Sierra Club opposes the deployment of the MX Ballistic Missile system as proposed by the U.S. Air Force because the assessment of environmental effects as presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate and misleading. As Chair of the Agassiz Basin Group, I offer this testimony in opposition to the proposed deployment and urge consideration of alternative defense strategies which do not depend on missiles with multiple nuclear warheads.

I recognize that nuclear war is probably the ultimate environmental threat and I support the arguments of those who oppose this proposal on the basis of its destabilizing effect on international relations. Far from being a "peacekeeper", the missile gives this system the capacity to strike any target on the planet, and, thus, increase the danger of nuclear war. I will leave the development of this proposal to others however, and concentrate my remarks on the shortcomings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement fails to address the issue of decommissioning adequately. It misleadingly suggests that reasonably foreseeable consequences are considered.

Decommissioning is dismissed with a terse, seven-line paragraph.

"It is difficult to predict how the Peacekeeper Ballistic Missile system would be decommissioned. The relevant laws and procedures may change substantially in the 20 or more years the system would be in use. Moreover, techniques for handling the disposal of nuclear material and the reclamation or disposal of nuclear material contained in the various warheads change during the period the Peacekeeper is actively deployed. Consequently, the Air Force has focused this DEIS on those actions which are reasonably foreseeable. The Air Force will follow all relevant laws at the time of decommissioning." I submit that nothing is more foreseeable than the decommissioning the MX Ballistic Missile system. No weapon system, from the crossbow to the B-52, has failed to become obsolete in time. The decommissioning of the MX Ballistic Missile system is not just "reasonably foreseeable", it is inevitable. It must be considered in an adequate assessment of environmental effects.

Furthermore, the waste material produced by this unavoidable decommissioning, glibly described as "obsolete missile fuel" and "nuclear material contained in the warheads", is among the most toxic and ominous garbage produced on this planet. High level nuclear waste requires thousands of years to decompose—more years than any of the structures described in this elaborate proposal are designed to endure. The waste produced by this weapon system will be the responsibility of many future generations. Failure to consider its effect in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is grossly misleading.

Nor is the implied faith in improved technology and changes in "techniques for handling the disposal of this waste material" encouraging. Such a reliance on future technological
The proposed enactment of the Earth

Statement for the Nt rail Garrison system has addressed easy to air, water, and food products as well as the nation's health. It categorizes the toxicity of the waste better that was done years ago, but we still bury it, burn it, or deep in the ocean. Each of these alternatives poses obvious dangers to air, water, and food products ultimately consumed by humans.

In summary, I maintain that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Nt Rail Garrison system has not addressed many important issues relative to the effect of this system on the environment of the Earth and of the local areas specifically considered in the proposal. I urge you to reject deployment of the proposed system and to insist on a complete environmental impact statement for any alternative plan.

Impact management methods for the Past 30 years, we now develop new ones.

In so far as the Military, in particular, is concerned, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is of minimal importance. It categorizes the toxicities of the waste better that was done years ago, but we still bury it, burn it, or deep in the ocean. Each of these alternatives poses obvious dangers to air, water, and food products ultimately consumed by humans.

The political boundary separating Canada from the United States, the famed 49th Parallel, is virtually meaningless in the nuclear age. That especially holds true for the border between Manitoba and North Dakota. With 300 Missiles (ICBM's) and two SAC bases in Minnesota and here in Grand Forks, North Dakota, with 300 bases in Grand Forks, North Dakota, we must now reconsider our national and international policy. The world's population and economic potential of the United States is at stake here. The world's third largest air base in North Dakota. Indeed the essential United Nations study: Our Common Future: The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) categorically states that the likely consequences of nuclear war make other threats to the environment pale into insignificance.

The Nt missile, I feel, in any being made - but especially in how it increases the likelihood of three aerial threats to our environment nuclear confrontation. The recent dialogue between President Reagan and Chairman Gorbachev, and the signing of the INF Treaty has caused billions on this planet to breathe a sigh of relief in the expectation that relations between the two superpowers are improving. We look forward to '85 expected 500 cut in Strategic weaponry. The Nt missile will inevitably complicate choices for such a situation. There are far too many nuclear weapons on the planet.

Let's work together to prevent the ultimate threat to our environment - nuclear war. No Nt's!
If we can assume that the Council's national multipliers would hold true in the two states, we find that $31,421,000 were spent on these uses, we would create more jobs in the direct job sector mentioned in the DEIS. For instance, the same amount of funding would produce 263 more jobs in mass transit equipment manufacturing, 234 more in public utility construction, 321 more in “Other” construction, and 2497 in water supply and energy conservation than it would in Ball-Garrison spending.

From these comparisons, we may conclude that as a job creation strategy, the Ball-Garrison project is relatively ineffective. For eight years we have used military construction as an industrial policy. Consequently, money that could have been used to rebuild our decaying infrastructure, to develop human resources through education, to provide jobs for the most disadvantaged, to clean up the environment, to develop alternative energy sources, to promote energy conservation, to improve the mass transit system, to relieve downtown congestion, to save family farms and small towns has been diverted to military spending.

Second, the kinds of jobs created by the NS Ball-Garrison project are relatively unskilled. A small portion of those jobs will be jobs that are stable, pay relatively well and require a high level of skills. The remainder will be temporary jobs filled by a transient workforce and requiring little or no job skills. The DEIS estimates that $6,000 of the peak year jobs would be in manufacturing with the remainder distributed among other sectors of the economy. The DEIS does not discuss the distribution of the remainder of those $6,000 jobs.

Research indicates that relatively few defense-related jobs go to blue-collar producing workers, the bulk of jobs created by defense spending go to high-level workers, especially engineers and others with high-technology skills. These jobs are good jobs for those who can get them but few do. Defense spending tends to distribute employment benefits toward workers who are relatively affluent, highly educated, and already blessed with relatively few risks of unemployment. These workers are also overwhelmingly white and male. Every federal dollar spent on the Ball-Garrison is a federal dollar spent in other areas. Consequently, this spending will displace workers elsewhere. Most of the jobs displaced are the opposite of those who benefit from military spending — they are relatively poor, blue-collar working women and men, including teaching, health care, nondefense government workers, farmers, local small businesses, and local manufacturing. This disparity is even more pronounced when we compare the benefits of Ball-Garrison spending for public utilities and transportation with those of the NS Ball-Garrison spending which are much more effective in providing jobs for minorities, women and the disadvantaged.

The DEIS mentions that approximately 43 percent of the direct jobs at the end of 1990 or 26 percent of all jobs will be filled by civilian hires. About 72 percent of direct jobs would be filled by civilian employees in the peak year.

From an examination of the multiplier effects, we can conclude that the NS Ball-Garrison project is a rather inefficient and illegitimate use of government spending. The inefficiency is not just the cost of the project itself. The problem is much more significant because it increases gross receipts in only a few sectors of the economy, in the peak year. What would happen if we were to distribute the $31,421 million of NS Ball-Garrison spending to every farmer and rancher in North Dakota? We would see an increase of $129.7 million dollars agricultural processing, $2,005 million dollars manufacturing, $3,422 million dollars in wholesale sales, $4,580 million dollars in retail sales, $8,565 million dollars in services and $10,061 million dollars in government services.

In conclusion, the DEIS has inadequately addressed the impact on the rest of the state's economy, long-term productivity as required under the NEPA legislation. The project does not produce productivity. First, spending on the NS Ball-Garrison being mode is an effective creator of jobs compared with alternative ways of using government monies. Second, the kinds of jobs it creates are not those most needed and most helpful in developing a vital economy. Third, every dollar spent on NS Ball-Garrison spending is a dollar that is not spent on local purchases and is not used to support local residents and the local community. It is a dollar that is spent on out-of-state purchases that do not support local residents and the local community.

**ALTERNATIVES** | **U. S. NUMBER OF JOBS** | **COST PER JOB**
---|---|---
**GRILLED MISSILE** | 52,248 | $18,780
**MASS TRANSIT EQUIPMENT** | 72,727 | $10,372
**PUBLIC UTILITY Constr** | 85,859 | $10,344
**SOLAR ENERGY CONSERV** | 85,079 | $10,366
**Direct plus indirect employment** | Source: Adapted from David Gold and Geoff Quinn, "Military Spending Analysis" in the Program for Public Service Council on Economic Priorities: Newsletter, July 1987, P. 8


| ALTERNATIVES | **NUMBER OF JOBS** | **COST PER JOB** |
---|---|---|
**GRILLED MISSILE** | 1824 | $999
**MASS TRANSIT EQUIPMENT** | 2407 | $820
**PUBLIC UTILITY Constr** | 2064 | $960
**SOLAR ENERGY CONSERV** | 2035 | $1200

*Derived by dividing military spending of $21,421,000 by $31,421,000 total personal income,*
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August 21, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
Environmental Planning Division
AFCEE-WJS/OFX
Bolling AFB, DC. 20038-5440

RE: Comments on DEIS

Dear Col. Walsh:

We have problems with the proposed counterproposals to the missile rail-division. These issues were not addressed in the DEIS. Included is a copy of the issues that must be part of the decision making process.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Barbara Jackson

Enclosures

Note: See Document 287 for further responses.
Earl Bock
234 South Drive
Minot, N.D. 58701

15 August 1988

LtCol Peter Walsh
AFRCC-BMISO
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, Ca. 92409

Dear Col. Walsh,

I attended the hearing in Minot on 11 August 88 and was really dismayed at the various reasons given to support the rail garrison, only a couple touched upon the real reason to go ahead with the project, what its best for the nation. That should be the only reason to build any project as far as the military is concerned.

If the powers that be decide to build the rail garrison project, I hope that Minot Air Force base becomes part of the program. As we heard the other evening the environmental impact would be negligible and there would be no serious impact on the local housing or educational facilities. In other words there would be a minimal impact on the community.

The people that traveled hundreds of miles to protest are well intentioned but no informed. Possibly a solution to their thearics would be for a team to meet with their leaders (privately) and discuss the whole matter to ascertain what their problem is.

For 43 years our leaders have been able to negotiate from a position of strength and if it takes this project to maintain that strength, I'm for it.

One man that spoke in favor of the project gave his credentials which were impressive but not complete. I usually fight vociferously against any tax supported projects if I think that this project is worthy than how can anyone else be against it.

Sincerely,

Earl Bock

LOCATION: Jacksonville, Ark.

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention any facts or data not adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I. We feel this would be a vital part of our defense for the safety & protection of our nation. This would also be an asset to Jacksonville & surrounding communities.

-________________________

Thomas Jaster: 1116 Co. Hwy., Jacksonville, Ar. 72076

Name:        Street Address:        City:        State:        

Please send this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRCC-BMISO
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

LOCATION: Jacksonville, Fl.

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention any facts or data not adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I. I am against having the Peacekeepers located at Jacksonville if they are approved by Congress.

-________________________

Thomas W. Oglesby 722 S. Street Jacksonville

Name:        Street Address:        City:        State:        

Please send this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRCC-BMISO
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409
LOCATION: LAFB - Bahama

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER BALL-GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to ensure that you the environmental community have been adequately informed of the Peacemaker Ball-Garrison program, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to have a thorough and complete environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please see this about as being to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Buzzard-3 Prison 3-3-31 31333</td>
<td>80-111-99</td>
<td>31333</td>
<td>31333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the record, you state that we have been adequate informed of the deployment of MX missiles in the last decade. During that time we have MIRV'd the Minutemen, added sea-launched ballistic and cruise missiles, added air launched cruise missiles and bombs, and added ground launched missiles. You have not made a decrease in US warheads?

Col. Walsh, you state that we have more than sufficient nuclear warheads. You state that deployment of the MX will mean "no new warheads." Here are the warheads coming from? Are the air LRF warheads to be retooled for use on the 500 new MX warheads? Is this not a violation of the spirit of the INF Treaty?

You say that the present arsenal is of 1950 vintage. Are you forgetting that the Minutemen missiles have all been updated with new warheads and guidance systems? Are you ignoring all of the new air launched, sea launched, and ground launched missiles designed and deployed in the intervening years?

You continue to believe that deployment of the MX missile is in any way in a provocative, destabilizing waste of taxpayer's money. Deployment will make the world a more dangerous place to live.

Page 2 of 2
My name is Michelle Lange and I am a native of Devils Lake, N.D. I would like to express my opposition to the MX Ball Garrison. I believe that every dollar spent on nuclear weapons is a dollar that could have been spent conquering fears in a more productive way. I am a student at UND majoring in Russian and Soviet Studies. My main goal is to use my education to teach young people in the Russian language and familiarize them with Russian culture. I can think of no better, safer way to peace than through global education, cultural exchanges, and people to people exchanges. Peace achieved this way is true, lasting peace, for it teaches human hearts in ways missiles can never do.

Thank you.
Michelle Lange

August 12, 1988

To Whom It May Concern: Testimony for MX Ball Garrison public hearing - ND...

The MX fails to explain fully what the L. missile is and what it is designed to do. The L. missile is:
- 92 inches in diameter
- 75 feet long
- weighs 195,000 pounds or 299 tons

Cassini ten independently targeted warheads. Each warhead equals 300,000 metric tons TNT equivalent. Each warhead is 15 times as powerful as Hiroshima’s atom bomb. Each MX missile carries 3,600 warheads or 3,600 million tons TNT equivalent. Three warheads equal all allied explosives & bombs used in WWII. Therefore, one MX missile equals approximately one world war two. The MX range is over 3,000 miles and is accurate to 250 feet. Detonating an MX warhead will vaporize everything over 300 feet from ground zero and will cause massive damage to a much wider area. The MX accuracy is therefore designed to destroy hardened military targets like missile silos. Since there is no reason to hit an empty silo, we must assume that the MX is part of a United States’ first strike nuclear war fighting strategy.

If the MX is a first strike weapon because of its accuracy and speed, the MX is also inherently destabilizing due to its multiple warheads. Deployment of the MX in any basing mode would therefore decrease national security because deployment increases the likelihood of a nuclear exchange. The U.S. Air Force implies that deployment will “enhance deterrence.” But deterrence is defined as “having sufficient military strength and perceived willingness to use that strength after an enemy attack to inflict unacceptable damage on the enemy, thus inhibiting them from striking in the first place.” But according to the Congressional Budget Office (November 1997), approximately 3,700 U.S. nuclear weapons would survive a Soviet surprise attack and 8,200 would survive a shorter warning time alert to strategic forces. Considering the fact that launching only a small fraction of these missiles would obliterate the Soviet Union, undoubtedly initiate nuclear winter, and contaminate the entire earth to an inhabitable state, is this not sufficient “military strength?” Non-use adding MX missiles adds to sufficiency?

DOCUMENT 336

LOCATION Little Rock, AR

NAME
Lea Lounsbury

CITY
Little Rock

STATE
Arkansas

ADDRESS
2001 S. 5th St.

PHONE NUMBER
(501) 266-1000

DOCUMENT 337

The MX fails to discuss the nuclear arsenal that the MX missile joining. Understanding the existing nuclear capabilities is essential for a genuine consideration of the “no action” alternative.

The MX missile joins a world with approximately 60,000 existing nuclear warheads. The United States has over 10,000 warheads while the Soviet Union has over 25,000. England, France, and several other countries possess nuclear warheads. Ninety percent of the world’s nuclear arsenal was leveled by 16 kilotons (only one-hundred eightieth of the destructive power of one MX missile), killing 75,000 people immediately, injuring over 100,000, and causing cancer death today, over 6 years later. The deployment of only 2,000 MX missiles adds 30,000 Hiroshimas. The world’s nuclear arsenal equals over one million Hiroshimas, over 7,050 Hiroshimas, and, over 4 tons of TNT equivalent for every man, woman, and child on earth.

The MX fails to address the previous 30-plus basing modes for the MX (underground, near surface, below surface, etc.) that were proposed, discarded, and rejected. A discussion of the comparative costs, profits, and vulnerabilities would be expected. Any haven’t the four or more basing modes considered by the Reagan administration been included in the MX?

The MX fails to address the environmental impact of producing the materials for the MX missiles. For example, the MX does not address the increased uranium mining, uranium tailings, and the resultant increased cancer rates. It does not consider the additional production of high and low level radioactive wastes and the fact that there is no plan to dispose effectively these wastes which are radioactive for tens of thousands of years.

The MX fails to discuss how the MX Ball Garrison deployment conforms to the spirit of the INF Treaty, the ongoing arms limitation talks, and the arms reduction talks. At a time when the Soviet Union seems genuinely interested in arms reductions, it is absurd to escalate the arms race with a very expensive, vulnerable, provocative, and destabilizing weapon system.
The MX fails to address how the MX fits into nuclear war fighting or nuclear war threatening scenarios. Because the enormous costs of the development and deployment of a weapon system must be justified through an identifiable use, and because the use of the MX would be an environmental disaster of incalculable dimension, the MX fails to describe the consequences of the use of the MX missile or even enemy attack on the MX missile. Let us briefly consider the detonation of just one-one-megaton enemy warhead over the Grand Forks Air Force Base. Indeed, the CAFB would undoubtedly be targeted with several warheads due to its strategic importance.

A heat wave traveling at the speed of light from the fireball, which exceeds 30 million degrees Fahrenheit, vaporizes everything nearby. Exposed flesh over six miles away receives third degree burns. Within a three mile diameter, which encompasses most of the Air Force, all buildings are vaporized, crushed, or exploded while intense radiation kills even those hiding behind two feet of concrete. Almost everyone dies in this zone.

From 1.5 to 2.9 miles of ground zero, all but the strongest buildings collapse. Some 300 to 500 miles, per hour hurt human and debris alike. Everything flammable ignites. One half of the population in this zone dies immediately and most of the others die from burns and radiation exposure.

From 2.9 to 4.8 miles of ground zero, some exceed 150 mph, assault melts, wood and clothing spontaneously ignite, and houses disintegrate. Out to 40 miles, people could be cut by flying glass. Those who look at the light could be temporarily or permanently blinded.

Those in the area who escape immediate death must contend with burns, radiation, stress, and lack of resistance to spreading disease. Local hospitals would be destroyed, damaged, overtaxed, and probably contaminated. Health personnel, transportation systems, communication systems, and law enforcement could be overwhelmed. Many more people would die slow, painful deaths. Large areas would have to be excavated and indefinitely abandoned. Cancer and genetic abnormalities rates would be elevated for decades.

In the 1970 landmark case, The Kagette Decision, the United States Supreme Court held that international law is part of and parcel of the structure of federal law. International law includes the law of war.

Under the Fourth Hague Convention, no nation may use weapons which cause unnecessary suffering to human beings. Second, poison and poison weapons are flatly prohibited by the Hague Resolutions, by the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and by the U.S. Army Field Manual 27-10 on the Law of Land Warfare (1956). The United States is bound as a party to each of these. Additionally, a nation may not adopt methods or tactics which fail to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants. Because of the inherent nature of nuclear weapons, each of these rules prohibits their use.
LOCATION: DRAFT
COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for holding this meeting is to
announce our intention to seek public comments at a hearing to be held in
January 2018. This is an announcement of the date, time, location of the
hearing, and the purpose of the hearing. The hearing will be held to obtain
citizen input on the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project.

In order to ensure that the draft EIS accurately reflects the views of the public,
we are soliciting public comments on the draft EIS. Public comments will be
considered in the development of the final EIS and the final decision on the
project.

The public hearing will be held on January 17, 2018, at 7:00 p.m. at
the following location:

Rancho Bernardo High School
15500 Bernardo Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92127

Please provide your comments in writing on or before January 12, 2018. You
may submit your comments electronically by sending an email to peacekeeper
rail
program@energy.doe.gov or by mail to:

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM
15500 Bernardo Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92127

Your comments will be reviewed and considered in the development of the
final EIS and the final decision on the project.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFPEE-SMIG
Morton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

Department of Environmental Quality

The State of California

Department of Environmental Quality

15500 Bernardo Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92127
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LOCATION: DRAFT
COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for holding this meeting is to
announce our intention to seek public comments at a hearing to be held in
January 2018. This is an announcement of the date, time, location of the
hearing, and the purpose of the hearing. The hearing will be held to obtain
citizen input on the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project.

In order to ensure that the draft EIS accurately reflects the views of the public,
we are soliciting public comments on the draft EIS. Public comments will be
considered in the development of the final EIS and the final decision on the
project.

The public hearing will be held on January 17, 2018, at 7:00 p.m. at
the following location:

Rancho Bernardo High School
15500 Bernardo Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92127

Please provide your comments in writing on or before January 12, 2018. You
may submit your comments electronically by sending an email to peacekeeper
rail
program@energy.doe.gov or by mail to:

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM
15500 Bernardo Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92127

Your comments will be reviewed and considered in the development of the
final EIS and the final decision on the project.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFPEE-SMIG
Morton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409
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Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for holding this meeting is to
announce our intention to seek public comments at a hearing to be held in
January 2018. This is an announcement of the date, time, location of the
hearing, and the purpose of the hearing. The hearing will be held to obtain
citizen input on the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project.

In order to ensure that the draft EIS accurately reflects the views of the public,
we are soliciting public comments on the draft EIS. Public comments will be
considered in the development of the final EIS and the final decision on the
project.

The public hearing will be held on January 17, 2018, at 7:00 p.m. at
the following location:

Rancho Bernardo High School
15500 Bernardo Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92127

Please provide your comments in writing on or before January 12, 2018. You
may submit your comments electronically by sending an email to peacekeeper
rail
program@energy.doe.gov or by mail to:

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM
15500 Bernardo Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92127

Your comments will be reviewed and considered in the development of the
final EIS and the final decision on the project.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFPEE-SMIG
Morton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409
LOCATION: Little Rock Air Force Base

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to provide you the environmental assessment we have determined may occur of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention any issue we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to thoroughly examine any issue that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention any environmental issues that you believe have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I did not notice any adverse impact which would be caused by the placement of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Little Rock Air Force Base in Jacksonville, Arkansas. The one aspect which was not covered was in the relationship between the base and the City of Jacksonville. Even though this is a sensitive topic, it is still important.

I moved to Jacksonville in 1965 with my father who was assigned to the USA Southeast Naval Base. Since that time I have witnessed the continuous improvement of the relationship between the base and city. I moved a year after my father retired in 1968, to Jacksonville and returned here after both my parents passed away.

I believe that the base and the City of Jacksonville to have the Peacekeeper located at LRAFB.

JUNE A. JONES
Jacksonville, AR

NAME: JUNE A. JONES
ADDRESS: JACKSONVILLE, ARKANSAS 72076

Please hand this form to or mail to:

Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRC-PEACEKEEPER
Horton Air Force Base
Ben Bernard, California 92089

LOCATION: Grand Forks

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to provide you the environmental assessment we have determined may occur of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention any issue we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to thoroughly examine any issue that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention any environmental issues that you believe have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

There are three questions concerning scope. One is the following question excluded from consideration when determining in some environmental impact of Fairbank.

1. Incidents relating to sabotage. There is only the potential mention of sabotage. The claim in the report is that the very mention of this is such a sensitive matter that we may have overlooked some aspect of the future strategy for peacekeeping in strength. And since this would clearly lead to propagating myths, the decision will be made in the case of the environmental impact.

2. Psychological impacts. A number of it is clear that this is a major economic concern and that if it can be dealt with capitally along with any other environmental issues, I will consider the influence of this factor also. The whole area needs to be looked at including the potential for psychological and social activities. The feeling is about preventing the long-term impact of environmental impacts on the business community or the public.

3. Documentation. Similarly, it is often said that the Air Force is not legally eligible to damage. To exclude the impact of documenting a particular defense action within this base is contrary. It also is required for funding purposes. It is difficult to analyze the impact of not documenting a particular defense action within this base.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. SCHWABE
Associate Professor
The University of North Dakota

NAME: JUNE A. JONES
ADDRESS: JACKSONVILLE, ARKANSAS 72076

Please hand this form to or mail to:

Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRC-PEACEKEEPER
Horton Air Force Base
Ben Bernard, California 92089

LOCATION: Grand Forks

NAME: JUNE A. JONES
ADDRESS: JACKSONVILLE, ARKANSAS 72076

Please hand this form to or mail to:

Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRC-PEACEKEEPER
Horton Air Force Base
Ben Bernard, California 92089

2-145
Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for holding this meeting is to give you an opportunity to express your opinion regarding the potential environmental issues that may be affected by the proposed rail garrison. Since the environmental analysis is an ongoing process, we would like to have your input to help us improve our analysis and to ensure that the project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

A detailed Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared to address and discuss the potential environmental issues. The EA will be available for public review and comment before final decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to express your comments and concerns.

Thank you for your participation in this process.

[Name]
[Position]
[Company]
[Address]

[Date]
DOCUMENT 349

LOCATION: Abilene, Texas

CONSENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and to afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please see the front pages of this hearing to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I was very disappointed in the hearing of 5/1/85 at the courthouse in Abilene, Texas. The civil leaders were given time to get their act together but those who might speak against the missiles were cut off. I did not get to speak.

I gave my card to an Air Force officer handling the desk. I gave him my card and asked him to give it to Lt Col Peter Walsh.

The environment will be affected by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

DOCUMENT 350

LOCATION: Abilene, Texas

CONSENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and to afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please see the front pages of this hearing to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

\[...\]
August 18, 1988

Mr. Gary D. Hess
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force
Department of the Air Force
Washington, D.C. 20310-7000

Dear Mr. Hess:

As a representative of the community that has supported the military, we are very pleased to see that this Environmental Impact Statement for the Peacekeeper rail garrison is being conducted.

As a result of the favorable response from the people of this area, and the fact that the Environmental Impact Statement shows no problems with the environment, we would strongly urge that the Peacekeeper rail garrison be placed at Minot Air Force Base when it is implemented.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Gail Henson
Mayor

August 19, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
SPARC-MN 345
Norton AFB, California 92409-6446

Dear Colonel Walsh:

I am enclosing a letter I received from one of my constituents, Ray Jefferson of Great Falls, Montana, regarding the public hearings that were held in Great Falls on the rail garrison.

This letter is being sent to you so that you can be made aware of his concerns regarding the way in which the hearing was conducted.

Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

9/2/88

Sen. John Melcher
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Melcher:

I am gratified to contact you in person for an informal discussion of the rail garrison project.

On August 16, I flew to Great Falls to make a brief stop, and met with people at the rail garrison project. I was advised that the rail garrison would be completed by 1990, and that the rail garrison would be completed by 1990.

The rail garrison is an important project for the people of Great Falls. It is a major economic development project for the area, and the rail garrison will provide a major economic benefit to the people of Great Falls. It is a major economic development project for the area, and the rail garrison will provide a major economic benefit to the people of Great Falls.
Dear Lieutenant Colonel Walsh

I think the idea of rail opposition to the MX missile is unrealistic. Sending them regular train trips through highly populated areas of the Western States puts too many people at risk if conceivably leaves it more open to terrorist attack than having it in a more limited area.

Also, this project has not been adequately publicized. It is difficult to comment at this week's meeting from aboard the 3,000-vehicle motorcade, but the potential groups who might be against to them plan to be given the opportunity to submit comments before a decision is made. The new of having the issue is responsible.

Please be aware that opposition is going to plan is likely to be much more widespread than what you have been able to receive in the limited time period comments on the issue.

Thank you.

 undersurface Air

Calif., Calif.

LOCATION: Belene, Texas

DATE: July 31, 1988

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for holding this meeting is to give you an opportunity to express your interests and concerns for analyzing the environmental impact statement. Our goal is to provide you with an environmental document that will be made available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on building and implementation is made. Please use this sheet to bring your environmental issues to this meeting.

Thank you.

LOCATION: Middle Reversal Highway

DATE: July 31, 1988

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this meeting. Our purpose for holding this meeting is to give you an opportunity to express your interests and concerns for analyzing the environmental impact statement. Our goal is to provide you with an environmental document that will be made available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on building and implementation is made. Please use this sheet to bring your environmental issues to this meeting.

Thank you.
Lieutenant Colonel Peter Walsh
AFRCE - BUS/DEV
Norton Air Force Base
California, 92409-6448

August 21, 1988

Dear Lieutenant Colonel Walsh:

I am shocked and appalled that the availability of the DEP's on the Rail Garrison Project Program was not well advertised.

I want to firmly state that I feel the implementation of this plan would be an absolute disaster. It is absolutely in some people's interest to mislead the public by misusing key words. This is just one of many acts of misinformation.

Sincerely,

Julie Bazan
1360 Ullyse
Berkeley, CA 94703

Robert L. Schuetz
August 20, 1988

Dear Lieutenant Colonel Walsh:

With regards to the Public Hearing on 11 August 1988. My business was over that evening, and consequently I was unable to attend the meeting in a show of support for the Rail Garrison Project.

As an active member of the Military Affairs Committee of the Mount Shasta Chamber of Commerce and a local business owner, I would like to extend to you my support for locating the Rail Garrison Project at Mount Shasta where we believe the environmental impact of the project will be significantly reduced. The region is well-suited for the project and we believe the economic benefits will outweigh the environmental concerns.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Schuetz

LOCATION: Mount Shasta, CA

CONFIDENTIAL U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to answer any questions you may have regarding the environmental impact of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program.

I am not able to attend the meeting since I was out of town on business. I did, however, wish to state my support of locating the Peacekeeper at the site you have described as feasible. The region offers a variety of benefits including a lower environmental impact. I believe the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program would be a valuable asset to the region.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Schuetz
Lt Col Peter Valah
AFRC-MDS/REK
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

Dear Col Valah:

This is to expand upon and in some cases modify my verbal comments made at Medical Lake, WA on 4 August 1988. Firstly, I want to strongly protest the time limitation of three minutes for verbal comments, and secondly I think the location of the meeting, Medical Lake, reflected the intent of the USAF to limit the number of attendees. My forefathers came over here in the 1600's; a Carroll signed the Declaration of Independence; a relative served as a general officer in the Civil War; and another served during the Vietnam War as a three star general....

EACH ONE OF THEM I'M SURE SERVED TO PRESERVE AND EXPAND DEMOCRACY. The dictatorial time limitation and handling of the citizens at the hearing at Medical Lake was the antithesis of what they lived, fought, and died for, and don't you forget it.

The Peacekeeper (as you know if I ever heard one) Ball Carriage Program was about as well thought out as the IRAU dollar, i.e., a new problem used to solve an old problem. The whole object of the game is to enhance SECURITY. Spend the same amount of money and effort on satellites and launch vehicles as that projected for the Ball Carriage Program and it will result in enhanced security. Someone is being railroaded!

Under Section 5-1, it is stated that "there is a very slight potential for mishap". Rail accidents are very common in this area; we read many times a year about accidents resulting in derailments. Many times drug or alcohol abuse is the cause of rail accidents. In fact, this month several rail employees were picked up without warning and given tests for substance abuse.

The railroad company is supposed to avoid the results they may still they did not release the results; that reason to be seen however. The potential for rail accidents will certainly increase during times of "national need" because of increased auto traffic and general nervousness. This can be addressed and not just dismissed as "no information available".

I made comments regarding Tech. Inc. and their personnel. These comments I believe were inappropriate, and I retract them here and will make no further comment on the appropriateness of your contractor selection.

In Sections 5-1 and 5-41 it is stated that radioactive material dispersal is so unlikely that it is considered a negligible risk and that plutonium "can" be clothing or even

with results in contamination and does not result in biological harm. That is not correct. It should read "will Coast likely result in plutonium being labeled and injured". It's similar to being without clothing and covered with rassenashes. You are indeed contaminated with rassenashes and it will most likely result in biological harm. A human's lifetime body burden for plutonium (defined as that amount of plutonium causing no detectable biological harm) is about one microgram and can be represented by an amount of material which can cover a small pencil eraser.

Plutonium is a nonleagical dose seeking element and a highly toxic chemical poison. "Cleanly, by recognized means" glasses over a serious problem. A quantity such as might be in a special weapon could ruin an entire city such as Spokane. The "plutonium dust" referred to in the draft EIS is most likely plutonium dioxide. I've seen a few silverline contamination whole laboratories under controlled atmospheric conditions. Can you imagine a plutonium fire outside a populated area? The draft EIS is seriously lacking in details regarding how an accident involving a plutonium weapon fire could be handled. What about training of local police, fire, and other emergency teams? Should citizens in the area have monitors in their home? How will citizens be told to evacuate, and where
The M-X missile system is a "first strike" weapon. The Fiscal Year 1980 Arms Control Impact Statement (op cit, pp. 24-25) clearly states:

...if the M-X were deployed in substantial number, the U.S. would have acquired, through both the Minuteman and M-X programs, an apparent capability to destroy most of the Soviet silo-based ICBM force in a first-strike.

The M-X is specifically aimed at military targets in the Soviet Union; therefore it is not a weapon of deterrence. Its purpose is to destroy military targets before they can retaliate. Every statement of the Catholic Church since Hiroshima, for example the statements of Vatican Council II and the U.S. Bishops' Peace Pastoral, have insisted that it is immoral to initiate the use of nuclear weapons. In 1983, the U.S. Catholic Bishops wrote in their pastoral ("The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response"):

We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear warfare, however restricted a scale can be, can be morally justified.

Therefore, as followers of St. Francis, the patron of peace, and as those responsible for the spiritual and physical well-being of the people in the Spokane area, we cannot tolerate the M-X missile system and insist against its deployment anywhere, and specifically in the Spokane area. In the spirit of the INF Treaty, let us continue to dismantle these weapons of destruction, and turn our economy toward the production of life-giving resources.

Sincerely yours for a peaceful world,

Joe Chinnici, OPF
Provincial Minister
Member of Social Concerns Committee

cc Archbishop Raymond Hunthausen
Bishop Lawrence Welch
Richard Jares, OPF

This letter is hereby submitted for inclusion in the Peace and Social Concerns program of the Franciscan Friars Province of Saint Barbara.

August 23, 1983

Director of Environmental Planning
APRCE - BMS/DEV
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, CA 92409-6448

To whom it may concern:

It has come to our attention that the Air force is planning to base the M-X missile system in the Spokane, WA, area. We are members of the St. Barbara Province of Franciscans, and have a 500 year history in the Western United States. We currently administer two parishes in Spokane, and have the pastoral responsibility for the people of that area.

There are many grounds upon which to condemn the M-X missile system. However, for purposes of this letter, it is our intention to focus on two crucial issues which your previous environmental impact study completely ignored.

In the Spokane, WA, area.

The M-X missile system is a "first strike" weapon. The Fiscal Year 1980 Arms Control Impact Statement (op cit, pp. 24-25) clearly states:

...if the M-X were deployed in substantial numbers, the U.S. would have acquired, through both the Minuteman and M-X programs, an apparent capability to destroy most of the Soviet silo-based ICBM force in a first-strike.

The M-X is specifically aimed at military targets in the Soviet Union; therefore it is not a weapon of deterrence. Its purpose is to destroy military targets before they can retaliate. Every statement of the Catholic Church since Hiroshima, for example the statements of Vatican Council II and the U.S. Bishops' Peace Pastoral, have insisted that it is immoral to initiate the use of nuclear weapons. In 1983, the U.S. Catholic Bishops wrote in their pastoral ("The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response"):

We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear warfare, however restricted a scale can be, can be morally justified.

Therefore, as followers of St. Francis, the patron of peace, and as those responsible for the spiritual and physical well-being of the people in the Spokane area, we cannot tolerate the M-X missile system and insist against its deployment anywhere, and specifically in the Spokane area. In the spirit of the INF Treaty, let us continue to dismantle these weapons of destruction, and turn our economy toward the production of life-giving resources.

Sincerely yours for a peaceful world,

Joe Chinnici, OPF
Provincial Minister
Member of Social Concerns Committee

cc Archbishop Raymond Hunthausen
Bishop Lawrence Welch
Richard Jares, OPF

Clearly, a first strike weapon is immoral in use, and as well in its possession, because possession implies intention to use.

Since the M-X missile is a first strike weapon, our possession of it causes the Soviet Union to live under the fear of its use. Should the Soviets suspect, either because of international conditions or because of misinformation (computer error, etc.), that the United States might be prepared to launch a first strike attack, they would be compelled to initiate a nuclear assault. This would greatly endanger the Spokane area because with deployment of the M-X, it would become a first strike target. This danger has been clearly demonstrated even in statements from the President's arms control impact statement:

...under crisis conditions, Soviet leaders, convinced that war was imminent, and fearing for the survival of the ICBMs if the United States struck first, nonetheless would perceive pressures to strike first themselves. Such a situation, of course, would be intolerable...

Even the knowledge that this perilous situation exists would create a severe psychological impact on the citizens of the Spokane area and particularly on the children, who know they live under the imminent threat of nuclear destruction.

The Bishops' pastoral, pointing to a 'strictly conditioned moral acceptance of nuclear deterrence', further condemns first strike weapons such as the M-X:

...we oppose some specific proposals in respect to our present deterrence posture: The addition of weapons which are likely to be used in a first attack, yet also possess a "prompt hard-target kill" capability that threatens to make the other side's retaliatory forces vulnerable. Such weapons may seem to be useful primarily in a first strike; we resist such weapons for this reason...("The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response")

Physicians for Social Responsibility hereby submits comments and questions on the Air Force Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Minuteman III Nuclear Weapons Program. We request that this letter be included and printed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement with specific and complete responses, and that a copy of the FES be sent to us.

Physicians for Social Responsibility is one of the nation's largest organized medical societies, with 15,000 members representing all major fields of medicine. In the early 1960's, PSR was instrumental in exposing the public about the dangers of atmospheric nuclear testing. Demonstrating the concentration of radioactive strontium-90 in the deciduous teeth of American children. PSR testimony in Congress about these health hazards helped raise public consciousness and led to the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty, which prohibits atmospheric nuclear testing. Since then, PSR has continued its efforts to educate medical doctors and the public about the world's number one public health threat - nuclear war.

Nuclear weapons wreak their destructive power even when they are not detonated. PSR is advocating for a ban on nuclear testing that would bring the public to the broader social, economic, political, and health consequences of the nuclear arms race. All of these consequences must be addressed through the Environmental Impact Statement for the M-X Minuteman III nuclear weapons program.
The National Environmental Policy Act requires the Air Force to conduct a thorough evaluation of the potential impacts this major project would have, and to report its findings in a public document known as the DEIS. The DEIS would serve as the basis for determining whether the project should proceed. The DEIS must meet certain standards, including presenting a comprehensive and balanced analysis of the project's potential impacts. The DEIS should also be useful for decision-making, and it should be complete and accurate.

**Scope of the Project**

The Air Force has identified the construction of a new rail garrison as a potential impact. The DEIS would analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with this project. The Air Force is considering several alternatives, including the construction of a new rail garrison, the expansion of an existing rail garrison, or no action at all. The DEIS would evaluate these alternatives and provide a recommendation to the Air Force.

**Environmental Impacts**

The DEIS would identify potential environmental impacts associated with the construction of the new rail garrison. These impacts could include changes to the physical environment, such as changes to the landscape, air quality, and water quality. The DEIS would also identify potential social and economic impacts, such as changes to the local economy and the impact on local communities.

**Decision-Making Process**

The DEIS would provide a comprehensive and balanced analysis of the potential impacts associated with the construction of the new rail garrison. The DEIS would be used by decision-makers to evaluate the potential impacts and make a decision about whether to proceed with the project. The DEIS would also be used to provide information to the public and to other stakeholders who may be affected by the project.

**Conclusion**

The DEIS is an important document that provides a comprehensive and balanced analysis of the potential impacts associated with the construction of a new rail garrison. The DEIS would be used by decision-makers to evaluate the potential impacts and make a decision about whether to proceed with the project. The DEIS would also be used to provide information to the public and to other stakeholders who may be affected by the project.
Evaluating the Environmental Impact of Proposed Rail Garrison Systems

28 steps will the Air Force take to keep the system running? What will be the cost of such steps?

Economic Effects

The DEIS cites some favorable economic impacts of garrison and base completion in the proposed planning area. Without stating clearly the assumptions used to calculate the promised economic benefits.

Table 4.1.1-1 includes statistics representing the Air Force’s plans for the national impact on employment of rail garrison expansions. The employment projections account to a claim of 185,000 new jobs annually nationwide. Most of these jobs are expected to be highly young, 23,000 of which are part-time jobs that are likely to be temporary. But the young are then 30,000 new jobs fully job is a protective net to support the local communities, or the nation as a whole? How long will these jobs be? If a job is lost, how many other jobs are available? How many people will lose their jobs after initial construction tasks have been completed?

The DEIS forecasts that jobs created by the program would go from nearly 40,000 in FY 1989 to nearly 148,000 in FY 1991, and then decline sharply to 13,000 by FY 1992 and just under 12,000 in FY 1994 and beyond. The DEIS does not indicate the job growth in the region will have any significant effect on local communities, or the nation as a whole. How long will these jobs be? If a job is lost, how many other jobs are available? How many people will lose their jobs after initial construction tasks have been completed?

Will the new jobs be used by current construction employees who are currently unemployed? Will the jobs be filled by local citizens, or by specialists from outside the region?

After construction of the garrisons, will there be any long-term economic benefits derived from the project? If so, what are these benefits? How long will they last after the garrisons are completed?

Will the workers, whether local or from outside the region, be allowed to use the Air Force’s FEZ and other facilities? If they are, how will the new economic activity impact already existing local economies?

How much track renovation and new track construction will be required to implement the rail garrison system? How will track renovations and track use costs be shared by the Air Force with public and private rail interests?

If the Air Force plans to build more than one rail line out of each garrison, what additional rights-of-way will need to be purchased for the required track? How does the Air Force plan to

How will MX components with dangerous explosive or radioactive materials be transported to their targets? How can the Air Force assure the public that MX Missiles and their components will be shipped safely to their target location?

How will the Air Force insure against accidents at assembly areas like the recent Morton-Thiokol plant accident in Utah?

What effect, if any, will accidents involving other missile arms have on other nearby missiles in their garrisons? (Since there would be no explosion, the missile attack can set off a chain reaction of explosions.)

Technical Merits

The final EIS study must address the impact of actual use of this system as designed and its likely demise — local missile warheads. It is clear that the environmental impact of nuclear detonations near these systems will have devastating effect on surrounding communities and air quality. The technical merits of a rail-based missile garrison being made in particular, the ability of the system itself to function in a combat environment must be addressed. The technical merits of the performance of a rail-based missile under these circumstances must be assessed by the EIS:

Would the MX Missiles trains be hardened against Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP)? If so, what are the engineering costs? If not, how will the Air Force insure that the communications system necessary to authorize and respond to missile launches will work in the event of an atomic explosion high above the U.S.?

In the civilian rail yard this system would incorporate strong enough to withstand the firing of missiles from trains at any point in the network. What protective actions should the Air Force take to mitigate the effects of accidental fires and explosions?

Only a complete, detailed response to these and all other questions of the impacts and costs of the proposed MC missile rail garrison system in this EIS will constitute full compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. The Air Force, like any agency of the federal government, must conduct such an inquiry and include in its recommendations

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,
(ii) the potential direct and indirect adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,
(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,
(iv) the relationship between local short-term use of man’s natural resources and long-term productivity, and
(v) any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources, which would be involved in the proposed action.

36 relocations residents or owners who might be displaced from, or lose the use of, their property due to this construction?

Safety

The DEIS raises questions about the impact on public safety of such a system that could travel over at least 150,000 miles of track in the continental United States. The potential for catastrophic accident or deliberate sabotage is significant with such a system. The final EIS must address all potential safety issues for this system, and must evaluate fully worst-case scenario and the option of not building the system at all:

What steps will be taken to protect MX Missile trains carrying dangerous cargo from the mishaps that befell ordinary civilian rail larges as in the July 22, 1977, accident in Pueblo, Colorado? In this accident railroad personnel were exposed to radioactive contamination and the Air Force was criticized for its response to this spill.

What will be the costs of such steps, and how will the Air Force determine whether or not these steps are sufficient to prevent the public from accidents involving explosions and non-explosive release of radioactive material?

Who will public cooperation be mobilized to respond to an accident or malfunction of the rail garrison system? Will military law be imposed to enforce citizen cooperation with its operation during a time of crisis?

What provisions will be made to protect the public and the environment from an accident resulting in an explosion and/or the release of radioactivity into the environment? What is the cost of such protective steps?

Will local personnel near the rail lines used by the MX Missile trains be equipped to deal with hazardous waste containment and leakage? For example, in Colorado, they were not. What is the cost of such preparations?

Will each community along the proposed MX train deployment arteries have its own evacuation plan? Who is responsible for writing and giving final approval to such plans, and for notifying and involving several different communities along the same rail line?

What provisions will be made to secure the civilian rail bed from the threat of terrorist or other acts leading to derail civilian rail traffic? What is the cost of such preparations?

Sincerely,
Christine Cassel, MD
President

2-154
Lieutenant Colonel Peter Walsh  
APRCN/STR/OV  
Barton Air Force Base  
California 92409-4449  
August 24, 1988

Dear Lieutenant Colonel Walsh:

I would like to request a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Fort Sill Garrison planning for the NT missile, and the opportunity to submit comments of which for this ORES at least 30 days so that I may submit comments.

I believe an extension of this comment period is reasonable following the guidelines of Sec. 1502.4 of the Council on Environmental Quality regulations for the National Environmental Policy Act. These latter time limits are the size of the proposed action, which in this case is quite large, and the degree to which the action is controversial, which with the NT program has always been high.

I would also like to state my belief that environmental impacts of this program are national in scope. This is because:

1) The program as understood involves transportation of nuclear missiles on railroad tracks over a substantial portion of the continental U.S.,
2) I and my other U.S. citizens might be travelling on those same railroad tracks or near related depots and support facilities,
3) The routine stationing and transport of intercontinental ballistic missiles on public transportation corridors and non-military-owned portions of the United States represents in my knowledge a radical departure from traditional military operations. In addition, the environmental impacts are substantial to the quality of the human environment as a whole.
4) Any nuclear weapons program of this sort carries substantial risks to the global environment in general, and must be evaluated with those risks in mind.

Because this program has national impacts of these sorts, I would like to request that future hearings, public notifications, and the like regarding this program be conducted

August 27, 1988

Dr. Jamae B. Saleh  
Barton Air Force Base, CA 92409  

Dear Sirs:

In regard to area around the Fraynaker Rall Garrison site up for developing, the Fort Sill Apache Tribe have no concerns in this area.

Thank you for informing us.

Sincerely,  

MILDREDI CLEERAIM  
Chairperson

LOCATION LAYOUT  

U.S. AIR FORCE FRAYAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to present for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Planseaker Rall Garrison program proceeds, and allow you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have incorrectly overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use the sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Please hand this form in or mail to:

Col Peter Walsh  
AFRC-FRADDY  
Barton Air Force Base  
San Bernardino, California 92409
LOCATION: Grand Forks, North Dakota

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to ascertain for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I am chairman of the Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce-Military Affairs Committe and president of the Grand Forks, ND chapter of the Air Force Association. On behalf of both groups I wish to tell you that we are in strong support of locating Peacekeper Ball Garrison in Grand Forks, ND. We feel we are one of the best alternative locations to choose, but we have all these issues in mind.

I also believe that we can accommodate the additional people required to operate it. We have wonderful schools and a university. I think locating Peacekeeper Ball Garrison in Grand Forks, ND is a good situation for both civilian and military affairs.

Respectfully,
[Signature]

August 22, 1988

Dear Col. Walsh,

I thank you for the letter you received in the district or maybe even in the nation from the population center.

I would like to see a Peacekeeper base in Grand Forks, near my old home town of Portland. No matter in which city in the nation I will be located, my wife and I will find our way.

The letter, the sign, the newness of this area to the military, it makes you feel good. I have no doubt this will make our nation proud.

Yours truly,

[Signatures]

October 22, 1988

2-156
LOCATION: Champaign, ILL.

COMMEND SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for standing this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to

consult with the community concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the

Minot Air Force Base. We have determined that the

Minot Air Force Base will have a significant impact on the surrounding area. We are conducting this hearing to

explain the DEIS and to receive comments and questions from the community.

We appreciate your interest and will consider all comments made during the hearing.

Sincerely,

[signature]

Commander, Minot Air Force Base

LOCATION: Champaign, ILL.

COMMEND SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for standing this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to

consult with the community concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the

Minot Air Force Base. We have determined that the

Minot Air Force Base will have a significant impact on the surrounding area. We are conducting this hearing to

explain the DEIS and to receive comments and questions from the community.

We appreciate your interest and will consider all comments made during the hearing.

Sincerely,

[signature]

Commander, Minot Air Force Base

WARD COUNTY COURT

Document 374

GARY A. HOWARD

JANET LARSON

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh

AFRCE-BMS/DEV

Porter Air Force Base

Bemidji, Minnesota, 56601

August 25, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh

AFRCE-BMS/DEV

Bemidji, Minnesota, 56601

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Minot Air Force Base

Dear Lt. Colonel Walsh,

I am a resident and an elected official for Ward County North Dakota. I have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement regarding Minot Air Force Base and I concur with the findings therein.

I was available as an elected official and had requested an opportunity to speak at the hearing here in Minot on August 11, 1988. A change in the rules at that hearing precluded a number of elected officials from speaking, myself included. There is a certain amount of unfairness in this as those people who follow from meeting to meeting promoting The Ball Garrison System seem to have an audience wherever they go. People who live here and work with the Minot Air Force Base do not have that same opportunity.

The environmental impact of The Ball Garrison upon Minot and the surrounding area will be minimal, if any. The environmental impact will be a benefit rather than a detriment to this area.

I support Ball Garrison at Minot Air Force Base. Shortly after the hearing on The Ball Garrison, in fact within three days of the hearing, The Ball Garrison System, Inc. went into operation at the Minot Air Force Base and was attended by nearly 500,000 people.

We appreciate Minot Air Force Base. They are part of this community. They are not a separate entity, as we look at it. What is good for them is good for us.

I appreciate the opportunity of being able to respond by mail.

GARY A. HOWARD

WARD COUNTY JUDGE
BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MINOT PARK DISTRICT
607 E 4th Street
Minot, North Dakota

BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS

Minot Park District is aware of the projected impact of personnel to the Minot area for the Peacekeeper Ball weapon program.

The Park Board operates 170 acres of park land that includes an 18 hole green golf course, 2 swimming pools, a major park, a 15 acre urban park and 13 neighborhood parks. The Board feels that the project would add a great opportunity to the City of Minot for people to recreate and enjoy the outdoors. They feel that with the number of acres and individual parks in the area there will be no negative effect on the Park system.

The Minot Park Board would welcome the additional people needed for the deployment and operation of the Peacekeeper Ball program.

Robert Perry, President
Board of Park Commissioners

DOCUMENT 376

DOCUMENT 377

LOCATION
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER BALL GARRISON PROGRAM

COMMENTS

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to have you understand the environmental consequences we have determined occur if the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison program proceeds, and allow you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters you may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough examination of the Draft EIS before we make a final decision on the project is made. Please use this effort to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Appended to this hearing booklet are various documents and the argument presented to us by the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison Program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri for the following reasons:

1. Selection of such a weapons system near the greater metropolitan Kansas City area with a population in excess of one million persons is reckless and imprudent. Whether by accident or by design launch a target of a weapon or subject to attack at and around our “area,” such centers should never be near highly populated areas.

2. Statutorily, there is a wasteful duplication of other high priced defense systems. We already have mobile systems in operation (the Tomcats and space-ships, or the submarines and ships). I cannot justify further expenditures along these lines which would duplicate existing systems. Our economy can not handle further waste and duplication by high priced, wasteful weapons systems.

3. The purpose of bringing the other side to the bargaining table is already fulfilled. Progress on weapons negotiations has progressed and continues to develop. It is contradictory and a display of bad faith to negotiate arm reductions while at the same time developing more weapons and delivery systems. Are we not deceiving ourselves and the world?

4. The purpose of deterrence already exists for each side. Each side has 34,000 nuclear weapons. Weapon experts have testified under oath that a small number of nuclear weapons (i.e., 100) could inflict irreparable harm to all life on this planet. Again, why this unnecessary duplication?

5. We object to further extension of weapon systems in Missouri. Your proposal would take 280 acres of valuable farm land and subject 110 acres to adverse comments. We are already saddled with Whiteman AFB and its complex of 150 nuclear missile silos scattered over ten counties.

Sincerely,

Senator John Danforth - MO
Senator kit Bond - MO
Representative Ike Skelton - MO
Representative Al Watt - MO
Vice President George Bush - Republican Presidential candidate
Governor Michael Dukakis - Democratic Presidential candidate

DOCUMENT 378

DOCUMENT 378

Page two
Letter to Lt Col. Peter Walsh

8/15/88

6. Morally, we are offended by any development of weapons. We recognize that your defense of these actions is based on the argument of deterrence. Such systems are already in place and each person abandons the threat of nuclear war. However, each weapon represents a willingness and a present intent to take the lives of many innocent persons on this planet. This mind, this is an intent to commit murder. The development of this delivery system is adding and adding the ability to lethally kill other innocent victims. This system is a disservice to the pressing needs of humanity in so many areas.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

For the Stoovers

Henry M. Stoover

Lt Col. Peter Walsh
APFC-IM/DEP
Horton ABF, California 92460-6448
Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement Peacekeeper Ball Garrison Program
Whiteman AFB, Missouri

Dear Mr. Walsh,

My wife, two children and I oppose placement of the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison Program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri for the following reasons:

1. Selection of such a weapons system near the greater metropolitan Kansas City area with a population in excess of one million persons is reckless and imprudent. Whether by accident or by design launch a target of a weapon or subject to attack at and around this area, such centers should never be near highly populated areas.

2. Statutorily, there is a wasteful duplication of other high priced defense systems. We already have mobile systems in operation (the Tomcats and space-ships, or the submarines and ships). I cannot justify further expenditures along these lines which would duplicate existing systems. Our economy can not handle further waste and duplication by high priced, wasteful weapons systems.

3. The purpose of bringing the other side to the bargaining table is already fulfilled. Progress on weapons negotiations has progressed and continues to develop. It is contradictory and a display of bad faith to negotiate arm reductions while at the same time developing more weapons and delivery systems. Are we not deceiving ourselves and the world?

4. The purpose of deterrence already exists for each side. Each side has 34,000 nuclear weapons. Weapon experts have testified under oath that a small number of nuclear weapons (i.e., 100) could inflict irreparable harm to all life on this planet. Again, why this unnecessary duplication?

5. We object to further extension of weapon systems in Missouri. Your proposal would take 280 acres of valuable farm land and subject 110 acres to adverse comments. We are already saddled with Whiteman AFB and its complex of 150 nuclear missile silos scattered over ten counties.

Sincerely,

Henry M. Stoover

8/25/88

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER BALL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to have you understand the environmental consequences we have determined occur if the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison program proceeds, and allow you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters you may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough examination of the Draft EIS before we make a final decision on the project is made. Please use this effort to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Appended to this hearing booklet are various documents and the argument presented to us by the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison Program at Whiteman AFB, Missouri for the following reasons:

1. Selection of such a weapons system near the greater metropolitan Kansas City area with a population in excess of one million persons is reckless and imprudent. Whether by accident or by design launch a target of a weapon or subject to attack at and around this area, such centers should never be near highly populated areas.

2. Statutorily, there is a wasteful duplication of other high priced defense systems. We already have mobile systems in operation (the Tomcats and space-ships, or the submarines and ships). I cannot justify further expenditures along these lines which would duplicate existing systems. Our economy can not handle further waste and duplication by high priced, wasteful weapons systems.

3. The purpose of bringing the other side to the bargaining table is already fulfilled. Progress on weapons negotiations has progressed and continues to develop. It is contradictory and a display of bad faith to negotiate arm reductions while at the same time developing more weapons and delivery systems. Are we not deceiving ourselves and the world?

4. The purpose of deterrence already exists for each side. Each side has 34,000 nuclear weapons. Weapon experts have testified under oath that a small number of nuclear weapons (i.e., 100) could inflict irreparable harm to all life on this planet. Again, why this unnecessary duplication?

5. We object to further extension of weapon systems in Missouri. Your proposal would take 280 acres of valuable farm land and subject 110 acres to adverse comments. We are already saddled with Whiteman AFB and its complex of 150 nuclear missile silos scattered over ten counties.

Sincerely,

Henry M. Stoover

8/25/88

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
LOCATION: Grand Forks, ND

COMMENTSHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to provide you with the opportunity to review an Environmental Impact Statement which has been determined to be a Draft. We have determined to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement is intended to provide you with information on the potential environmental effects of the proposed project.

This is a public hearing under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). You are invited to provide your comments on the proposed project. Your comments will be considered in preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Dear Sir or Madam:

This is to advise you that we agree with the Environmental Impact Statement that has been prepared for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. We have determined that the proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Peacekeeper program.

We are committed to ensuring that the proposed project is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner. We have taken steps to minimize the impact of the proposed project on the environment.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
General Manager

AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

LOCATION: Grand Forks, ND

COMMENTSHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to provide you with the opportunity to review an Environmental Impact Statement which has been determined to be a Draft. We have determined to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement is intended to provide you with information on the potential environmental effects of the proposed project.

This is a public hearing under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). You are invited to provide your comments on the proposed project. Your comments will be considered in preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Dear Sir or Madam:

This is to advise you that we agree with the Environmental Impact Statement that has been prepared for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. We have determined that the proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Peacekeeper program.

We are committed to ensuring that the proposed project is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner. We have taken steps to minimize the impact of the proposed project on the environment.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
General Manager

AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

LOCATION: Grand Forks, ND

COMMENTSHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to provide you with the opportunity to review an Environmental Impact Statement which has been determined to be a Draft. We have determined to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement is intended to provide you with information on the potential environmental effects of the proposed project.

This is a public hearing under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). You are invited to provide your comments on the proposed project. Your comments will be considered in preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Dear Sir or Madam:

This is to advise you that we agree with the Environmental Impact Statement that has been prepared for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. We have determined that the proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Peacekeeper program.

We are committed to ensuring that the proposed project is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner. We have taken steps to minimize the impact of the proposed project on the environment.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
General Manager

AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

LOCATION: Grand Forks, ND

COMMENTSHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to provide you with the opportunity to review an Environmental Impact Statement which has been determined to be a Draft. We have determined to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement is intended to provide you with information on the potential environmental effects of the proposed project.

This is a public hearing under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). You are invited to provide your comments on the proposed project. Your comments will be considered in preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Dear Sir or Madam:

This is to advise you that we agree with the Environmental Impact Statement that has been prepared for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. We have determined that the proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Peacekeeper program.

We are committed to ensuring that the proposed project is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner. We have taken steps to minimize the impact of the proposed project on the environment.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
General Manager

AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

LOCATION: Grand Forks, ND

COMMENTSHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to provide you with the opportunity to review an Environmental Impact Statement which has been determined to be a Draft. We have determined to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement is intended to provide you with information on the potential environmental effects of the proposed project.

This is a public hearing under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). You are invited to provide your comments on the proposed project. Your comments will be considered in preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Dear Sir or Madam:

This is to advise you that we agree with the Environmental Impact Statement that has been prepared for the proposed Peacekeeper RAIL Garrison at Grand Forks. We have determined that the proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Peacekeeper program.

We are committed to ensuring that the proposed project is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner. We have taken steps to minimize the impact of the proposed project on the environment.

Sincerely,

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
General Manager

AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM
LOCATION: Little Rock, Air Force Base

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to acknowledge for the environmental concerns we’ve determined may arise in the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program, and allow you an opportunity to bring to our attention any other issues you may believe are important to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. Our goal is through constructive public comment to help ensure that all environmental issues are considered before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We feel that issues discussed at the public meeting are among any concerns we have about the government. We feel that there will not be any significant impact on the local environment by the construction and/or operation of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

We hope that the Air Force applies environmentally sensitive design for the site for this program.

T.R. Bond 1000 School Dr. Jacksonville, AR

Name: Street Address: City State: Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter W. AFRIC-BMS/DEV
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

LOCATION: Chicago, IL

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to acknowledge for the environmental concerns we’ve determined may arise in the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program, and allow you an opportunity to bring to our attention any other issues you may believe are important to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. Our goal is through constructive public comment to help ensure that all environmental issues are considered before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

1. Do you know any of the landmarks who are responsible for implementing the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and the State Environmental Programs?
2. What is the working relationship with the Air Force?
3. What is the working relationship with the State?
4. What is your opinion of this program?

Rita Dechuck 3x Harman Dr. Liverton, IL 60506

Name: Street Address: City State: Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter W. AFRIC/BMS/DEV
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

LOCATION: Grand Forks, ND

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to acknowledge for the environmental concerns we’ve determined may arise in the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program, and allow you an opportunity to bring to our attention any other issues you may believe are important to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. Our goal is through constructive public comment to help ensure that all environmental issues are considered before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

1. I believe the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison will give me the security I need. I would use my potential earnings from this work if I am able to counter attack with anti-peace forces. This will keep me from losing the first wave.
2. I believe the Grand Forks area would be an excellent location for a Peacekeeper. My reasons are as follows:
   (1) Not a contested area.
   (2) We have excellent relations with the military in this area.
   (3) We have excellent education facilities including a university.
   (4) Excellent rail facilities.
   (5) We have a large labor force in this area.
   (6) Most of our people understand that we need a good defense system to keep the peace.
   (7) We also recognize Rail Garrison would be an economic benefit to the area.

James O. McCall Grand Forks, ND 58201

Name: Street Address: City State: Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter W. AFRIC/BMS/DEV
Horton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

2-160
Sedalia Area Chamber of Commerce
113 East Fourth Street • Sedalia, Missouri 65301 • 816-689-2262

Director Environmental Planning
March 10, 1990

Dear Airman,

On behalf of the business community of the Sedalia area as represented by the Sedalia Area Chamber of Commerce, I am pleased to voice our full support for the deployment of the 931st Fighter Wing at Whiteman Air Force Base.

The Sedalia area has enjoyed a long and impressive relationship with MATS since its opening as a Sedalia Air Base. Realized for a Sedalia Air Base, which dates back to the Sedalia Regional Airport, was established as an early project of the Sedalia Area Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber has always been active in this area, and we believe that the current project is in the best interest of the community and our national defense.

The deployment of Air Force personnel will also provide an economic boost to the Sedalia area. We see the value of our commercial, industrial, and agricultural activities as critical to the success of this project. The Chamber has been an active participant in the development of the Sedalia Area Chamber of Commerce, and we believe that this project will provide a strong foundation for future growth.

We believe that the creation of new businesses in the area and the expansion of existing businesses will be positive for the Sedalia area. We are committed to working with the Air Force to ensure that our community is able to take advantage of these opportunities.

We look forward to working with the Air Force to ensure a smooth transition of the 931st Fighter Wing to Whiteman Air Force Base.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Title]
The Defense Realignment and marketing office will be responsible for providing the proper handling of waste and arranging for transport to treatment and storage facilities, according to the draft statement. The purpose of the DDO is to plan to construct a new conference storage facility on the near future, in a way closely with local emergency response teams to identify the types of materials and their locations in and around the base. They encourage the DDO to complete the draft correctly in place, that includes protection to the sites of the processes to permit the location of new or any such facility. 

The comments from the facility area to your draft environmental impact statement are not general in nature but we want them to be very specific as we view our support for the continued growth of MAE through this deployment project. The Gallos area holds the required resources, in the area of the opportunities, work availability, schools, health-care facilities, social organizations, churches, housing development areas, public utilities, post-secondary educational systems (PSE) and our forward-thinking local leadership inaccept with open arms the deployment of the Peacekeeper program. The Gallos community area has negative effects at this location which would concern us at this point. We wish to offer and extend our complete cooperation with the program and hope that you will look to the many resources available in the Gallos area as you continue planning for this important step in the distribution of our strategic systems.

Unable amounts

On behalf of the Gallos Area Chamber of Commerce

Sally Palmy 715 S. 30th, Laramie, WYO 82070

Please send this form in mail too, U.S. Air Force Peacekeeper Rag. Garrison Program

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to acknowledge for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper missile program proceeds, and to offer you an opportunity to bring to the decision makers any and all concerns you may have. The DOD plans to provide an environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Pleased read and accept the enclosed letter as my citizens reply.

Sally Palmy 715 S. 30th, Laramie, Wyo 82070

Please send this form in mail too.

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAG. GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to acknowledge for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper missile program proceeds, and to offer you an opportunity to bring to the decision makers any and all concerns you may have. The DOD plans to provide an environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Pleased read and accept the enclosed letter as my citizens reply.

Sally Palmy 715 S. 30th, Laramie, Wyo 82070

Please send this form in mail too.
25 August 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFRES-SSM/DFR
Norton AFB, CA 92351-4448

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

Having reviewed the Air Force's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the MX Ball-Garrson Site plan, SANE/FREEZE finds that it fails to address a number of key issues:

1. Will the 50 MX missiles based in the rail-garrison mode be new missiles or existing ones? The DEIS states that the "Proposed Action" is to deploy 50 missiles on 25 trains, but fails to explain whether these would be the same 50 missiles currently deployed in silos across the West or whether 50 additional missiles would be built. If new missiles would be built, the cost of building them should be included in the DEIS. Neither the "Proposed Action" nor the "Alternative Action" assuming replacement costs figures.

2. As the MX trains travel along public railroad lines, they will make every city they pass through a nuclear target. As Captain Joy of the Air Force's Ballistic Missile Office stated in March, "Figuring would be to use more weapons to try to destroy MX trains." The DEIS does not address the environmental impact of nuclear warheads dropped on cities along the MX train route.

3. The DEIS' estimates of jobs to be generated by the MX program are highly suspect. For instance, only all the FYSs and nearly all the FYS2 funding would be for research and development, and nearly all the FYS2 spending would be for operational functions very different in kind from research functions performed by different types of workers. Yet the DEIS' ratio of jobs generated per billion dollars spent is about the same figure, indicating that 30 jobs per billion dollars funding was used in the DEIS. The alternative methodology should have been used to generate the job estimates in the DEIS.

4. The DEIS does not adequately analyze the "No Action" alternative. For instance, the DEIS does not analyze how many jobs would be generated by spending the $10-15 billion it projects as the rail-garrison's cost on other sectors of the economy, such as housing or education.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Reedy
SANE/FREEZE

---

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
25 August 1988
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1. The DEIS fails to analyze the economic impact on local communities of the new 'no-build' fan cycle created by the MX-a cycle that will not reduce the number of MX missiles, as the DEIS claims. The DEIS estimates that jobs created by the MX program would fluctuate from nearly 40,000 in FY85 to nearly 140,000 in FY86 and then decline to 12,000 in FY90 and just under 12,000 in FY91 and beyond (optionally). Does the Air Force have any plans to address the unemployment and resulting taxes the MX program can be expected to leave in its wake?

SANE/FREEZE believes these questions must be addressed by the Air Force in order for the final Environmental Impact Statement to have any validity. Please respond to and include this letter in the final Environmental Impact Statement, and please forward to us a copy of the DEIS when it is complete.

Yours for peace,

Dana Blank
SANE/FREEZE

Acting Executive Director

DEIS

---

August 31, 1988

To: DEIS Committee

From: Moel Hardin

RE: MX Rail-Garrson Draft Statement

I am a ninth grade student, the Lutheran campus pastor at State University, and a first year student and a Volunteer for the MX program. In the summer of 1988, I participated in an intentional "work project" of converting an abandoned factory into a community center. It was the same time that the Navy was commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Navy Yard. One of the Volunteer supervisors was a black district officer. I asked him why he sent his black friend to the project and his response was something like this: "I need to do this for myself. Living in the Navy yard, I feel myself taking it for granted, accepting it as normal. Then I meet people like you, who are shocked by it, who find it offensive and immoral. I need to do this, to be reminded frequently that the Navy is about---and unacceptable."

I thank you for the work you have put into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It is thorough and you are straight forward in addressing the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and the reasonable alternatives, including the No Action Alternative. A discussion of morality, national security policy, and psychological factors to beyond the scope of this EI.

There is no doubt in my mind, however, that our environment includes those things that affect us morally and psychologically, whether or not we are consciously aware of them. I realize one that the insight of our Mixer friend applied to me, I no longer want to be surrounded by silent missiles. Even if we could get rid of them, the thought of and potential of these nuclear weapons, if we do not get rid of them, we know that they and their presence are a daily threat. And we are real.

There are sections of the DEIS that trouble me. To mention several:

1. Section 9.2.5.3, Native American Resources, "Although the study area is within the traditional territory of the Blackfeet, specific mention of the Blackfeet is not made. Therefore, some may be affected by the Proposed Action. However, the study area may be used by the Blackfeet in the area, to make their... Therefore no one is the section affected by the Proposed Action. This section is not specific, nor it is clear whether the pollution..."

2. There is a section about a potential second rail connector, being built in the U.S. In discussing this possibility, Section 9.2.5.3 states: "Some of these areas (Little Big Horn Creek, Log Creek, and an unnamed creek) require bridges to be state-designated areas, indicating that they are not particularly sensitive streams." I really doubt that conclusion.

The statement continues: "The Right of Way (in Montana) would use about 10 acres of land and could probably be avoided with adequate acquisition of federal rights. There could, however, be a conflict with existing structures or roads at Landmark where a wetland would be constructed in the land.

"I am interested in knowing if the if the people living near the proposed pwarter are aware of this possibility."

3. In dealing with natural soil hazards in Section 5.2.3, the report mentions lightning, landslides, landslides, and flooding. "Flooding is of concern. The surficial geology and the nearby streams feed into the local drainage areas near Lake, Montana, the engineer reported that the recent storm caused soil erosion and the subsequent runoff.

4. In summarizing the program's impact on Montana, the draft states in page 5.4.4: "The Proposed and Alternative actions at Morton Air Force Base would not result in significant impacts on any resources." I don't think one has to be a rocket scientist to understand this statement.

I want to conclude by affirming the presence and the people of Montana Air Force Base. I want to see the economy of Montana and neighboring areas benefit from this program. It is possible to create MX jobs in Montana, which will help the people of Montana. The program will be too largely impacted by the residual of the local community, which I am proud to be a member of the governor's Task Force, working toward that goal. I also want to stress that this program will not only provide for the needs and the people of the local community, but for the economy as well...
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Robert Henderson

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT 394</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **For Immediate Release**  
For further information contact Madeleine Kinscher at 232-7940 or 379-8775  
Statement by Madeleine Kinscher to be released on 8-1-88 at the Jacksonville MO hearings on the DEIR. |
| **Arkansas Social Workers for Peace and Justice are against the Rail-Garrison Proposal.** We believe that the draft environmental impact statement did not properly address the alternative of building no MX missiles and instead used that money for social programs. Social workers are concerned with the victims of the violence of poverty which manifests itself in inadequate education and health care. Social workers feel that the money for the MX system could much better be used to alleviate the above problems. Especially in a state like Arkansas where problems such as homes, illiteracy and homelessness are acute, social workers are against using ultimately billions of dollars on a weapon system. Social workers in Arkansas deal with the above social problems on a daily basis, and they feel that people who are presently in desperate financial need. Therefore, the Arkansas Social Workers for Peace and Justice strongly oppose the proposed missile system. |
| **1. The Rail-Garrison System would be Vulnerable.**  
When based in question, the MX trains would be more vulnerable to Soviet strategic warheads than they are in their current fixed-silo deployment. When dispersed from their garrisons, the MX trains would be more vulnerable, especially during the early part of a crisis, due to their relatively light construction, all missile and guidance vehicles are 4-6 miles of track would be destroyed by a single 500 kiloton warhead. This vulnerability looms large when the trains have moved over a larger part of the rail network, some 4-4 hours after dispersal. |
| **2. The Rail-Garrison would be Strategically Destabilizing.**  
The MX, like any multi-warhead system, increases incentives to attack early in a crisis, since its ten warheads, not located, can be destroyed by only two Soviet warheads. Deploying the MX in a vulnerable basing mode also increases American incentives to strike early, since delay will only decrease the attacking force's chance of success.  
The rail-garrison plan increases both of these incentives, since the trains will carry 10 warheads and will be especially vulnerable to attack during the first four to six hours of a crisis. The best way to deal with this vulnerability, moving the trains out of garrison, could be perceived as provocative, creating or accelerating an international crisis. |
| **3. The Rail-Garrison would act as a Magnet Attracting Soviet Attack.**  
The deployment sites, as well as the surrounding areas in which the missile trains would operate, will be targets for "harass" attacks as the Soviets saturate the areas with nuclear explosions. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT 395</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **For Immediate Release**  
For further information contact Walter Krueger, Ph. D. at 866-8767 or Union of Concerned Scientists at 202-332-8880  
Statement by Dr. Walter Krueger to be released on 8-1-88 at the Jacksonville MO hearings on the DEIR.  
I am a member of the Union of Concerned Scientists. I have looked over the draft environmental impact statement (DEIR) on the proposed MX missile-garrison system. Most of the concerns of the Union of Concerned Scientists have been addressed by the DEIR. Some of the problems that the Union of Concerned Scientists believe need to be addressed include:  
1. Rail-Garrison System would be Vulnerable.  
When based in question, the MX trains would be more vulnerable to Soviet strategic warheads than they are in their current fixed-silo deployment. When dispersed from their garrisons, the MX trains would be more vulnerable, especially during the early part of a crisis, due to their relatively light construction, all missile and guidance vehicles are 4-6 miles of track would be destroyed by a single 500 kiloton warhead. This vulnerability looms large when the trains have moved over a larger part of the rail network, some 4-4 hours after dispersal. |
| **2. Rail-Garrison would be Strategically Destabilizing.**  
The MX, like any multi-warhead system, increases incentives to attack early in a crisis, since its ten warheads, not located, can be destroyed by only two Soviet warheads. Deploying the MX in a vulnerable basing mode also increases American incentives to strike early, since delay will only decrease the attacking force's chance of success.  
The rail-garrison plan increases both of these incentives, since the trains will carry 10 warheads and will be especially vulnerable to attack during the first four to six hours of a crisis. The best way to deal with this vulnerability, moving the trains out of garrison, could be perceived as provocative, creating or accelerating an international crisis. |
| **3. Rail-Garrison would act as a Magnet Attracting Soviet Attack.**  
The deployment sites, as well as the surrounding areas in which the missile trains would operate, will be targets for "harass" attacks as the Soviets saturate the areas with nuclear explosions. |

---
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TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

WHEREAS We, the Jacksonville Commerce Corporation dedicated to the industrial growth and economic well being of our community and recognize both the national military importance and the local economic impact and

WHEREAS As taxpayers we recognize that the rail garrisoned Peacekeeper system provides the best return on our military deterrent tax dollars

NOW THEREFORE Be it resolved that the Jacksonville Commerce Corporation of the City of Jacksonville supports and endorses the selection of Little Rock Air Force Base for the deployment of the rail garrisoned Peacekeeper Missile, and strongly urges the officials of Strategic Air Command to view Little Rock Air Force Base as a favorable prospect for the system.

JACKSONVILLE COMMERCE CORPORATION

Jerry Halsell
DIRECTOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

My name is Gene Farrell I am 39, a student and a nurse at St V. I wanted to make a brief statement in opposition to further buildup of MX missiles in general and in particular to having them based here in Arkansas. I believe the production and deployment of the MX system is a step backward in recent advances toward nuclear disarmament which came about when President & Sec. Gorbachev signed the...
I NF treaty. There is abundant and undeniable scientific documentation which attests to the fact that the INF is basically an obsolete weapons system. Particularly, the only purpose is to pad the pockets of military contractors (which are now under semi-serious investigation regarding procurement practices) or to make the chosen basing site a more vulnerable target in the event of a nuclear weapons exchange. I have reviewed the lengthy Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared with obvious conflict of interest by the U.S. Air Force and I remain convinced intellectually and ethically that this so-called peace keeper will actually be worse based on records on our shake trunks, where to promote peace, being in fact an offensive weapon, in the militaries scenario. I feel the strong desire by the government and local officials to base this system here in Sox.

is a politically motivated to try to bring an economic boost to this area which is suffering from serious environmental hazards from former ill-advised military investments. Money and profits making should not be the priority here, and basing the INF in Jacksonville does not promote a safe, healthy, nor peaceful community for the residents. I’m about to become a father at Christmas, God willing, and...
It is a good chance that these objectors might succeed in preventing a unit of this rail mounted system from being deployed at Little Rock Air Force Base. That would be very unfortunate.

To put it bluntly, if our nation is determined to spend all that money anyway then let some of that money be spent in our area where our people will get some of the benefits. We need to remember that in addition to these elements of the environment which in most cases attract the attention of the environmentalists, there is another element of the environment which has a tremendous impact upon the quality of life. This other element is the economy. Having a prosperous and stable economy throughout the area as a whole, and one which would enable more of our people to live somewhere above the levels of poverty and drudgery, is a valid and worthwhile objective.

It appears that our government, in spite of anything that the objectors can do, is going to go ahead and deploy this rail mounted system. If so, let's try to get a unit of this system garrisoned at Little Rock Air Force Base.
The Paloski County chapter of ACORN would like to express its concern with the building of Peace Center in opposition to the building of the MX Missile in this county. We feel that placing this costly and dangerous weapon in our community will endanger our citizens by making us a target of Soviet missiles. This weapon will be especially dangerous to low and moderate income residents, since a great many of our neighborhoods are located near commercial railroad tracks which might be used for transporting the MX. Let's not forget that Donnie Addition was evacuated twice because of Nature's real danger and irresponsible. What are the chances of an incident occurring involving the MX Missile?

Finally, the money spent in developing the MX missile could be better used for necessities, such as decent streets and drainage, education, and health care. We are not convinced that the MX is basically necessary for our country's defense. Let it be on record that the Paloski County chapter of ACORN opposes the basing of the MX in this county.

1) Rail Safety: The increased chances of accidents due to the immense size & weight of the cars isn't addressed in the DEIS. Standard rail cars are 52 feet long, & the maximum load is 9,000 lbs. The MX missile is 71 feet long, and weighs about 200,000 pounds. The MX missile alone is 7.8 "wide. Will the MX missile need to be wider to accommodate the launch assembly & other needed equipment? If the cars are 12 feet wide, the tracks will need to be cleared before the trains can enter the system. The DEIS doesn't address this possibility, and its effects.

2) Economic Impact: The DEIS examines accidents in isolation, while there are likely to be secondary effects, and costs. For example, if there were an explosion, and consequent release of radioactive material, even if the exposure levels released were not harmful to humans, there would be an economic impact. The public might seek to see agricultural products from the area as unsafe, and might thereby buy less of them. The cost of a $1 drop in agricultural sales from Johnson County would run in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is possible that the public might respond by decreasing their purchases of all Missouri agricultural products, resulting in millions of dollars of losses. An example of this phenomenon is the losses in sales by German farmers after the Chernobyl accident, whether or not there was any contamination of their products.

3) Another area that should be addressed is the effect on local values of an accident. Land values over the Rocky Pass nuclear plant dropped after an accident at the plant. What would be the economic impact on land owners, and on city & county tax revenues, and how would this affect the school system?

4) The "Public Relations" problem: I am not an advocate of civil disobedience, but anyone who attended the evening hearing April 7th will remember the student who stated that he would be down on the tracks if this system were placed in Whitman. The Federal government doesn't pay for, or help enforce the laws that are broken by protesters. Knox County, Washington paid an average of $1,000 per accident to clear the roads of people protesting the shipment of nuclear waste. This county spent $100,000 prosecuting protesters in one year, and obtained no conviction, nor any money from the Federal Government.

5) The economic impact of shutting down the program after it has been built is not discussed. This is a real possibility to do negotiations at the STRAT talks.

6) Security Issues: How many people will be employed to maintain security? Will trains secure personnel have the right to detain & search anyone approaching the tracks, as they do on Air Force installations? Will the security personnel stop and search campers on the tracks? Runners carrying rifles? Fishermen carrying rods, especially in areas where the security personnel are keeping local people under observation?

7) The DEIS doesn't cover the secondary effects of the accidents scenarios. The analysis is of the effects of the fuel from one missile, yet there will be two missiles on each train, and it is highly unlikely that a situation could develop where one missile would be damaged enough to catch on fire without the second missile being likewise affected. Also, any accident, fire, or explosion in garrison would affect four to eight missiles, with greater destruction resulting.

8) The DEIS doesn't adequately discuss the risks or consequences of sabotage, give that MX trains will be particularly susceptible for the following reasons:

9) MX trains will be easily identifiable as such, due to the immense size compared to normal railroad cars. It would also be easy for terrorists to track the trains from the time they left the garrison.

10) 100,000 miles of track cannot be protected from people who will plant bombs on the tracks (the DEIS doesn't discuss secondary consequences of this possibility either - the resulting explosion could impose greater forces on the missile than would an accident). Since plans include serving the trains only four hours every day, terrorists could easily plan and carry out an attack.

11) The Air Force doesn't examine the secondary effects of a rail accident involving another vehicle carrying hazardous or explosive materials.

12) The economic impact of shutting down the program after it has been built is not discussed. This is a real possibility to do negotiations at the STRAT talks.

13) The No Action alternative is not discussed as it should be according to the National Environmental Policy Act, which calls for the creation of a "reasonable alternative of no action." In the 764 pages of the DEIS, only 61 lines of text mention the no action alternative.
44. Is this system necessary given that missiles are more vulnerable than in its use for the first four to six hours?
45. Is this system necessary given that START negotiations would ban land-based ICBMs?
46. Is this system necessary given that targets are moving during times of "high international tension"? Could be seen as provocative?
47. Is this system necessary? Why?
48. Are civil defense plans along the coast adequate, or will they be adjusted to reflect the increased likelihood of nuclear attack?
49. What is the potential for the loss of retaliatory capability due to the ease of access for sabotage making this system justifiable?

Why do we need the MX in Maine? What problem, or conceived lack in our security, is this system designed to correct? Why is it being method better than the other methods that have been considered and rejected, such as the "Red Train"?

50. Why is Missle one of the proposed basing sites? What is it about

Whiteman AFB that makes it a good location?

51. How can a Skunk plane weapon like the MX nuclear build our deterrent capability?

52. What procedures were used to notify the public of these hearings? How far in advance did the Air Force know the time and date of the hearing? The date of the hearing was finally released on July 11. Can 24 days notice be considered within the spirit of the NSP?

53. Can the Air Force say that the public has had an adequate amount of time to respond to the DEIS? How many person-hours did the Air Force spend preparing the DEIS? Given that there are twelve volumes of supplementary documents, which must be ordered by name separately from the DEIS, has the public had adequate time and information to reasonably analyze the Air Force's methodology?

54. Is the process set up to hear the concerns of the public when ordinary citizens speak after the Air Force and after elected officials? How can all of the concerns and all of the criticism be heard with a three minute time limit in only one hearing of three hours? How many people at the hearings in other parts of the country didn't get a chance to speak? Why was time lost through late starting, sound system problems, etc. taken off of the public comments period? Is this the least important part of the
goal? Why?

July 26, 1988

To Whom It May Concern,

Since the April 5, 1988 Skidawne hearing the Oscoda-AuSable Chamber of Commerce has conducted an informal study on available housing for personnel involved in the set-up and the operation of the project.

The survey of local contractors assured our office that there would be adequate housing to meet the need. Their projections constitute both rental, residence and warming facilities. The 1 to 10 year projection is for 600 to 500 units. Sources also stated that 85% of the labor force utilized in the implementation of the Skidawne project would be local and already have lodging. Thus the need for additional housing would be partially negated.

The Oscoda-AuSable Chamber of Commerce would like to assure this assemblage that they will do their utmost to assist anyone involved with the project by providing either lodging or real estate information.

Terry Ricker, President
Oscoda-AuSable Chamber of Commerce

DECLARATION OF SUPPORT

For years the communities of Oscoda and AuSable have had the pleasure of being home to one of the many United States Armed Forces installations. Known as Camp Bannerman in the 1940's and 1950's it grew to be known as the "Bucktail" and was known Oscoda Army Air Field. In July, 1953 it officially became Wurtsmith Air Force Base.

Over the years the community and the base have enjoyed a co-existence that is so rare that hard to distinguish. No one can recall a time when we were not in agreement with their needs or their purpose.

The Oscoda-AuSable Chamber of Commerce is proud of all members of the armed forces but especially proud of those who have called Oscoda-AuSable their home over the years.

National Defense is an important issue to everyone but it is particularly important to us who have lived closely with so many of its personnel. Our Military Affairs Committee and The Air Force Association work intimately with Wurtsmith Air Force Base to keep this unity strong.

The Chamber and the majority of it's members recognize the economic impact Wurtsmith has on the area and wholeheartedly supports any and all missions which will help secure the freedom of our great nation.

The Oscoda-AuSable Chamber of Commerce and it's Directors, acting as representatives for the majority of businesses in the business community, stand firmly behind the possible housing of the Skidawne Skidawne at Wurtsmith Air Force Base.

Many film people have come and gone through our community as part of our nation's defense team and we thank you for letting us serve you but above all God Bless USA for serving US.

Terry Ricker, President
Oscoda-AuSable Chamber of Commerce
SISTERS OF CHARITY OF LEAVENWORTH
SOCIAL JUSTICE NETWORK
August 3, 1969

My name is Frances Russell. I am a native of Missouri and a Sister of Charity of Leavenworth, Kansas. My community was founded at Leavenworth, Kansas, and we now serve in Missionary Service in the United States. I am writing this letter in response to the request of the President of Leavenworth, Kansas, concerning the status of the United States as a nation of peace and justice. I am writing this letter in order to express my views and concerns regarding the current political situation in the United States and to urge the authorities to take action to promote peace and justice. I am a member of the United States Peace Corps and have been serving in the United States Peace Corps since 1967. In my capacity as a Peace Corps volunteer, I have had the opportunity to witness and experience the effects of the current political situation in the United States. I have seen firsthand the impact of the current political situation on the lives of ordinary citizens, particularly those who are members of marginalized communities. I am deeply concerned about the current political situation in the United States and I urge the authorities to take action to promote peace and justice. I am committed to working towards a better world, and I believe that the United States has the potential to become a model for peace and justice. I urge the authorities to take action to promote peace and justice, and I hope that my letter will contribute to this end. Sincerely,
Frances Russell
Sister of Charity of Leavenworth, Kansas
The writer as an Agricultural Economist graduates with minor in crops, dairy industry, soil, animal husbandry, conservation, animal nutrition and human nutrition. At your American Legion member, former City Alderman to hereby hearty accept and agree with and endorse the Environmental Impact Statement after a thorough study of same. Based on several decades of experience, it is proven conclusively that there has been no friction or problem between the present Air Force Base including the Miracle Fields, and the City of Miami and it's entire territory. Misunderstandings are terribly unimportant, especially concerning setting for actual use where a single house may have contact of a memory wall or a foundation wall. The situation has proved to be ideal and there is little doubt that such would continue were the Phoebe Home Rail Corridor to be located in the Miracle Fields. In the field of utilities there is competition between the utilities and sufficient expansion to the improvements to serve. The Phoebe Home Rail Corridor Project should be well and gladly taken care of at the most reasonable rates with swift, efficient, complete low cost service. Transportation facilities are extensive, swift, and economical, which in the opinion of the writer would serve the Phoebe Home Rail Corridor Project very well. Rail safety records here are tops in the Nation. We have adequate, even surplus housing, at low rental rates. As for the land use, it should be meaningless to have the lowest land costs to accomplish either a land quality of our place in the United States. The land buildings are large, accounting for the very sparsely populated area. It would seem that the Phoebe Home Rail Corridor Project would only serve from heavily populated areas where the farms are smaller and there are only a few houses and where the market value of the land is extremely high by comparison. The natural resources, Miami to simply surrounding, it's small University has done much to accomplish this. The size of the University is explained because it does not further advance small, and political aspects are often react the military stage. There is virtually none of this element in the Miami area. Never comprehensively in the Miami area are more than adequate. The mathematical probability that there could be any water pollution from this Project seems not beyond the imagination, since it is virtually zero.
Document:

LOCATION: MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, FL

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Dear Mr. M. Segun:

Your request for a hearing for blocking this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to determine the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to ensure that the final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for attending this hearing.

We would appreciate your comments on this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Additional comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

[Handwritten notes]

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

[Handwritten notes]
The Union of Concerned Scientists has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the MX Rail-Garrison basing plan prepared by the United States Air Force. Our comments follow:

We request that these comments be considered in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and that a copy of the FEIS be sent to our Washington, DC office at the address listed above.

We believe that the DEIS is deficient in a number of areas. Specifically, we believe that the Air Force has failed to address the following important questions:

1. WHAT IS THE EXACT LIKELIHOOD OF A SOLID-FUEL EXPLOSION?

There appears to be some confusion in the sections describing the likelihood and consequences of mishaps involving the missile's solid- and liquid-fuel propellants (sections 5.4.1 and 5.4.2, respectively). In particular, the pathway and likelihood of the two liquid-fuel components igniting and the resulting ignition or detonation of the solid-fuel elements are not fully explored. While examining

the environmental and health concerns of the solid-fuel propellants, the DEIS describes the chance of a fire igniting and detonating the solid-fuel missile stages as an "extremely unlikely event" (page 5-18). Later descriptions of liquid-fuel mishaps, however, throw this sanguine assessment into doubt. In discussing accidents involving liquid-fuels, the DEIS explains that detonation of one liquid-fuel component--monomethylhydrazine (MMH)--"could" occur given a requisite concentration of MMH as low as 2.5 percent to 6.7 percent and the presence of an ignition source (page 5-33). The liquid-fuel stage in fact carries its own ignition source for MMH in the form of nitrogen tetroxide, the second element of the liquid-fuel propellant.

According to the DEIS, these two chemicals "ignite spontaneously on contact with each other" (page 5-35). The overall safety consequences of mixing MMH and nitrogen tetroxide, with their subsequent ignition, can be tentatively placed together from the report. In the case of a liquid-fuel fire, the DEIS admits that the heat could "involve the adjacent solid propellant and cause them to ignite or explode. . . ." (page 5-35; emphasis added). More serious still, if nitrogen tetroxide and the requisite concentration of MMH were present, the resulting detonation of MMH "would immediately involve the solid propellant in the missile" (page 5-33). The DEIS has not provided the information necessary to assess the likelihood of these liquid-fuel accident scenarios beyond the fuzzy verb "could"--no quantitative analysis of the probabilities of such events is given. Furthermore, the report does not assess adequately either the impact of a liquid-fuel fire or the consequences of an explosion of the solid-fuel propellant. In war, under the scenario sketched in the paragraphs above, it is not at all clear that the Air Force has done the necessary work to conclude that detonation of the solid-fuel components would be an "extremely unlikely event."

2. FOR EACH ISSUE, WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACT ON NON-GARRISON SITES THROUGH WHICH MX TRAINS WOULD TRAVEL UPON DISPERSAL?

The courts have found that the Air Force is not required to assess the environmental impacts that would result from non-peacetime or intentional use of the silo-based MX. However, unlike the silo-based MX, which has only two operational modes (peacetime, during which the missiles remain in its silo, and wartime, during which the missiles are launched intentionally), the MX Rail-Garrison presents the Air Force with three operational modes: garrison, out of garrison, and launched. Only the third mode can be characterized as a wartime use, and thus exempt under the court's ruling, from review in the DEIS process. The United States will remain at peace during both the in-garrison period and when the MX trains are dispersed.

This clearly shown by the Air Force's commonly used example of the type of crisis which would provoke dispersal: the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. Although American armed forces were placed on alert during that crisis, hostilities never occurred. The United States never went to war, and dispersed forces returned to base unused. It is clear that during such a dispersal MX trains carrying nuclear-armed and fully-fueled missiles could have a significant impact upon the cities and rural areas through which they would travel. The risk of substantial property damage and severe personal injury or death are much greater during this dispersed period than during normal in-garrison operations. The Air Force should fully assess the impact of all such peacetime operations, as required by law.

3. WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF AN MX TRAIN COLLIDED WITH A VEHICLE CARRYING COMBUSTIBLE SUBSTANCES?

When assessing the possible hazards to the MX Rail-Garrison system (section 5.2), the DEIS ignores the nature of the

Cambridge Office: 21 Church Street Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 617-395-1033
other rail or road vehicles involved in a collision with the MX train. The only variables used to determine the forces that might lead to missile damage during a mishap were "collision speed" and "length of fire" (pages 5-10 and 5-11). There is no discussion, for instance, of the effects on the missile's integrity resulting from a collision with a road or rail vehicle containing flammable or explosive substances.

4. WHAT SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT EFFECTS WOULD RESULT FROM TRAIN SABOTAGE?

The environmental and safety concerns over sabotage are not adequately addressed. This threat is most relevant once the trains are released during a "strategic dispersal". While it is unlikely that Soviet sabotage would occur outside the context of a US-Soviet war, third parties, such as terrorist groups, could attempt to destroy the MX-bearing trains for their own purposes. There is no discussion, for example, of the effects on missile integrity of an attack on the trains by stand-off weapons or land mines. Similarly, dispersal of nuclear weapons throughout the country could provide tempting targets for third parties desiring to acquire a nuclear warhead (or 20 of them). We agree with the DES that security personnel onboard the trains probably would be able to prevent the physical takeover of the trains and warheads from any predictable terrorist attack. However, the final EIS should address the implications of such an attempt, as well as the consequences in the unlikely event that such an attack were to be successful.

5. WHAT ECONOMIC IMPACT WOULD RESULT FROM TRAIN ACCIDENTS?

While the environmental and health effects of various types of train mishaps are evaluated in the DEIS, their economic impacts are not examined. Such an assessment should not be limited to the areas surrounding the garrison sites, because the most dangerous accident could occur when the trains are on the rail system. This is especially true during strategic dispersal, since that will be the only time that both missiles and nuclear warheads will be carried (Table 5.3.1-4). Whatever the likelihood of such accidents, local areas throughout the country need to be informed of the environmental and health costs.

6. WHAT WOULD BE THE IMPACT AT VERNON ARM, WORKING OF USING EXISTING SINO-BASED MX MISSILES FOR THE RAIL-GARRISON SYSTEM, AS REQUIRED BY LAW?

The Air Force has estimated the positive economic impact of the Rail-Garrison system at each deployment site. However, it has not evaluated the negative economic impact which would occur at Vernon Arm, NV, if the Pentagon chooses to supply the 50 missiles needed for the Rail-Garrison plan by withdrawing missile current bases in place there. Indeed, under current law, which limits to fifty (50) the total number of MX missiles that can be deployed, the Air Force would have no choice but to use the currently deployed missiles for the Rail-Garrison system. The negative impact assessment should deal with all effects of such a missile withdrawal, but should primarily focus on the socioeconomic area where the greatest impact can be expected: number of jobs lost, projected decline in local population and school attendance; overall decrease in personal income and the local tax base; etc. As an example of potential negative impact, according to Air Force figures, the switch from silo-basing to Rail-Garrison can be expected to cause a loss of 120 permanent jobs, as 150 permanent jobs associated with the silo-based MX force would be replaced by only 42 permanent jobs created by the rail-garrison system.

In short, we believe that significant changes are necessary to ensure that the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) adequately addresses the full impact a deployment decision would have, as required under the National Environmental Policy Act. Each of the issues raised above must be addressed by the Air Force if the FEIS is to have any validity. Failure of the Air Force to produce a complete FEIS would provide the Congress with additional justification to reject the Administration's proposal.

Sincerely,

Robert Llinas

Weapon Analyst
Also be impacted such as Lanes or Scottsbluff. Since the impact of the rail car train accidents is so large, does the Air Force plan to hold more hearings?

4. How many permanent jobs will be added to the area as a result of the installation in Seward County? If any, will they be added as part of the installation project or development?

5. Will the guidance system in the rail car train in the orientation deployment in Minot be deployed in the deployment plan? It is well known in domestic that the rail cars are frequently "loose" because the guidance system is not working. Who will manufacture the guidance systems for the rail car train project? If nothing is hired, will there be a closer scrutiny of the procurement of parts and the procurement of the system?

6. What will the Air Force do about metal fatigue in the rail car train in the orientation deployment in Minot? Is the rail car train currently "locomotive"? How does the rail car train plan to improve the safety of the rail car train for the deployment plan? The Air Force very briefly mentioned at the public hearing that there have been other accidents, but assured us that the dangers are not as significant as the people we have seen at Broken Arrow, so why aren't we given a more accurate picture of the accidents discussed? What about the accidents in Minot in 1982? When the B-52 crashed in Spain during 1982 and the ground was contaminated, did the Air Force have time to bring the contaminated soil back to the USA for disposal? Can the Air Force be so confident about the safety of the N-2 when there are numerous problems with the rail car train in the guidance system and metal fatigue?

7. What will the Air Force do about metal fatigue in the rail car train in the orientation deployment in Minot? Is the rail car train currently "locomotive"? How does the rail car train plan to improve the safety of the rail car train for the deployment plan? The Air Force very briefly mentioned at the public hearing that there have been other accidents, but assured us that the dangers are not as significant as the people we have seen at Broken Arrow, so why aren't we given a more accurate picture of the accidents discussed? What about the accidents in Minot in 1982? When the B-52 crashed in Spain during 1982 and the ground was contaminated, did the Air Force have time to bring the contaminated soil back to the USA for disposal? Can the Air Force be so confident about the safety of the N-2 when there are numerous problems with the rail car train in the guidance system and metal fatigue?

8. What will the Air Force do about metal fatigue in the rail car train in the orientation deployment in Minot? Is the rail car train currently "locomotive"? How does the rail car train plan to improve the safety of the rail car train for the deployment plan? The Air Force very briefly mentioned at the public hearing that there have been other accidents, but assured us that the dangers are not as significant as the people we have seen at Broken Arrow, so why aren't we given a more accurate picture of the accidents discussed? What about the accidents in Minot in 1982? When the B-52 crashed in Spain during 1982 and the ground was contaminated, did the Air Force have time to bring the contaminated soil back to the USA for disposal? Can the Air Force be so confident about the safety of the N-2 when there are numerous problems with the rail car train in the guidance system and metal fatigue?

9. What will the Air Force do about metal fatigue in the rail car train in the orientation deployment in Minot? Is the rail car train currently "locomotive"? How does the rail car train plan to improve the safety of the rail car train for the deployment plan? The Air Force very briefly mentioned at the public hearing that there have been other accidents, but assured us that the dangers are not as significant as the people we have seen at Broken Arrow, so why aren't we given a more accurate picture of the accidents discussed? What about the accidents in Minot in 1982? When the B-52 crashed in Spain during 1982 and the ground was contaminated, did the Air Force have time to bring the contaminated soil back to the USA for disposal? Can the Air Force be so confident about the safety of the N-2 when there are numerous problems with the rail car train in the guidance system and metal fatigue?

10. Air Force very briefly mentioned at the public hearing that there have been other accidents, but assured us that the dangers are not as significant as the people we have seen at Broken Arrow, so why aren't we given a more accurate picture of the accidents discussed? What about the accidents in Minot in 1982? When the B-52 crashed in Spain during 1982 and the ground was contaminated, did the Air Force have time to bring the contaminated soil back to the USA for disposal? Can the Air Force be so confident about the safety of the N-2 when there are numerous problems with the rail car train in the guidance system and metal fatigue?

11. Where will the nuclear waste be disposed of for the rail car train project?

12. There are numerous other questions that should be addressed if the EIS is to accurately depict the impact of the system. I hope the Air Force will make a concerted effort to answer all the questions, not just those that they want to answer. I look forward to reading the final EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Eileen F. Sorensen
Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined any course if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention issues we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to give environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a draft decision on the program is made. Please use this time to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

As Chairman of the Peacekeeper Nuclear Weapons Systems Command, I would like to invite representation of Wyoming Air Force Base to present data on your input and concerns regarding the effects that the draft program may have on your county. It is important to note that this presentation is not to determine that your concerns are valid, but only to seek to understand the impact on your community and determine how the program may affect you.

Our goal is to provide the best possible service and support to our local communities. We believe in open communication and encourage you to provide your input on the draft program. Please use this time to bring to our attention issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We appreciate your participation in this hearing and look forward to a productive discussion.
available. Technology has its failures. The human factor under stress of combat and crisis has also been shown to vary, with the most operating real-world RMI, there will certainly be stress, tension building over a period of time, perhaps even a sort of combat stress. To quote Maj. Harry H. of the Florida-based Central Command which investigated the atomic bomb tests of the French measurement plane, "What you had was combat stress, which is always characterized by confusion..." such a scenario could be duplicated again in the Gulf or anywhere in the world. The massive power of RMI and the decompression of beginning the last war by about 16 months by analogy, I would understand putting individuals in the military and all of civilization in such a massive position where reliance on technology and human judgment can sometimes fail, we have more to lose.

In conclusion, the real-world RMI remains as one of the titles of Major Rader's book "To our own people". An RMI report on our needs. Real-world RMI will be devastatingly important, something we knew when the opportunity to tip the scale against our enemies was out there taking almost life. By the end of the Cold War, the need for RMI was shown in the Gulf, having a community response and support for our service members. This is the scenario when our society has many other needs. Our security will not be enhanced by more weapons but by force and a new approach to internal and external situations.

DOCUMENT 420

My name is Paul D. D. S. I live in space station as a space member of the Voyager Program.

Sincerely yours,
Paul D. D. S.

DOCUMENT 421

August 30, 1985

My name is Paul D. D. S. I live in space station as a space member of the Voyager Program.

Sincerely yours,
Paul D. D. S.
I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Air Force for providing the opportunity to participate in this public hearing. The public hearing is to enlist public involvement in the planning process and to obtain comment and input on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and is an important part of the planning process if the rail garrison is to be deployed in Wyoming. National defense strategy will ultimately be decided by the executive and legislative branches in Washington, D.C. The final environmental impact statement and the public input will help to influence and shape the final decision and its impact on our state.

Wyoming will play a significant role in the proposed rail garrison basing node. It is imperative that this, or any system to be deployed, be evaluated and determined to be safe.
IMPAKTS NEED TO BE ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED AND MITIGATED TO REDUCE, IF NOT ELIMINATE, ADVERSE IMPACTS, REAL OR POTENTIAL. THE STATE OF WYOMING HAS ADOPTED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ADDRESS IMPACTS FROM THE CONSTRUCTION OF MAJOR FACILITIES AND IDENTIFY APPROPRIATE MITIGATION. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES ARE EXEMPT FROM THE CURRENT REVIEW PROCESS UNDER THE INDUSTRIAL SITING ACT. IT IS MY POLICY, HOWEVER, AS IT WAS GOVERNOR HERSHEYER'S, FOR MY OFFICE TO BE ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN THE REVIEW OF ALL SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES THAT CAN AFFECT THE STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES. IMPACTS ARE NO LESS REAL REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE FACILITIES ARE TO BE DEVELOPED BY THE PRIVATE OR THE PUBLIC SECTOR.

IN SEVERAL AREAS, THE DRAFT EIS FAILS TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE DETAIL TO ALLOW A REVIEWER THE OPPORTUNITY TO FULLY AND CRITICALLY EVALUATE AND TEST THE CONCLUSIONS PRESENTED. SOME OF THE DATA PRESENTED IS UNDOCUMENTED WHICH, IN TURN, REFLECTS ON THE RELIABILITY OF THE IMPACTS OUTLINED AND THE CONCLUSIONS REACHED.


2. I AFFIRM MY SUPPORT FOR THE GENERAL CONCERNS IDENTIFIED AND TO BE RAISED BY THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE IMPACT COUNCIL AT THIS PUBLIC HEARING. I INSIST THAT THE AIR FORCE WORK DIRECTLY WITH THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES TO ADDRESS THEIR CONCERNS AND DEVELOP APPROPRIATE AND NECESSARY MITIGATION MEASURES TO MITIGATE THE NEGATIVE PROJECT IMPACTS.

3. I WILL LOOK TO THE AIR FORCE TO REVISE THE DATA, PROJECTED IMPACTS AND CONCLUSIONS TO REFLECT INPUT RECEIVED THROUGH THIS REVIEW PROCESS. THIS IS THE BEST AND ONLY MEANS OF DEVELOPING THE ACCURATE DATA TO PREPARE THE FINAL EIS.

4. ONE EXAMPLE WOULD BE THE USE IN THE DRAFT EIS OF 1985 DATA FROM THE WYOMING HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT TO EVALUATE TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS OR THE CONCLUSION THAT RESERVE FUNDS OF GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES ARE SUFFICIENT TO ABSORB THE INCREASED STRESS ON SYSTEMS. SEVERAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED SINCE 1985 WHICH WOULD AFFECT THE TRAFFIC DATA, AND RESERVE FUNDS ARE NOT AVAILABLE IN MOST INSTANCES FOR SUCH PURPOSE (EVEN IF WE COULD AGREE THAT RESERVES ARE SUBJECT TO SUCH A CALL, WHICH WE DO NOT). THE DRAFT EIS IDENTIFIES THAT THERE WILL BE A SIGNIFICANT GEOLOGIC IMPACT RESULTING FROM EROSIONAL LOSS OF TOPSOIL IN SOME AREAS. YET, THE DRAFT EIS ALSO INDICATES THAT AIR AND WATER QUALITY IMPACTS WILL BE INSIGNIFICANT. BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE FACTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE CONCLUSION IS REQUIRED TO BE ABLE TO ADDRESS AND EVALUATE POINTS SUCH AS THESE.

5. I HAVE REQUESTED MY STAFF, AS A PART OF THEIR CONTINUING REVIEW, TO COMPARE A LIST OF QUESTIONS AND INFORMATION NEEDED TO FURTHER EVALUATE THE DRAFT EIS.

THE FINAL EIS WILL BE CAREFULLY REVIEWED TO ENSURE THAT THE AREAS OF CONCERN RECEIVE ADEQUATE ATTENTION AND THAT THE BASIS FOR A COMPETENT DECISION IS PRESENTED. I WILL REVIEW MY FINAL REVIEW AND COMMENTS REGARDING THIS PROPOSAL UNTIL THE COMPLETION OF THE REVIEW PROCESS. ONLY UNTIL THE REVIEW OF THE FINAL EIS WILL IT BE POSSIBLE TO MAKE AN OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT AND DECISION CONCERNING THE PROPOSAL. I WOULD HIGHLIGHT, HOWEVER, THE IMPORTANCE OF SAFETY AND ON-GOING INTERGOVERNMENTAL PLANNING PROCESS AND EMOTION TO WYOMING CONTRACTORS AND WORKERS.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PLANNING PROCESS FOR THIS PROPOSAL.

###

2-181
Deterrence - do in 196 H-bombs all in one place above ground. You trust the Russians for more than that. This is just obviously stupidly tactical and strategically. You make surprise attack more likely, not less. Of course, given enough warning all our planes and submarines can be dispersed. But why would they so be so stupid as to work for us? I'm concerned about national security, this garrison idea flies in the face of security. The approval of this harem and elsewhere is in hopes of profit for a few cities and a few companies. I ask you to put your country before your personal bank account. That is not much. Many thousands have given their lives for their country. I ask for only to sacrifice a little profit.

4. Economy

Scientists & engineers & balance of payments.

 fewer jobs created by weapons systems than any other way to spend it.


Lieutenant Colonel James J. Bartell
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considered remedies to reduce these blockages, especially for emergency vehicles. Such remedies include grade separation or procedures to give precedence to emergency highway traffic.

Geographical & Social

1. Beyond the scope of the Draft EIS, we need to consider the issues of the benefits of wide-spread dissemination of missile capabilities. This is important from the point of view of the survivability of S-3 Balistic missile force and also from the point of view of future sensitivity by political and military leaders who will have to consider the vulnerability of the nation, not just sparsely populated regions in which the forces are based.

2. Another question involves the possible threat to public safety when the training routine come in contact with elements from previous groups. What is United States Air Force policy regarding procedures interfering with the training routine during the performance of their duties? What is the sharing of responsibility here between local, state and federal law enforcement agencies?

The above comments represent some of the major concerns raised by the Draft EIS in North Dakota. These comments, however, do not preclude the submission of comments from the individual agencies on specific points.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS. Your attention to local issues and concerns is appreciated.

Sincerely,
George H. Ember
Director
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2-183
To: Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRCE - BMS/DEV
Norton AFB, CA 92409-6448

From: BETH HOWARD
916 Laredo Ct.
Cheyenne, WY 82009

The attached are my comments and concerns in regard to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It is my sincere hope that these things will be addressed in the EIS.

Beth Howard

Seems to me that our times of "national need" are not a secret to any other nation, which makes the system a target. Half of the time, it is housed in the garrison. Given the hypothetical dispersal cited, it seems these trains would not be hard to keep track of even while dispersed.

What is the margin of greater survivability, if any, that this basing mode has?

Beth Howard

Page 1

1. How much more survivable is this rail Garrison concept than the current basing mode?
   - On page 5-1 of the Draft Environmental Impact statement under "Purpose & Need" it states that "Congress limited the deployment of Peacekeeper missiles in Minuteman silos to 56 and asked the President to propose a more survivable basing mode for the other 50 Peacekeeper missiles."
   - There should be proof (which I don't find in this statement) that this system is more survivable. Given the hypothetical dispersal used on page 5-8 where "In times of national need...That hypothetical dispersal consisted of 25 trains (50 missiles) running nonstop for the first 12 hours of dispersal, then moving approximately 4 hours of every 24 hours for a period of 4 weeks..."

Beth Howard

Page 2

2. Why has the high-density population, adjacent to the base and within the city limits, been minimized in this report?
   - An old map (more than 5 years old) has been used in Figure 5-5, 5-14 and Figure 4-2-3. It is the same old map in each case.
   - This map leaves off the entire northern HALF of the subdivision, which is a half mile, with at least 20 streets, of high density single family housing and multiple family townhouses. This entire subdivision is within the city limits.
   - This map also leaves off all the development East of I-20, all high density, including single-family homes, townhomes and apartment complexes on at least 25 streets not shown and all within the city limits.
   - The inset used on this map and on those of the South Site Option...
that shows the city in relationship to the base, is completely inaccurate and doesn't designate Western Hills or any of the high-density northern development that is all within city limits and most immediately adjacent to the Air Force Base.

- Figure 4.2.4-1 is the Land Use Map/Graph at F.E. Warren and vicinity and though it correctly depicts the land use, the language describing Figure 4.2.4-1 on page 4.2-34 once again minimizes the population adjacent to the base. The language currently states, "The residential land uses consist of single-family subdivisions within the City of Cheyenne on the eastern side of the base. The area near the base north of Cheyenne city limits contains low-density, single-family subdivisions." To be fair to these within the city and adjacent to the base, shouldn't the wording indicate that?

---

3 Why is there no Department of Defense proposed "Explosive Safety Zone" at the Cheyenne Municipal Airport?

- The same hazardous materials that require the "Explosive Safety Zone" on the Air Force Base will be handled at the airport which seems would make such a zone mandatory. The Draft EIS states on page 5-1 that "The probability of a mishap during air transport of the re-entry systems is extremely small." It does not say that it won't happen ever, and having this information it seems irresponsible not to require an explosive safety zone at the Cheyenne Municipal Airport.

- However, the Cheyenne Airport is surrounded by the city on all sides, including apartment buildings and other multiple family housing; the Frontier Mall and other businesses; public recreational facilities; and many high-density single-family subdivisions.

- Therefore, the safety reassurances on page 5-2 don't apply, that "In the unlikely event of a mishap... If radioactive materials were dispersed, the public would be kept at a safe distance...." There is no safe distance between the Cheyenne Municipal Airport and the public.

---
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BETH HOWARD

The land use consists of high-density single-family subdivisions within the City of Cheyenne?

- Furthermore, it is my understanding that the land to the North of the current Western Hills subdivision shown on Figure 4.2.4-1 as "Mixed Open Space" is platted to become "the rest of Western Hills"... which I assume would also be within the city limits. This would put high-density housing further north to less than a mile from the rail garrison—immediately adjacent to the low-density housing and to the Air Force Base.

- Minimizing the population immediately adjacent to the base is not a small error. Even with only a slight potential for mishaps, it is the population immediately adjacent to the Air Force Base that stands to be affected at greatest risk should such a mishap occur.
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BETH HOWARD

2 Why is there no Department of Defense proposed "Explosive Safety Zone" at the Cheyenne Municipal Airport?

- The same hazardous materials that require the "Explosive Safety Zone" on the Air Force Base will be handled at the airport which seems would make such a zone mandatory. The Draft EIS states on page 5-1 that "The probability of a mishap during air transport of the re-entry systems is extremely small." It does not say that it won't happen ever, and having this information it seems irresponsible not to require an explosive safety zone at the Cheyenne Municipal Airport.

- However, the Cheyenne Airport is surrounded by the city on all sides, including apartment buildings and other multiple family housing; the Frontier Mall and other businesses; public recreational facilities; and many high-density single-family subdivisions.

- Therefore, the safety reassurances on page 5-2 don't apply, that "In the unlikely event of a mishap... If radioactive materials were dispersed, the public would be kept at a safe distance...." There is no safe distance between the Cheyenne Municipal Airport and the public.

---

Page 7

BETH HOWARD
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5.

What is the increased safety risk to Cheyenne with the Air Force Base as the Main Operating Base?

- The risks were calculated for the entire system but the levels of activity in the area stand to be much greater as the MOB than for the rest of the system.

- Since F.E. Warren has been designated as the MOB and Garrison Station, and should the rest of the proposed system not materialize, the people in Cheyenne and Wyoming need to be informed of the specific risks to our area and population.

Page 9

6.

What was the economic impact of the derailment that interferes with regular train traffic?

- In Wyoming, serious train derailments have caused whole trains to be pushed off the tracks, to be picked up later, so as not to interfere with train traffic. A Peacekeeper train would have to block the track until operational.

- Obviously, the trains will have many more miles travelled than those carrying missiles, so they have the greatest possibility for derailment. Certainly, to assure the integrity of the system, these trains will have to be handled as though they do carry missiles, and in the case of a derailment, stand to interfere with regular train traffic and to cause a negative economic impact to the rail industry as a whole.
The DEIS only provides a heightened atmosphere of less national security. It shows that if the rail service is deployed, our children's heritage will be greatly expanded by even one more threat of nuclear war.

Please address the cooled questions in your

Sincerely,
[Signature]

PS Especially address how you will prevent sabotage of the railways and the train.
27. What precautions will the Air Force take to prevent radar jamming devices from interfering with the communication systems between the Air Force control centers and the trains? The rail road worker I talked to last week said he and other railroad employees were able to talk with Air Force personnel on the Air Forces frequencies. What precautions will be taken to ensure that our Air Force personnel on the trains receive instructions from the right people?

28. As the B-52 bomber can be flown by a flock of geese, what extra precautions will be taken to ensure that wildlife such as rodents or weeds, etc., will not cause a malfunction in the operation of the trains to prevent it from moving?

29. What are all the other specific being notes you have addressed for the HS missiles and why were they rejected? Do we actually need more HS missiles - isn't our current ability to blow up the dome-union U.S. 40 times over sufficient? Why do we need to continue to throw hoards of money into the pockets of our Defense Contractors?

30. As the Air Force is biased in their opinion with respect to the deployment of the rail garrison project, will there be an independent commission appointed to also investigate all the NSF concerns? And if one is appointed, what steps will be taken to ensure that the members on this commission will not have any personal vested interests favoring a corrupt overshining of possible hassles?

31. How well protected will the garrison trains be? How much will it cost to build these trains under ground? What could a terrorist do to them?

32. What would be the specific amount of economic damage to our atmosphere if only one missile was launched? Consider if it was to explode high into the atmosphere, before it hit close to the ground, or if it exploded after it hit the ground. What would each impact be on the damage? Also, what would happen to the ozone layer? What amount of our land base would be wiped out? What amount of our agriculture could we expect to lose? What amount of our coal, oil, and gas would be lost?

33. Will there be restricted air space over these garrison areas? If a commercial or passenger plane went over these areas, would they be shot down?

34. What is the estimated economic impact in terms of jobs on each of the 12 planned sites? What will the Air Force do to accommodate all the extra strain put on each location - education, medical, commercial?

35. As we frequently have flash floods around Cheyenne, would the impact be of having the trains with their computer records? After such flash floods, will the tracks still be capable of supporting the weight of the trains?

36. What did the Reagan-Bush Administration move away from a policy of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) toward a policy of peace? What is your opinion of the production process of the HS missiles and how much will it cost to clean up the sites after the missiles are gone? What will you dump the nuclear waste and what will you do to prevent it from contaminating our land, etc., and water? What is your opinion of the particular gur ps and their sites in the B-52 in our state?

Note: My comments are in a private capacity as a concerned citizen of the state.

NFCC Comments - Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program

Q. State your name, age and address.

A. My name is James R. Deal, age 74. My address is 1145 W. Hearne St., Blytheville, Arkansas 72315.

Q. Are your comments for your self alone?

A. My comments represent a consensus of the opinion of the Northeast Arkansas Citizens Committee. NFCC was organized primarily to represent the residential and small business interests before the Public Service Commission. The group is active in all other issues that affect the health, welfare and safety of citizens in the city to the international level.

Q. State briefly your education and ongoing activity.

A. After high school, I attended Memphis State University for two years. My majors were mechanical & architectural drafting, wood shop and music. I served as Lt. Col. in ROTC and six years in the Tennessee National Guard 115th Field Artillery. Until I went to California in 1937, I was the manager of the family building specialty business while also working as a professional musician. I went to California in 1937 and went to work for the B.P.R.R. beginning as a switchman. I worked through the various transportation services before I was promoted to conductor and was an extra. As I trainmaster, I was frozen on that job for the duration of the war. A personal injury inspired return to Blytheville and back into the building specialty business, interior decorating & design, and a motel and restaurant owner and operator. I retired in 1977 and now manage a trust fund for my wife, a lawyer and an MD. I am involved in ongoing studies of economics and advancing technologies.

Q. What are your comments on the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program?

A. In oral testimony at the Blytheville hearing I stated my doubt...
concerning the ability to move the trains from their sheds within the delivery time of enemy missiles. I served as a railway conductor during the time that General Patton was training his African Corps in the desert between India and Tunisia, Col. During the 1960s, Burlington Northern is a single-track service with Central Traffic Control as was the Southern Pacific at that time and I am aware of delays in getting a clearance to move into the scheduled traffic.

I learned from your panelists that it is not the intent of the air force to assemble the trains but instead will rely on 'STRATEGIC WARNING' to initiate a dispersal of trains.

He said, "Now by strategic warning I mean that on a day to day basis the Soviet Union does not have sufficient forces deployed to launch a successful attack on the United States and successfully destroy the entire train."

When will the trains need to be dispersed? He said, "SEVERE DETERIORATION OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS such as the Cuban crisis in 1962 or the Mid-East crisis in 1973."

His answers to my questions were more extensive than my other question. As I rephrased the answers, and compared them with previous information, I found serious contradictions.


gence, nuclear weapons deployment, computerized war games, antiaircraft missile counter measures, research and development of U.S. Army missile systems, and military weapons system requirements. Such should be supported by a military assessment.

According to Bearden, nuclear warheads can be detonated by EMP which can be projected at rates of time the speed of light. The Soviets have been perfecting the Tesla Scale Wave technology since 1950s. They received most of the German radar and infrared scientists at the close of WW 2 and have deployed their fifth generation of EMP.

Bearden has a VLS logic that shows a checker board formation of what appears to be vapor trails above Huntsville. He writes that the Soviets are controlling the jet stream which is responsible for the unusually heavy snows in the deep south and the droughts such as one we are having this year. He suspects that loss of the challenger and failure of other launches, unexpected losses of many of our aircraft, the mysterious formation of giant ice clouds in the north Pacific were caused by EMP attacks. Now Press, itself.

Therefore, to say that the Soviets do not have sufficient forces deployed to launch a successful attack is a gross understatement, assuming that Bearden's research is as credible as his credentials.

After the hearing I managed to speak with several of the panelists and in a short conversation one of them was aware that EMP would detonate nuclear in any of its various forms. I am glad to know that someone is aware of this. The big question in my mind is, "Do our so called peacekeepers understand the Soviet EMP capability and our vulnerability to its power?"

Since our nuclear inventory is so widespread, and since EMP can detonate nuclear, and since the use of EMP would render a scorched

2

earth in the U.S. and trigger a nuclear winter that would affect the whole world, it is most likely that the Soviets will not use EMP as long as our nuclear inventory stays at its present level. They will continue their willingness to retire nuclear unilaterally in an effort to remove all nuclear. This would give them complete control of the entire world with their deployed EMP system.

Obviously we have a large enough nuclear stockpile to deter the use of EMP. The expenditure of fifteen billion dollars for the MX Railguard delivery system is only a waste of resources and manpower.

One witness spoke to the fact that Blytheville, Ark. is in the path of the New Madrid Fault. He was referred to paragraph 7 of the handout brochure which states nothing at all about earthquakes. Four on the Richter scale will move rails into a snake-like twist and I have witnessed such in and around Blytheville, California.

I am aware that public hearings are held to comply with the law as stated on page 1-19, 1-18 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I trust that the public statements will be used with more consideration than compliance with the law. My comments above may very well be outside of the scope that is intended in the draft. However, those who will make the final decisions on deployment of the MX via Rail Garrison are here to challenge the utility of its deployment in light of the EMP technology. Thank you very much for your consideration.

James E. Fanc

President, NACC, 1146 W. Haven St. Blytheville, AR 72315, 981-762-2749.

NACC Comments - Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program
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Thank you for standing this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to assemble for you the environmental consequences of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program and afford you an opportunity to bring in your comments. A copy of a Pass Event Environmental Assessment that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring in your attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The "Small Action Alternative" is selected for many obvious reasons. Highly national law has not been avoided in your jurisdiction. "One Minute Weapons/Office HOLLY, a small step up the MX "Where" The MX is in a "Phase 2" M.D. The MX and B.M. have caused under-the "Holly" Private Belongings. Our national assets up to forty inches have been destroyed, as well as forty to sixty inches on the national level, our nation's assets will be at risk to natural hazards.

Through our work, we should be able to quantify and some serious citizens suggest that the MX will result in a "Kill" gain in our national assets. Our nation's rail system is still under severe pressure. The contentment and benefits that are a threat to the environment. Furthermore, the MX poses crucial long-term threats to the citizens of the United States.

Marylou Fain 506 H. Anacostia Dr. 97100

Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Please hand this form in or mail to:

Lt Col Peter Walsh

AIRCRAFT 2615

Baton Air Force Base

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809
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Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to

inform you of the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the

Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to

our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough

environmental analysis that will be submitted to public officials and citizens before a

final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention

environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft

Environmental Impact Statement.

If this is an issue of concern to anyone who might need a newspa-

per or media attention that military contractors and procurement officials have been

involved, ask President Bush to appoint a blue-ribbon of

experts to study the question of nuclear weapons in the

Washington Post (Sunday, June 22). These experts should

be chosen from the expertise of nuclear weapons defense

administrators, the heads of the nuclear weapons

complex, and experts in nuclear weapons

technology. We must act because the $133 billion in

possible savings from the Peacekeeper Rail

program is huge.

The questions we will ask our system because

the budget is finished and if not, the cost of

a system that can only afford to be used and

also the cost of a system as an adequate

protection, properly, to stop the

Peacekeepers and their capability.
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SCORPION REASONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF BALL GARRISON

Before specific questions are addressed by the EIS, it is important to realize that the word "environment" can have multiple meanings and that the "impact" of the EIS should be whatever the people say it is, and not limited to air quality and acoustic. Our environment includes social, political, economic, moral, and safety. It includes the strategic environment and that in turn includes potential enemies and their perceptions. It is certainly influenced by us, too! If the missiles are launched and show up, and the public reactions are based on a few reading the areas are expected to be approved.

The first question is: WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF NOT BUILDING IT AT ALL?

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE BUILDING PROCESS: In a democratic society where there are public hearings mandated by law, it is of utmost importance that they be real, not cosmetic, and that the peoples' concerns are fully addressed by the environmental impact statement.

1. During the planning process for the EIS, many public meetings and concerns were not addressed in either the draft EIS or the final EIS. Do you intend to ignore our concerns again? If so, why are you silencing the spirit of the public hearings, which is for the seventeenth people who pay your salaries to tell you what we want addressed?

2. Give the time constraints you have placed on these hearings, what is the procedure for additional written comments and questions to be submitted?

3. The hearings need to be a thoughtful process. Unless we have heard your presentations, we may not have that to help us in the EIS. Why is only one hearing scheduled?

4. Has a firm been hired to develop the EIS? If so, who were chosen, and how was the selection process conducted? Do the firm stand to gain from a ruling which would allow the rail garrison to be chosen as the final building site? Is the firm already33

21. What is the likelihood of train wrecks and what would their impact be if they should occur?
22. What are the chances of radioactive materials escaping in the event of a breach?
23. What is the chance of malfunctions or accidents?
24. What is the chance of accidents or injuries, and radioactive incidents at Rocky Flats, Amarillo, and other production sites?
25. What will be the impact on nearby states of various kinds of accidents?
26. Who will be the first state to receive the message if the missile trains aren't explosive?
27. What is the possibility of accidental launch?
28. How will the trains be transported and how will they be handled?
29. What are the additional costs of the Turkistan-Garsonia
30. Is it wise to make Cheyenne or any populated area a target for a heavy atomic bomb? Is it safe to let such a bomb fall near a populated area, or is it a violation of the law of war?
31. Are there any health hazards to the population from exposure to nuclear fallout?
32. Is it wise to make Cheyenne or any populated area a target for a heavy atomic bomb? Is it safe to let such a bomb fall near a populated area, or is it a violation of the law of war?
33. Are there any health hazards to the population from exposure to nuclear fallout?
34. Is it wise to make Cheyenne or any populated area a target for a heavy atomic bomb? Is it safe to let such a bomb fall near a populated area, or is it a violation of the law of war?
35. Are there any health hazards to the population from exposure to nuclear fallout?
36. Is it wise to make Cheyenne or any populated area a target for a heavy atomic bomb? Is it safe to let such a bomb fall near a populated area, or is it a violation of the law of war?
1. Exactly how will additional security measures impact on existing human rights?  
2. How many missile trainers are in carkers?  
3. What is the military strategy for their disposal?  
4. Will individuals be subject to additional scrutiny by any intelligence agency?  

ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: An important part of our national heritage in the free enterprise system of competition.  
1. What corporations will benefit from rail pollution, and how much?  
2. How will property values be affected in Western Hills and other neighborhoods?  
3. How would a treaty dismantling 1/3 of all strategic weapons (as the President proposes) affect rail pollution?  
4. What will be the cost of the project?  
5. What will be the annual costs of maintenance and operation?  
6. What will be the costs of the EIS process, including the mapping hearings?  
7. Where will this system become obsolete? Will it be obsolete before it is built?  
8. What will be the social and economic impacts to our area if the President is presented to its intent to "sail the world of war?" (removing all nuclear weapons)  
9. What happened to the funds promised in the late EIS for the first fifty KX missiles?  
10. Is this system being proposed in Cheyenne because you think we are more docile than the rest of the country, or is there some unusual advantage in this area?  
11. How many economists and politicians are going to be used on this project that could otherwise be working on problems that would help our balance of payments, our general living standards, and improve our standard of living?  
12. It can be anticipated that increased funding for this project will result in costs to other government programs. The monies spent on the interstate train are public monies being spent in this same area supporting funding for agriculture, infrastructure, the Environmental Protection Agency, grants in the area and the like. What research is being conducted on the environmental and economic impact of such increased funding?  
13. What will be the economic impact of the increased costs of the EIS process, including the mapping hearings?  

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ON THE LAND:  
1. How many miles of new track will be laid? Where? How many miles will be upgraded? Where? Where will the gravel come from?  
2. Where will the trains go?  
3. How large will the project be?  
4. How large will the "off limits" areas be?  
5. In there a need for an AI system to protect this project, and if so what will those 'limits' be?  

FAIRNESS: We have always assumed an environment in which fairness is the norm. This should apply to any great national projects like the proposed X exchange deployment.  
1. How can we get independent assessment of guidance system reliability?  
2. Why then this hearing being conducted by an independent agency?  
3. Isn't this hearing pressure in view of the fact that Secretary of Defense Cauti astonished with the recent decision?  

NATIONAL. In this portion of the country we give great emphasis to the Judeo-Christian code of ethical behavior and teach these to our children. We expect our government to supply a credible example of decency. It is and  
should be part of the American system of government.  
1. Does the continued arms race mean we have abandoned the [H]oilet principles concerning crimes against humanity, or was that just rhetoric to justify the millions of dollars?  
2. Have launch control officers been educated about their duties to disobey unlawful orders under the [H]oilet principles?  
3. What will be the environmental impact on the missiles are fired and exploded as they were designed to do?  
4. Is building ever more nuclear weapons an act of terrorism?  
5. How expendable in the human race?  
6. How will building more nuclear space affect the principles of Christian action that we try to teach to our people, such as love for neighbor and love for our enemy? To what extent is our credibility damaged? Will this promote an environment of desert and how to people in this case?  
7. How do we justify these weapons' purposes in the name of democratic principles when the people are deprived of the rights, gladly the government, and with a military subterfuge in all of the above? Certainly in terms of money, and perhaps in terms of policies, power, the military is fighting with each new project, including the missile test project.
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

3. Will the missile system be adequately trained and experienced engineers since MI rail accidents pose serious problems in weight, load, and design of accident at 176 miles per hour (283 km/h)?

4. Will the missile system be adequately trained and experienced engineers since MI rail accidents pose serious problems in weight, load, and design of accident at 176 miles per hour (283 km/h)?

5. Will the missile system be adequately trained and experienced engineers since MI rail accidents pose serious problems in weight, load, and design of accident at 176 miles per hour (283 km/h)?

In addition to this fundamental flaw in the planning process, we believe the BES fails to resolve a number of specific concerns.

11 Public Interface

The BES for the proposed MX missile rail garrison being mode fails to address the impact of the system on the lives of ordinary citizens residing over hundreds of thousands of square miles. It is an if Air Force planners have examined a map of the United States showing primarily military bases and facilities in a fashion reminiscent of the days of open-air nuclear testing when patrons of the Scarecrow were simply written off as unpunished. Anecdotal history suggests that development and deployment of the MI railroad system is likely to stimulate large public protests and even civil disobedience as witnessed by “white train” protests in the Northwest and elsewhere which have resulted in at least one critical injury to Brian White, a veteran who got in front of a train carrying nuclear weapons. Indeed, this is an area that the Congress specifically requested that the BES assess. It does not.

What does the Air Force have for dealing with civil disobedience? Will martial law be imposed in time of “national need”? And what standards of deadly force will be allowed for security guards in order to protect non-violent protesters and ordinary citizens who may be considered as interfering with MI operations?

We are further disturbed by the interned internment by the Air Force in hearings that “terrorist effects” and “psychological impact” of rail garrison deployment were “beyond the scope” of the hearing. The system is designed to operate during times of crisis and to make the land-based portion of the US strategic nuclear armed less vulnerable. Clearly then, operation of MI rail vehicles outside a personnel mode, whether for training or in a strategic crisis will have severe impacts on local communities.

How will citizens be notified if missile war is imminent? How will public notice be avoided in which anyone who disapproves of, is afraid of, or takes political action against MX rail-based missiles is seen as subversive or dangerous?

2. Antiaircraft and Sabotage

The Air Force BES severely underestimates and neglects the possibility of rail accidents and sabotage involving the MX rail system. Given the record of over 200 accidents and incidents involving nuclear weapons (“Broken Arrows”) in recent US history and the record of civilian freight accidents, the BES fails to acknowledge that an accident involving the MX rail system is highly likely.

In particular, how will civil defense and Air Force train operators communicate? How will the Air Force ensure that its train operators are both adequately trained and experienced engineers since MI rail can pose serious problems in weight, load, and design of accident at 176 miles per hour (283 km/h)?

The problem of adequate security for MX rail cars and the protection of sabotage whether by warheads, foreign agents, disgruntled employees, or violent protesters in time of “national need” is not adequately considered. Historical evidence indicates that sabotage was fairly widespread during the first years of the Vietnam War and that entire aircraft carriers were put out of service by, for example, sailors who dropped wrenches into main engines. (See Naval Convoy, Soldiers in Revel, Doubleday, 1975)

Specificaly, what security measures will be taken? What is their cost?

3. Explosions and Fires

The possibility of derailment, “Broken Arrows” collisions, or sabotage are not the only safety and environmental issues involved with the MX system. We are concerned about the possibility of a solid fuel explosion which is not adequately explored in the BES. The chances of a fire resulting from the solid fuel accidents are described in the BES as an "extremely unlikely event" (pp. 3-28). The discussion of liquid fuel fires, however, must deal with the very optimistic assessment. The BES acknowledges that mononitromethane (MIN) and nitrogen tetroxide "ignite spontaneously in contact with each other" (pp. 5-31) if these two chemicals do ignite, the BES concluded that the "solid invent will involve the adherent solid propellants and cause them to ignite or explode."

Why is such an event judged "extremely unlikely"? Further, what is the qualitative risk that "a propellant fire would not study last long enough to breake the RV and begin contamination of nitrogen tetroxide fires and explosions in (pp. 5-12)"
13 especially when such a fire would likely cause the SVE to be exploded.

14 [op.3-12]

15 Why, in addition, is the possibility of serious secondary fires and toxic
16 spill not adequately explored? What are the hazards for local citizens? Per-
17 (2) The hazards to citizens of the Sarasota, Florida, area, even though
18 this county has been identified as a high priority for use in case of nuclear
19 war, are not adequately explored.

16 Another serious defect of the Air Force DEIS is that it does not ade-
17 quately present the possibility of the site becoming a major nuclear
18 war, as a result of a major nuclear weapon test. The Air Force has re-signed
19 itself to the belief that the site cannot be used.
20 Will the DEIS provide a safe, secure, and adequate nuclear weapon test site?

17 In particular, the hazards of nuclear weapons testing are not ade-
18 quately explored. It is not clear how the Air Force DEIS addresses these issues.
19 The Air Force DEIS is based on the assumption that the site cannot be used as a
20 test site. This is not the case.

21 Conclusion:
22 The DEIS raises other significant questions that need to be addressed, especially the economic impact of the project. Nevertheless, the area.
23 As far as we are aware, not properly explored. The Air Force DEIS
24 provides a limited number of options for the site.

DOCUMENT 438

The air force considers a number of issues to be beyond the scope of the hearings: e.g., national security policy, including arms control
12 impact on the environment. The air force is not required to present the
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The D.E.I.S. indicates that rail garrison housing is needed for "complicating the enemy's targeting tasks." [1.3.3] A spokesman for the Air Force's Ballistic Missile Office was quoted in the 1984 newspaper article as saying, "Housing would have to be used only in a more aggressive way to try to destroy [H] trains." Isn't this just another way of saying that towns and cities along H train routes could expect to become targets in a nuclear war? [1.3.6]

It is claimed that all train movements -- whether training, maintenance, or operational -- would be subject to appropriate security practices. [1.3.7] In addition, it is claimed that the H train and training roads would be "integrated into the overall rail system." [1.4.3] A spokesman for the Air Force's Ballistic Missile Office was quoted in the 1984 newspaper article as saying, "We do not expect to have any significant increase in losses from accidents due to the current trend in rail safety." [1.4.2] Another spokesman for the Air Force's Ballistic Missile Office was quoted in the 1984 newspaper article as saying, "We do not expect to have any significant increase in losses from accidents due to the current trend in rail safety." [1.4.2]

* The D.E.I.S. has been properly considered within the D.E.I.S. In terms of the Economic Commission, 1.4.1. The job creation potential of the rail training program is discussed. However, it is claimed that the D.E.I.S. would not create a certain number of jobs, the impact of which would be minimal. [1.4.2]

Under the heading "Purpose and Need," the Air Force claims that its proposed actions will enhance deterrence. Deterrance is defined as having "sufficient military strength and the perceived willingness to use that strength if necessary in order to deter aggression." [1.2.2] The trains would "serve as an additional deterrent." [1.2.2] The trains would also provide increased effectiveness for nuclear weapons that are already deployed. The trains would also increase the likelihood that the United States would initiate a nuclear arms race. [1.2.2] The trains would provide increased effectiveness for nuclear weapons that are already deployed. The trains would also increase the likelihood that the United States would initiate a nuclear arms race. [1.2.2]

The trains would have "adequate" security personnel. [1.2.2] What effects might this have on civilians living or traveling near the trains? Will there be any restrictions on access to the trains? Will the security personnel be authorized to use force to make any restrictions that would be encountered? [1.2.2]

According to the D.E.I.S., "civilians who are assigned to nuclear weapons duties, security requirements, which include security clearance, random drug testing, and mental and psychological evaluations) have been imposed on the civil inspectors when the D.E.I.S. claims that the trains will provide increased effectiveness for nuclear weapons that are already deployed. The trains would also increase the likelihood that the United States would initiate a nuclear arms race. [1.2.2] The trains would provide increased effectiveness for nuclear weapons that are already deployed. The trains would also increase the likelihood that the United States would initiate a nuclear arms race. [1.2.2]

The D.E.I.S. fails to answer. If civilian installers know the location of shelters, they could obtain some intelligence gain access to this information, thereby defeating the whole purpose of the training mode.
August 2, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFRC-BME/GSV
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, CA 92409

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
"Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program, June, 1986"

We have reviewed the above referenced Draft EIS and make the following comments:

We agree that the impact of the development is, on balance, favorable to the City of Spokane.

While we find no errors or omissions in the information presented, we are concerned with the number of routes considered by the Rail Garrison Program as those routes could involve our citizens in the Spokane Metropolitan Area.

Insofar as possible, trains carrying missiles or missile propellants should be routed around the Spokane Metropolitan Area because of the explosive nature of these substances and potential dangers to our citizens. These trains could subsequently be rerouted into the Metropolitan Area. A map of route alternatives should be included in the final EIS along with a statement addressing the routing procedure.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Vicki McMill
Mayor of Spokane

LOCATION:
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri

COMMON SHEET:
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to ensure for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds to its final decision. We have an opportunity to bring to your attention, matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to ensure the environmental analysis that will be used to evaluate the feasibility of the project is made before a decision on the project is made. Please see the sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We address ourselves solely to the rail safety factors mentioned in 5.1.4 et seq., of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement dated June '86.

We want you to understand the reasons for the concern about rail safety that has been expressed by many people in this part of the country.

To demonstrate these reasons, we enclose an eight-year statistical study of train safety, rather than a casual glancing or necessarily thorough or complete, from the last four months newspapers in the area, primarily the Kansas City Star (Kansas City), of reports of rail "incidents" or "accidents." We call them "incidents." We call them "incidents." Enclosed items:

22 Jun 1988: Train hits car; 1 killed
27 Jul 1988: Burlington Northern train derailed
12 Aug 1988: 1,000 evacuated as trains try to right train
1 Aug 1988: Railroad tank car crash in Iowa; 2 women killed
6 Aug 1988: Train fire consumes much of weekend...
13 Aug 1988: Train derailed in Harrisonville
6 Aug 1988: Amtrak derailment leaves 150 injured

...and in summary of the 1987 rail record in Kansas:
27 May 1987: 11 killed...
Seven in car are killed

Continued from Page 1-1

Railroad tank cars crash in Iowa; 2 crewmen killed

As the train was moving through the rural countryside the group of men, known as the "Acme Towing Company," was carrying out its regular duties. The men, who were all experienced in the use of heavy equipment, were working on a bridge across the railroad tracks.

The bridge had been damaged by a recent storm and the company was hired to make the repairs. The men worked for several hours, using large equipment to lift and move the damaged section of the bridge. The job was completed without incident and the men were about to leave when they noticed that the tracks were covered in snow.

A large snowfall had begun and the men knew that they would be unable to work safely in such conditions. They decided to delay their departure until the snow had cleared.

However, the snowfall continued throughout the night and the following day. The men were forced to remain on the bridge, working in the cold and snow-covered conditions. They were able to make some progress, but the work was slow and dangerous.

At around midday on the second day of the snowfall, one of the men collapsed and died from hypothermia. The others quickly sprang into action, using their equipment to transport the victim to safety.

The remaining men worked through the night to make the repairs, but the snowfall continued and they were unable to complete the job before daybreak. They decided to leave the bridge and return the next day to finish the work.

Train fire consumes much of weekend for town in Missouri

The fire, which started in a storage yard, quickly spread to nearby buildings and structures. Firefighters from several departments responded to the scene and worked to control the flames.

The fire caused significant damage to several buildings, including a historic train station and a popular restaurant. However, no one was reported injured in the fire.

The cause of the fire is under investigation. It is believed to have been caused by electrocution, but the investigation is ongoing.
AND NOT REQUIRE THE DISLOCATION OF HOMES.

WE ARE FOCUSED ON THE IMPACTS OF THE MINOT AIR FORCE BASE, THE PROGRAM HERE AT MINOT AND MINOT AIR FORCE BASE. THIS PROGRAM WILL BEGINS.

FIRST, PUBLIC SERVICES EXPENSES WILL INCREASE WITH THIS PROGRAM, BUT WILL BE LIMITED TO COSTS FOR ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL, A MAJORITY OF FIVE PEOPLE FOR THE CITY OF MINOT AND TWO FOR HARD COUNTY. THIS PROGRAM WILL GENERATE ADDITIONAL REVENUE TO THE CITY AND COUNTY FROM SALES TAXES AND MISC. CHARGES AND FEES. THE ADDITIONAL REVENUE COMBITED WITH EXISTING REVENUE SOURCES WILL BE MORE THAN ADEQUATE TO COVER ANY ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS.

SECOND, MINOT HAS THE HOUSING AVAILABLE TODAY AND WILL HAVE IN 1992 WHEN THIS PROGRAM BEGINS. OUR OCCUPANCY RATE IS AT 95 TO 96%, LOWER THAN WHAT THE DRAFT EIS STATES. THE INCREASED DEMAND FOR HOUSING CAN AND WILL BE EASILY MET. PLUS THE OCCUPANCY RATE WILL INCREASE TO ABOUT 50% WHICH IS A POSITIVE IMPACT FOR OUR RENTAL MARKET. WE HAVE THE UNITS AVAILABLE FOR THE PEOPLE WITH THIS PROGRAM, WE WELCOME THEM TO JOIN US HERE IN MINOT AND ENJOY THE QUALITY WAY OF LIFE WE ARE SO PROUD TO HAVE.
We hope that the Air Force has appropriately considered this major decision in the DOD. Otherwise, it will be difficult for the Air Force to justify how it can protect the most valuable resource—our people—from physical destruction, while it ignores the possible psychological damage that may occur from deployment of the proposed missile system immediately adjacent to Cheyenne. It is time that the Air Force, at the very minute, many who affect living with the MX may have on the citizens of Cheyenne.

Parky J Marshall, M.S.
P. O. Box 5126, Cheyenne, WY 82004

P. O. Box 514
Cheyenne, WY 82004

REFERENCES


Dear Lt. Colonel Walsh,

As a concerned citizen and former Frankfurt native, I am concerned with the EIS for the Bismarck Rail Garrison Program. I do not feel adequate attention has been paid to the proposals in the document. I feel there are other less costly alternatives which should be considered.

First of all, reducing the number of nuclear weapons further than 100% would be a step in the right direction. The Senate has indicated a willingness to reduce those weapons in half, but the U.S. could go further. I would certainly favor any move toward disarmament. This would be an important step forward. I think we must consider finding the means to develop nuclear-free zones.

Second, it is important that the Senate reduce the arsenal to the same 100% reduction. This would have to be achieved over time.

Although my hope is that we could eliminate nuclear weapons entirely, I would hope that the above steps would be a long-term solution towards the elimination of that goal. If you have any questions, I would be happy to elaborate.

My address is 1227 South Harrison, Helena, MT 59601.

Thank you for including these comments in the EIS statement for the Rail Garrison Mode Plan.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]

August 21, 1986

Lt. Col. Walsh

Norton Air Force Base, CA 90650-6448

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh,

I would like these comments to go on record as written testimony against deploying the MX missile in rail garrison mode, or in any other mode in Montana. The final EIS statement should include these comments made by us in Montana who are very against this idea. My reasoning follows below:

1) We already have enough war weapons and power in Montana to do the damage done by Hiroshima.

2) We are already a target and with the missiles here, we would not be left with all kinds of problems, no money, and probably new people who would need jobs, when we already don't have enough work for the people who are there.

3) One of our best and fastest growing economic developments in Montana is our tourist trade and having more military growth is not appealing to tourists. Montana is our unspoiled space and the pristine beauty of our state.

4) I understand that the rail base plan is indeed the 37th plan for the missile modes. We have wasted enough money on where to put these missiles. All over our entire country this money could be used to help the sick and poor people.

Thank you for including these comments in the EIS statement for the MX Rail Garrison Mode Plan.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]
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2) We are already a target and with the missiles here, we would not be left with all kinds of problems, no money, and probably new people who would need jobs, when we already don't have enough work for the people who are there.

3) One of our best and fastest growing economic developments in Montana is our tourist trade and having more military growth is not appealing to tourists. Montana is our unspoiled space and the pristine beauty of our state.

4) I understand that the rail base plan is indeed the 37th plan for the missile modes. We have wasted enough money on where to put these missiles. All over our entire country this money could be used to help the sick and poor people.

Thank you for including these comments in the EIS statement for the MX Rail Garrison Mode Plan.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]
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3) One of our best and fastest growing economic developments in Montana is our tourist trade and having more military growth is not appealing to tourists. Montana is our unspoiled space and the pristine beauty of our state.

4) I understand that the rail base plan is indeed the 37th plan for the missile modes. We have wasted enough money on where to put these missiles. All over our entire country this money could be used to help the sick and poor people.
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Dear Lt. Col. Walsh,

I would like these comments to go on record as written testimony against deploying the MX missile in rail garrison mode, or in any other mode in Montana. The final EIS statement should include these comments made by us in Montana who are very against this idea. My reasoning follows below:

1) We already have enough war weapons and power in Montana to do the damage done by Hiroshima.

2) We are already a target and with the missiles here, we would not be left with all kinds of problems, no money, and probably new people who would need jobs, when we already don't have enough work for the people who are there.

3) One of our best and fastest growing economic developments in Montana is our tourist trade and having more military growth is not appealing to tourists. Montana is our unspoiled space and the pristine beauty of our state.

4) I understand that the rail base plan is indeed the 37th plan for the missile modes. We have wasted enough money on where to put these missiles. All over our entire country this money could be used to help the sick and poor people.

Thank you for including these comments in the EIS statement for the MX Rail Garrison Mode Plan.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]
Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to discuss the environmental consequences that have been identified for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. We afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention the environmental analyses that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I extend the great pleasure of this program and want to say I appreciate...

The impact is not as critical as the one estimated by the engineers in the early stages of the project. The final report on the environmental impact statement will be submitted to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to discuss the environmental consequences that have been identified for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. We afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention the environmental analyses that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

LOCATION: Little Rock, AR
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U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to discuss the environmental consequences that have been identified for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. We afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention the environmental analyses that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
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Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to discuss the environmental consequences that have been identified for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. We afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention the environmental analyses that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
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Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to discuss the environmental consequences that have been identified for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. We afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention the environmental analyses that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to discuss the environmental consequences that have been identified for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. We afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention the environmental analyses that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to discuss the environmental consequences that have been identified for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. We afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention the environmental analyses that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to discuss the environmental consequences that have been identified for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. We afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention the environmental analyses that will be available to public officials and citizens before a decision on the project is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
At a radius of a few miles from ground-penetrating wads or a result of the atomic blast, will literally, almost immediately, everything in its path.

At a radius of several additional miles, there will be more devastation as a result of a combination of effects: a cloud of dust (due to the 350-ton automotive vehicle, tractor,cars, farm equipment, etc.) will cover everything and everything at a speed of hundreds of miles an hour, and spontaneous combustion of fires.

Various forms of radiation and fallout will continue additional death, due in part, but not exclusively, to wind direction.

A casual survey, even 10, 20, 30 miles from ground zero, shows that the island, and the area by the sound of the detonation noise, will be substantially, permanently deleted. Depending on just one more form of travel and communication will be destroyed if not severely damaged.

If medical facilities such as hospitals, clinics, doctors' offices are still standing, they will face intense, immediate, severe shortages, inadequate communication.

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

Enclosed please find questions regarding the impacts associated with the Cheyenne-based B-52B CoCMAX Peacekeeper proposal, prepared in response to the Air Force's Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As I explained to you in previous correspondence, these questions are the result of the work a group of people in Cheyenne who support the proposal (some are federal employees, others are not federal employees but local residents who support the proposal).

I would like to note that these concerns include several which were raised during the scoping hearings and the subsequent comment period. I understand that the Air Force has chosen to address only those issues with a "large enough" impact; I would submit that many of the issues here -- ignored in the DEIS -- are "large enough" to generate significant community concerns regardless of how they technically are viewed by the Air Force.
For this reason, because more current data could have been used in several analyses, and because impacts which will be significant to the community were defined by the DEIS as not significant (e.g., Randall Avenue traffic impact), the DEIS is inadequate to meet the purpose for which it is intended. This problem is exacerbated by major - and very expansive - factors which are currently current and accurate. Many local conditions were not investigated -- conditions which are pivotal in assessing the magnitude of the impacts as the Rail Garrison project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Peacemaker Rail Garrison proposal. I believe there are a number of very significant local community concerns which must still be addressed and I appreciate your attention to these.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Due Palia

DOCUMENT 452

SITES

As two alternate sites are under consideration, the transportation impacts should be identified for each and a comparison should be made.

LAND USE

Future land use

The DEIS notes the location of lands north and west of the base owned by USNA, the City, Larimer County School District Number One, the Cheyenne Water Department and the Girl Scouts. There is also land near the north part of the base which is privately owned but not currently occupied on a year-round basis. The DEIS does not address future plans for these lands. (For example, if the School District has plans to construct a needed facility on its land north of the base, how will the proposed restrictive assessment affect these plans?)

Safety concern/future needs

No explosive safety zone restrictions are currently in place which include residences are anticipated. [Sec. 4.2.6.3] Penitentiary safety zones, however, were expanded after the final FIS was completed. What is the likelihood this will happen with Rail Garrison? How much "extra" distance, for each of the two sites under consideration, is available should the zones have to be expanded?

Pinnacle Assembly Building/Visual Impact

There is extensive discussion of the visual impact of future Stant shelters (FSH) and of the Training Tower Shelter (TTS), but no mention is made of the visual impact of the Pinnacle Assembly Building (PAB). [Sec. 4.2.6.3]. In previous comments, numerous concerns have been raised about the PAB, including its height, its visual character, the distance from which it will be visible, and anticipated lighting patterns for the building.

If the Pinnacle Assembly Building will be considerably taller than other base buildings, and if it will be visible from area residences, mitigation measures should be addressed in the EIR. Paint colors alone are an issue of importance. The color scheme of the PAB does not blend into, or even contrast well with, the surrounding residential areas.

Alternative site(s) should be considered for the PAB as well as the train shelters. Locating the RAB on the south site in association with the train shelters should be considered advantages/disadvantages assessed.

WATER RESOURCES

Runoff in the event of a major storm should be addressed. The potential for flooding is minimal, but the DEIS only addresses annual increases in base level wastewater discharges. [Sec. 4.2.7.3]. There are areas identified in the northern portion of the City that are prone to flooding during heavy rain events. How will these be affected by the project? The stormwater runoff impacts for each of the two alternate sites should be identified and a comparison should be made.

AIR QUALITY

The discussion of fugitive dust assumes a fifty percent reduction due to watering of the construction sites. [Sec. 4.2.9.3]. Experience has shown that construction site watering is often not performed as proposed. What provisions will be in place to assure watering?

There is no discussion of the effect of prevailing winds upon fugitive dust distribution. Will the area's customary northwesterly winds force the dust in some areas and reduce it in others?

Fugitive dust impacts for both alternative sites should be identified and a comparison should be made.

NOISE

The noises associated with the operation of a railroad yard are not addressed. [Sec. 4.2.10.3]. One of the most noticeable noises associated with the operation of railroads is not noise from trains travelling along tracks, but the rearrangement of cars and other oversized and heavy objects in the yard. How frequent will such noises occur? Where and at what level will these noises be heard if the north site is selected? If the south site is selected?

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The air force needs to address how the deployment of Small ICBMs might affect the advantages of one Cheyenne side over the other. All Small ICBMs are to be deployed at Warren AFB before the site selection for the Rail Garrison is made.
SOLID WASTE/LANDFILL CAPACITY

The DEIS notes that baseline requirements will result in the need for a new landfill by 1992, and then concludes that solid waste generation will not be a significant problem because the City will have to find a new landfill. The City has responsibility of the project to ensure that the impacts from the project are handled. The project is expected to be in place for solid waste disposal by the 1992 deadline should also be assessed.

MONITORING

What systems are proposed to monitor impacts, such as atmospheric emissions, local government bodies, address unforeseen problems, and ensure that unexpected impacts are monitored?

The Air Force should be coordinating its planning with the military and the Air Force in the Air Force District of Washington, D.C.; the City; and the County. The Air Force should address the planning with local government bodies.

HOUSING

The DEIS notes that housing is a significant concern, but does not address the likelihood that increased demand for housing will result in any adverse impacts. The DEIS notes that increased housing demand will result in increased housing demand for residential housing. The DEIS notes that increased housing demand for residential housing will result in increased housing demand for residential housing. The DEIS notes that increased housing demand for residential housing will result in increased housing demand for residential housing.

PUBLIC PURCHASING

The DEIS notes that increased housing demand for residential housing will result in increased housing demand for residential housing.

DEIS RENTAL:

The DEIS notes that increased housing demand for residential housing will result in increased housing demand for residential housing.

RENTAL:

The DEIS notes that increased housing demand for residential housing will result in increased housing demand for residential housing.
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August 29, 1988

LC Co. for Walsh

ARINC Bldg.

South East Corner

San Bernardino, California 92408

Mr. Walsh:

attended and spoke at the August 10 hearing in Cheyenne, Wyoming, regarding the draft environmental impact statement for the proposed Mi rail garrison.

Following is a written summary of the comments I made as well as additional concerns I have regarding the environmental impacts of the Mi program.

1. I feel the general public was given insufficient time to prepare for the DEIS hearings. The DEIS was not received by private citizens until approximately three weeks before the scheduled hearings, although government agencies reportedly had the draft version one week before that date.

2. A Mi hearing should be held in Cheyenne, Wyoming. It is unfair to expect people in Wyoming to drive 45 miles to attend a hearing. We would be directly impacted by the movement of trains on the rails of Wyoming as well as by any accidents associated with the Mi program, and our community deserves to have a hearing scheduled in a location convenient to our residents to ask questions and voice their concerns.

3. The no-action alternative needs to be more thoroughly addressed in the DEIS. Specifically, the impacts of using Mi rail garrison funds elsewhere in our country, such as in the Pacific Northwest, and the Mi would look at whether our national security environment would be better enhanced by using these funds to reduce the national debt or to feed the hungry, house the homeless, eradicate illiteracy, and provide health care to our people.

4. I would like to see the accident issue considered in greater depth, using real rail accidents as possible scenarios and determining whether or not such disasters could be avoided in the Mi program and what would happen if they were not.

5. I believe the DEIS has looked at the possibility of accidents when the trains are sent onto the tracks in times of "national need." If considering a wartime scenario as unrealistic in this context, then the environmental effects of wartime use of the system should also be addressed.

6. "National need" should be more clearly defined. The Mi rail garrison program involves nearly nuclear weapons that could one day be used. The public has the right to know what circumstances the government would fulfill such a program. The presentation at the DEIS hearing mentioned the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Mid-East Dib Crisis as examples of times of "national need." We survived just fine without sending out or off nuclear weapons, and I doubt most people would view sending weapons to war as justification for starting a nuclear war.

7. The presentation at the hearing mentioned a 1,350-ft explosive safety zone at the garrisons. If such a zone is needed at the facility, wouldn't similar areas be required on each side of all railroad tracks proposed for the system?

8. I dispute the DEIS contention that environmental impacts would be low and not significant. Spending $10-15 million on nuclear weapons when people in every region of the U.S. go hungry and without shelter every night is a serious social and economic concern.

9. It seems inappropriate to me that the Air Force plans to work with local agencies for the "next few months" to determine mitigation measures. Such measures and options should have been determined prior to issuing the DEIS and addressed therein for public comment.

10. The Air Force always states that Mi garrisons are not a forum for persons to state their views on arms control. However, the Air Force never says that the hearings are not a forum for people to praise the military. The entire Mi process needs to be more sensitive to the views of all and not a rubber-stamp process for the escalation of the nuclear arms race.

Sincerely,

Sharon Breitweiser
LOCATION: Little Rock, AR

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GAGE RON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
assess the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Rail Gage program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
evaluation of the data that will be available to the public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you fear have not been adequately addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

1. A truck, guided along the railroad, will be driven
on an open route. The route will be
roughly the same path as the original rail line.
2. The route will be made accessible
more likely.
3. I believe that if I were part of the AP,
the route would be assessed with the
knowledge that the AP is currently considering
will likely cause.

Not to cause undue security issues in a
region that has previously been
protected.

Kenneth Elza
2720 West 2nd Street
San Antonio, TX 78210

Math Street
City, State

Please send this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFCEC-RNDEE
Huntsville Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409
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U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GAGE RON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
assess the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Rail Gage program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
evaluation of the data that will be available to the public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you fear have not been adequately addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.
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Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
assess the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Rail Gage program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
evaluation of the data that will be available to the public officials and citizens before a
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environmental issues that you fear have not been adequately addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.

LOCATION: Little Rock, AR

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GAGE RON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to
assess the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Rail Gage program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough
evaluation of the data that will be available to the public officials and citizens before a
final decision on the program is made. Please see this sheet to bring to our attention
environmental issues that you fear have not been adequately addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement.
Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to
enshrine for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the
Peacekeeper Ball Launch Program, and offer you an opportunity to bring to
our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is to provide
you with a thorough environmental assessment that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final
decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention
matters concerning this program, which have not been adequately analyzed in the
Environmental Impact Statement.

The environmental impact of this program is
not beyond the scope. The making and passing of war, whether it is called a poltical
undercover or for reasons of national security, has always been and always will be damaging
in the environment in which it is waged. For example, national security or even
global security, once should be no place for
nuclear weapons.

The Chamber has gone on record in support of this
deployment and is actively soliciting chamber members
support because of the positive economic impact which
the project will have in this area.

Please consider filling out the form enclosed
and sending it to the Chamber of Commerce.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

James H. Bryant
President

August 12, 1980

Dear Chamber of Commerce:

Please read the attached memo from the Jacksonville (Florida) Chamber of Commerce. This is in response
to the possible deployment of the Peacekeeper missile Project at the Little Rock Air Force Base which is
located near Jacksonville.

Our Chamber has gone on record in support of this
deployment and is actively soliciting chamber members
support because of the positive economic impact which
the project will have in this area.

These statements and letters will have an impact concerning the issues
raised for this session. Your Chamber of Commerce itself has been invited to
attend the meetings concerning the deployment of the Peacekeeper missile at the
LAFB.

The purpose of these meetings was to
explain the environmental impact to our community of this possible deployment. The other purpose
was to allow the public concern about the draft of the Environmental Impact Study.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

James H. Bryant
President

Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce

1400 Main Street, Jacksonville, Florida 32207, 904-424-7511
Subject: Ballisncri at leek AF, Abilene, Texas

Secretary of Defense, Frank Carlucci
Department of Defense

Dear Sirs:

I am enclosing each of you a copy of this letter. I would like to see an investigation into the meeting that was held for the proposed Peacekeeper Ball Garrison at the Abilene, Texas Civic Center, on July 29, 1988.

I arrived at the meeting at 9:00 a.m. The meeting started at 10:00 a.m. I was not allowed to enter the meeting room. I was told by the security guards that I had to leave. I never did get to the meeting.

The Abilene Reporter-News estimated the crowd at 250 people attended the meeting. Self-exaggerating. You would think that there was a three-hour meeting, that there would be no chance for the public to be heard. In the air force Col. said the public would be allowed 3 minutes each to speak. Three minutes each to speak. About the first 50 or so who were called were major civic leaders, state and national representatives, etc. Many of them read letters from the Environmentalist, Governor, or Governor's office, etc. A total of 20 letters were read by people who live hundreds of miles away. A large portion of this first 50 was not heard. Many expected to get to speak, I believe some went over their 3 minutes. The Col. never looked at those who spoke against the Ball Missiles, said they didn't have to tell him they were 3 minutes were up. After the first 50 or so spoke, the Col. said the rest of the cards were shuffled. I believe the fact we elected to speak, I didn't have many people hear our voices. The people I spoke to, who had attended the meeting, did not have many people hear our voices. The people I spoke to, who had attended the meeting, did not have many people hear our voices.

I met some people who live near the Air Force Peacekeeper Ball Garrison Program and I was able to talk to them about their concerns. They were very concerned about the potential danger of an accidental nuclear explosion. I think that I would have a real impact on the environment.

Let not die cut and reuse with nuclear warhead on our railroad. I don't have many people hear our voices. I don't have many people hear our voices. I don't have many people hear our voices. I don't have many people hear our voices.

Max Vare

LOCATION:

Abilene, Texas

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER BALL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to determine for you the potential environmental impacts of the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison program. The Air Force was able to implement a thorough environmental study that will be available to public officials and citizens before the final decision on the program is made. This sheet is to bring to your attention the consequences of this program that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I was very disappointed in the meeting of July 29, 1988 at the Civic Center in Abilene, Texas. The civic leaders, managers, were given time to get their say. There were to many speakers. The two speakers were shuffled to the back of the deck. The fact was I had to stand with the card to speak. I didn't get to speak.

I gave my card to Air Force official behind the desk. Seems to me that a meeting having those who fixed it all those wanting to speak don't get to speak. Besides, probably I didn't get to speak. There were over 300 people there. They were all waiting to speak. The back of this system want to know what they are talking about. The environment will be ruined. Death in Father's value to mention. Thank you. Note: 10-3 Gallagher Abilene TX

Name: Street Address: City: State: 79605

Please send this sheet to me for the Abilene News.

Li Col Peter Walsh
ACE AFSC
N M Air Force Base

This is the first of a series of the citizens who want to speak. I would like to speak on a large scale.

Note: See Document 349 for further responses.
Show support at hearing

Editorials

Missile hearing set for Monday

An Enemy Agent Could disable this System with a Stick of dynamite.

Proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Facilities at Dyess AFB, Texas

Continued from Page 1A

The Air Force will go in search of a site that is not already classified with a view of the development of the air space.

The Air Force is encouraged to enter the public sphere with a view of air space.

Crowd

A lot of people in the area have asked the Air Force to enter the public sphere with a view of air space.

We would welcome other people to enter the public sphere with a view of air space.
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COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER MISSION

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to announce to you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Jeff J. Jones, 1156 San Al. Stage Mtn. 46762
Name Street Address City State

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFFCE-BR/MSC
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

LOCATION: Location

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER MISSION

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to announce to you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Jeff J. Jones, 1156 San Al. Stage Mtn. 46762
Name Street Address City State

Please hand this form in or mail to:
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFFCE-BR/MSC
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409

LOCATION: Location

COMMENT SHEET

U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER MISSION

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to announce to you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention matters we may have inadvertently overlooked. Our goal is a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this sheet to bring to our attention environmental issues that you feel have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Jeff J. Jones, 1156 San Al. Stage Mtn. 46762
Name Street Address City State
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Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFFCE-BR/MSC
Norton Air Force Base
San Bernardino, California 92409
LOCATION: Muncie, IN

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for hosting this hearing is to accommodate you for the environmental assessments we have determined necessary if the Peacemaker Rail Garrison program proceeds, and afford you an opportunity to bring to our attention any issues we may have over looked. Our goal is to provide a thorough environmental analysis that will be available to public officials and citizens before a final decision on the program is made. Please use this form to bring to our attention any environmental issues that you feel have not been fully analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I am against having the Peacemaker program located here or anywhere. I do not feel that we need any more weapons at this time. In the past, the planning of defense at Muncie, or any other site, has taken place without our input or consideration. When these weapons are finally produced, I cannot believe it will then be taken seriously. I truly believe that our community is being sacrificed here. I feel that this is an attack upon our lives. We are not being safeguarded. It is real that our lives are not at stake. I do not think that money on this project means very much to local citizens. I feel that local citizens, and later people at other sites, would take this issue more seriously if it was taken seriously. I truly believe that our community is being sacrificed here. I feel that this is an attack upon our lives. We are not being safeguarded. It is real that our lives are not at stake. I do not think that money on this project means very much to local citizens. I feel that local citizens, and later people at other sites, would take this issue more seriously if it was taken seriously. I truly believe that our community is being sacrificed here.

Anna Lewis 990 W. 10th, Muncie, IN 47305
Name
Street Address
City
State
Please hand this form in or mail to
Lt Col Peter Walsh
AFRDC-NRDS
Strategic Air Force Base
Bacchanal, California 95688

Acknowledged

DOCUMENT 469

QUESTIONs AND COMMENTS REGARDING THE PEACEMAKER RAIL GARRISON SYSTEM AT A D.E.I.S. HEARING: TUES, JUNE 11, 1975

My name is Anna Lewis. I have lived in Muncie for over 15 years and work as an occupational therapist with handicapped children.

I spoke many others in this room waiting peace in the world and prosperity for this community. I share an appreciation for the Air Force and specifically for the positive impact the Muncie Air Force Base has had on the area. However, this idea of adding to it by leaders with dollar signs in their eyes, frightens me. The endless testimonials orchestrated by the Chamber of Commerce describing citizens voluntarily and support for the plan is disturbing because I feel that this system is not favored by all. Many do not speak out due to real or imagined intimidation and fear of loss of business or votes should they oppose the plan publicly. Let us in this room express ourselves honestly without fear of reprisal and work together for the greatest good.

I note that in the future we will spend as much time, effort, and money on solving the problems of peace creatively as we have on accumulating thirty thousand pounds of destructive force for every human being in the world.

Specific questions and concerns are as follows (please answer in writing as part of the final document):

1) Why are such issues as the "national security policy," "psychological impact," and "military" considered "beyond the scope of these hearings?"

2) Why haven't the "no action alternative" been considered in terms of the Nationwide Economic Impact? How many jobs would be created if $20 billion were spent instead on education or medical science, for example? Or how many jobs would be created if the money was left in the civilian economy instead of toward taxes for military expenses?

3) Why were only 617 lines of text (of 4,000 original text) devoted to the "no action alternative" rather than being seriously considered and delayed in the EIS?

4) Why wasn't there a "no action alternative" considered in the EIS?

5) Will the 80 K missiles described in the "proposed action" be some that are currently deployed or new missiles? If new missiles, why aren't these costs included in the expenditure table?

6) Why does the Air Force believe that we do not already have "sufficient military strength?"

DOCUMENT 470
DOCUMENT 471

Good evening. I would like to begin by saying a few words to the 70,000 people in Hiroshima who were killed instantly on this day in 1945, when a nuclear bomb was dropped over their city.

My name is Janice Jackson. I live in Great Falls, and have a family of four young children. I am field organizer for the Committee of the 99%, which is a member of the National Coalition to Stop the N.

As part of my job, I have been in contact with people in Conrad, Great Falls, and Great Range. These people, many of whom are part of the community, are unable to attend this hearing tonight. It is an irony that I, who spend a good deal of my time on only one hearing for the entire state of Montana, in Great Falls. Many people in communities throughout the state, were the state troops, have very strong opposition to the development and deployment of new nuclear weapons, specifically and particularly the MX.

I protest even more strongly to the time constraints placed on us by the Air Force. The DEIS was released July 16th, leaving a mere 22 days to consult with experts and read through a lengthy, weighty, and technical document, regarding a system many of us have grave concerns about. This document took the IFR Force considerably longer to prepare, at a cost of $2 billion to the American taxpayer. The public should be given sufficient time to study it. Moreover, this NEPA process belongs to the public and not to the Air Force.

Since jobs are what supporters of the MX nuclear weapon system talk about, rather than whether or not a strategic rationale exists for deploying MX, more counterforce weapons, I would like to discuss employment associated with this system. Of the $2 billion projected cost to the taxpayers of developing and deploying MX, $622 million would be spent in Great Falls on construction. The Air Force projects the creation of 210 construction jobs in Great Falls in 1990 and 93 in 1991 and 94 in 1992 and 1993 & for life of the project.

1. I submit the No Action Alternative to be immediatelystudied in the DEIS. What will be the economic impact on Great Falls, in particular, and the state of Montana? If the $2 billion projected cost to the taxpayers of developing and deploying MX is reduced by $2 billion, $622 million would be spent in Great Falls on construction. The Air Force projects the creation of 210 construction jobs in Great Falls in 1990 and 93 in 1991 and 94 in 1992 and 1993 & for life of the project.

2. I submit the No Action Alternative to be immediately studied in the DEIS. What will be the economic impact on Great Falls, in particular, and the state of Montana? If the $2 billion projected cost to the taxpayers of developing and deploying MX is reduced by $2 billion, $622 million would be spent in Great Falls on construction. The Air Force projects the creation of 210 construction jobs in Great Falls in 1990 and 93 in 1991 and 94 in 1992 and 1993 & for life of the project.

3. I submit the No Action Alternative to be immediately studied in the DEIS. What will be the economic impact on Great Falls, in particular, and the state of Montana? If the $2 billion projected cost to the taxpayers of developing and deploying MX is reduced by $2 billion, $622 million would be spent in Great Falls on construction. The Air Force projects the creation of 210 construction jobs in Great Falls in 1990 and 93 in 1991 and 94 in 1992 and 1993 & for life of the project.

4. I submit the No Action Alternative to be immediately studied in the DEIS. What will be the economic impact on Great Falls, in particular, and the state of Montana? If the $2 billion projected cost to the taxpayers of developing and deploying MX is reduced by $2 billion, $622 million would be spent in Great Falls on construction. The Air Force projects the creation of 210 construction jobs in Great Falls in 1990 and 93 in 1991 and 94 in 1992 and 1993 & for life of the project.

To close, I would like to repeat the often-quoted words of President Eisenhower: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children... This is not a way of life at all in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity itself which is狮hing cross of iron."

I submit this country can no longer afford, in any sense of the word, to deploy the MX missile.

DOCUMENT 472

Ed Welch,

I understand this was upon your back and of casualty. I have been a pleasure seeking to know you to the extent I have, and I wish you much health, happiness for the future.

Sincerely,

Janice Jackson

July 29, 1988

The purpose of this letter is to state my opposition to placement of the MX

Anderson at Thunderchild,

Medical Lake, WA, and any other

to Armament Project Statement.

I object and

The Armament Project Statement
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will not be used, a correct assumption in

that the Air Force would from the Idaho make

be obtained. The statement does not include

figured in the effect to the state economy,

areas of small, not like the nearest affect

would have from the Idaho make.

Even if the effect very would, to include

the economic effect is

2-214
June 20, 1988

Dear Sir,

I would like to take this opportunity to submit the following questions regarding the Air Force's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The numbers in brackets refer to relevant sections in the DEIS document.

1. Will 50 MX Missiles be built? Congress has currently capped MX deployment at 50 missiles deployed in excess of the Air Force Base. The PROPOSED ACTION in the DEIS is to deploy 50 MX missiles in 20 trains. The Air Force fails to specify whether these 10 MX missiles would be the same ones currently deployed in silos or 50 new missiles.

2. If new missiles are involved, why aren't the costs of building them included in the DEIS? [4.1-2] Or, if missiles are to be taken from silos, why isn't the impact of this action on current ABF discussed including lost "jobs?" [2.1.4.1-2] New MX costs and MX relocation/shutdown costs are missing from the ALTERNATIVE ACTION proposal to deploy 100 MX on 50 trains...

3. Won't the MX trains make nuclear targets of many towns along their route? The DEIS says MX trains are needed for "complexing the target's targeting task." [1.1.6.1-2] A missile test prohibited by the Air Force's Ballistic Missile Office stated: "Enemies would have to use up more time to destroy the train."

4. Is it possible (at some future date), MX trains will be dispersed on public rail lines all over the U.S. According to Senator Cohen (D-Maine), "Department of Defense briefings on rail strikes indicate that a threat to rail workers may be a moving target."

5. Would MX trains increase the possibility of sabotage? According to Senator Albert Gore (D-TN), "About 50 pounds of conventional explosives carried in a back pack or a suitcase would be enough to render a railroad line unusable." (November 1, 1987) Why isn't the issue of sabotage addressed in the DEIS? Will all people carrying back packs or briefcases be detained and searched for "sabotage?"

6. Will the MX trains become vulnerable to attack? The DEIS states the "railroad system is classified as a critical infrastructure." [11.3.6.1-2] Is it possible that towns and cities along railroad routes could expect to become targets in a nuclear war?

7. Who will control the movements of the MX trains? How many civilian railway employees will know that an MX train is operating within their area of track? Will civilian railway employees ever be allowed to carry weapons or armed themselves? Would the MX train Commander have special right-of-way privileges or other extraordinary powers? How much disruption would such powers cause to other (rail) traffic and road traffic which must cross rail lines?

8. How thoroughly would MX trains be tested before deployment? The DEIS says that MX trains will be "completely tested". [11.3.6.1-2] According to the House Armed Services Committee the initial production of MX trains would take place more than a year after the first train should occur. It seems that while the MX trains might be "completely tested" before they are deployed, the missiles they carry will not.

9. By what crew? How many crews will be needed? How many "security" personnel will be necessary? How many "psychological" dispatchers have been trained? How many will be authorized to use force if protesters are encountered? How does this compare to current "security" personnel required by the military to carry out similar tasks? Could incidents like this be avoided if they were not authorized as a threat by armed personnel?


11. How many jobs would the MX program generate on a nationwide scale? The DEIS states that the national impact on employment levels, including "security" personnel and "psychological" dispatchers will be modest. [11.3.6.1-2] Is the national impact "modest" compared to the national cost of the MX program? The projected employment rate is over 62,000 jobs created in the U.S. after MX deployment. However, according to the Air Force "job generation may be double the projected number." [11.3.6.1-2] This is not an "accurate" statement as it is completely outside the range of all reputable studies on the military spending industry. For example, the study "The Fat Federal Pie", estimated 330,000 jobs created by the MX program.

12. Another indication of sloppy employment analysis in the DEIS is the lack of fluctuation in the projected number of new jobs. The DEIS states that "the number of new employment opportunities would remain constant" for the entire period of the MX program. [11.3.6.1-2] However, the Air Force figures that "MX creation would involve large costs, increased public interface, and would cut into other priorities." [11.3.6.1-2] Why would an MX program so expensive and so necessary -- as the DEIS claims -- not be expected to affect other job opportunities? Is it possible that the DEIS is intentionally misleading to make the MX program appear more beneficial?

13. What will the jobs generated really pay? The DEIS states that "the MX program will create jobs that are necessary for the safety and security of the nation." [11.3.6.1-2] The Air Force figures that "the economic impact of assigning this service to the new workforce..." [11.3.6.1-2]

14. How secure are the jobs? How likely is it that the "new workforce..." is likely to face similar problems to the "old workforce?" The Air Force figures that "the economic impact of assigning this service to the new workforce..." [11.3.6.1-2]

15. Would the MX program generate any "tax dollars?" The DEIS states that "the MX program will create revenue for the government." [11.3.6.1-2] The Air Force figures that "the economic impact of assigning this service to the new workforce..." [11.3.6.1-2] However, according to the Congressional Budget Office (November 1987) approximately $3.100 U.S. nuclear missiles would result in the most unexpected Soviet surprise attack, while roughly $3.200 U.S. nuclear weapons would result if there was enough warning.
August 29, 1988

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh,

This letter reiterates my testimony at Varnum APA, Overpeck, NJ, July 28, 1986, concerning the environmental impact of the rail garrison mode of basing of the MX Missile.

I speak as a citizen of Michigan and as a representative of the Michigan Peace Federation, United Church of Christ, Peace with Justice Committee. The United Church of Christ at national General Synod meetings have voted many resolutions opposing weapons of mass destruction (see enclosed).

1. I believe that the ultimate environmental impact of the use of the MX Missile must be addressed in the final Environmental Impact Statement.

Since 1976 the Pentagon has argued that the United States needs 100 MX Missiles, each with 10 1000-kiloton warheads. On paper, each is less powerful than the Hiroshima bomb. In one month of discussion, all public input and many votes in Congress, Congress voted deployment of 60 of those missiles based in Minot, N.D, 30 miles from Bismarck. Deployment of additional MX Missiles was not stipulated at that time, but somehow now, we must respond to a proposal for 90 additional missiles.

The ultimate impact of the use of one MX Missile can be understood by considering the following: If one MX Missile with its ten 1000-kiloton warheads were aimed at Great Britain land I know that they are not aimed at any one site, but they would be capable of striking 9 or 20 cities: London, Liverpool, Manchester, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Swansea, Birmingham, Plymouth, etc. In addition, the electromagnetic pulse, smoke, and radiation would drift worldwide, even over Britain. This would be the result of the use of one MX Missile. There would be 45 (or 95) yet to be used.

When I gave the above testimony at the Hearing on July 28th, one panel member said that it was not necessary to include this information in the Final Environmental Impact Statement because the use of Nuclear weapons has been researched and results published. I agree this is true, but the average person knows very little about the MX Missile or nuclear weapons in general. I only say that when I mention "MX Missile" someone turns and asks me what it is or what is it about. Perhaps the government prefers it this way.

Sincerely,

Linda Birling
100 Colby Dr.
Northville, MI 48167

Anne Kieckhefer
Michigan Conference Peace With Justice Committee
United Church of Christ
P.O. Box 1006
East Lansing, MI 48823
ฅcharted in a Christian basis to the belief that the Bible is the word of God, which is inspired of God, and that the Bible is the supreme authority in all matters of faith and practice.

2. adverely raiher than tees adverely impacted.

3. information in Environmental Impact Statement provided an alternative statement of many areas of the city, and while the subject of much comment and concern over its visual

4. mentions of the Cheyenne area and which ignores specific comments William

5. the peocess as intended.

6. make public participation impossible.

7. the Air Force chose the question with a "large enough impact" and those that would help leaders to decide on the rail garrison.

8. the buildings would fall within a mountain range and the building could be pointed north to blend in with the skyline.

9. "a large enough impact" to the United States Air Force they are primary to the citizen who will live and work in the same area as the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison

10. the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Draft EIS which fully addresses the expressed concerns of citizens of the Cheyenne area and which ignores specific comments made in the scoping process makes public participation impossible.

11. the U.S. Air Force's acts to avoid adverse impacts to the environmental and

12. the Department of Defense.

13. the Department of Defense in 32 CFR Part 214 states its policy to "act with care to ensure the maximum extent possible that, in carrying out its mission of providing for the national defense, it does so in a manner consistent with National Environmental policies... and... to ensure... practical means and measures are used to protect, restore and enhance the quality of the environment, to avoid or minimize adverse environmental consequences."

14. The Air Force in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement has failed to consider reasonable alternatives to recommended actions that would avoid or reduce the adverse impacts caused by the available resources. Regulations in 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508, are to ensure that the environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken. The United States Air Force to develop a Draft EIS which fully addresses the expressed concerns of citizens of the Cheyenne area and which ignores specific comments made in the scoping process makes public participation impossible.

15. the Draft Environmental Impact Statement provided no alternative information in this regard and very little information on the building itself. Enclosed is a copy of an article which appeared in the Wyoming State Tribune on August 11, 1988. You are quoted as stating that "the buildings would fall within a mountain range and the building could be pointed north to blend in with the skyline." A blue spot on a mountain range would look out to any adverse rather than less adversely impacted by the decision. These confusing comments plus the failure to analyze an alternative
Garrison Debate Even-Tempered

By Mike Runge

The need to discuss and debate the issues surrounding the proposed AX Garrison site is essential. It is important to ensure that all voices are heard and that informed decision-making takes place.

The debate should focus on the environmental impacts, economic considerations, and security implications of the proposed site. It is crucial to weigh the potential benefits against the risks and to ensure that the best interests of the community are served.

The debate should be conducted in a respectful and constructive manner, with a commitment to presenting evidence and considering all perspectives. This will help to build consensus and ensure that the final decision is in the best interest of the community.

Rail Garrison Site Not Determined

The decision on the location of the AX Garrison site is not yet final. It is important to continue the discussion and to ensure that all voices are heard before a final decision is made.

The debate should continue until a clear consensus is reached. This will help to ensure that the final decision is in the best interest of the community and that the needs of all stakeholders are considered.

The debate should be conducted in a respectful and constructive manner, with a commitment to presenting evidence and considering all perspectives. This will help to build consensus and ensure that the final decision is in the best interest of the community.

I attended the AX Garrison Draft Hearing in Medical Arts, March, hearing the Garrison

At this age, I feel the responsibility to speak out and share my thoughts with other people who are facing similar challenges.

What I have read the EIS and note that my concerns and specific requests were not

I have read the EIS and note that my concerns and specific requests were not

Thank you for hearing this. I hope that this hearing and this draft hearing will be an opportunity to bring our attention to issues that are important to public officials and citizens before a final decision is made.
LOCATION: Canby, Arkansas

COMMENT SHEET
U.S. AIR FORCE PEACEKEEPER RAIL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for having this hearing is to announce for you the environmental management we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper system is deployed to this area. These are very important issues that we are concerned about, and if you have any questions regarding these issues, please feel free to contact Mr. J. Sineck, President of our staff at (302) 326-2037, or in writing.

Sincerely,

State Peacekeeper Preservation Officer (North Dakota)

J. Sineck

cc: Judy Foster - North Central North Dakota Peace Network
Jim Lupton - Energy Impact Office

State Historical Society
STATE HISTORICAL BOARD
NORTH DAKOTA HERITAGE CENTER, FARGO, N.D. 58102

IN RESPONSE PLEASE REFERENCE 98-912

August 26, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFPEL-BUSINESS
Morton Air Force Base, California 92092-5008

RE: Peacekeeper Garrison Program

Dear Lt. Col. Walsh:

We have reviewed the environmental impact statement for the above referenced project and offer the following comments:

Page 1

4.1-24 4.1, 5.3 4.1, 7.3 - All of the environmental impact statement has been reviewed and accepted by the North Dakota State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) and the agency and SHPO have evaluated identified resources. It is premature to assess the effects of this federal undertaking upon historic properties. As this point we cannot agree that "no historic resources have been identified adjacent to the base."

4.10-21 4.10-5.3 - As explained above, until the identification of resources is complete, we cannot agree that "no important sites would be affected by the proposed program."

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to comment on this undertaking. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please feel free to contact Mr. J. Sineck, President of our staff at (302) 326-2037, or in writing.

Sincerely,

State Peacekeeper Preservation Officer (North Dakota)

J. Sineck

August 30, 1988

Lt. Col. Peter Walsh
AFPEL-BUSINESS
Morton Air Force Base, California 92092-5008

RE: Peacekeeper Garrison Program

Dear Sir:

I respectfully request that this letter be placed in the record of the final E.I.S. for the rail garrison Peacekeeper. I shall greatly appreciate your assistance in the evaluation of the proposal for the rail garrison Peacekeeper. I shall greatly appreciate your assistance in the development of the proposal for the rail garrison Peacekeeper.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

K. W. Foster
Security for the deployed BMD trains is an important and sensitive issue. I appreciate your concern about enhancing our information on the BMD's security system that might give aid and comfort to the enemy. However, some questions must be posed and answered if the public is to give this proposal a fair and informed consideration. To what extent will the BMD be exposed? Will it be self-defense, able to withstand limited-time fire only (e.g., longer than five minutes for SPS-89)? Will it be fully exposed, as are the US and Soviet SAMs and ICBMs? What is the risk that the possible economic and other impacts of such a program be underestimated?
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INTERNATIONAL BALISTIC MISSILE AGREEMENT

Statement by the Secretary of State Pursuant to the President December 19, 1968

The President decided today to proceed with full-scale development of the small intercontinental ballistic missile and to begin development of a mobile, rail-garrisoned missile complex for Pershing. These two programs are an integrated package pending SALT II’s. The decision authorizes research and development only.

In response to congressional direction to consider alternatives to missile basing and deployment issues for Pershing, the President has decided that a basing plan be developed to place missiles on railroad cars during paroling at military installations around the country. During times of national emergency, the Pershing missiles could be moved to classified locations.

The main operating base for Pershing missile system would be at F.E. Warren AFB, by whose action is already planned to be launched at F.E. Warren AFB and at other Defense installations throughout the continental United States. After considering the alternatives for satisfying the military-related requirements, the President has decided that the alternative installations for these purposes would include f) additional Army facilities. Information on these facilities will be provided in the near future.

The President has also decided to develop the small intercontinental ballistic missile, expected in operation approximately 20,000 pounds and carrying a single warhead capable of being launched in two basic modes. These modes are expected to be similar to those at Warren AFB facilities and lead to mobile launchers in a number access to the United States. The initial operating capability for the small ICBM would be achieved in 1972 with four systems at the facilities at Warren AFB. As the system is deployed, the small ICBM system could be deployed to other facilities at F.E. Warren AFB, by rail, for deployment in railburst locations on order to be deployed in railroad systems of major power plants in the United States. This could involve deployment at F. E. Warren AFB. The rail system complex consisting of the above Air Force and Joint Package would be an air air operating base for the Navy complex.

The total quantity of systems to be produced and the extent to which the missiles are to be deployed will be dependent upon the size of the Soviet threat and program needs as assessed on some control agreements.

4.

PRESIDENTIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

On December 19, 1968, President Johnson announced that he had decided to proceed with full-scale development of the small ICBM missile, and to begin development of a mobile, rail-garrisoned missile complex for the M-110 missile. The announcement stated: "The two programs are an integrated package pending SALT II. The decision authorizes research and development only."

The announcement continues that in response to congressional direction to consider alternatives basing and deployment issues for Pershing, the President has decided to place missiles on railroad cars during paroling at military installations around the country.

The last paragraph of the announcement says: "The total quantity of systems to be produced and the extent to which the missiles are to be deployed will be dependent upon the size of the Soviet threat and program needs as assessed on some control agreements."

The GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)) stated that the Secretary of the Air Force was to prepare a full draft environmental impact statement in accordance with § 433 of Title 42, United States Code, and Title 10, United States Code, to implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332 et seq.) on the proposed deployment and operational activities of M-110 missiles in the Minuteman complex referred to in subsection b(1). It would be noted that the wording of this section refers to the proposed deployment and operational activities of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites, not to any other basing mode. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made. In the GAF for FY 1969 (§ 110, b(1)), it was noted that the proposed deployment of M-110 missiles in Minuteman sites was not to be made.
The Presidential announcement also established that the total quantity of systems to be produced and deployed would be dependent on the level of the Soviet threat and would not exceed the number of strategic arms agreements. Mr. Solzhenitsyn, in his recent article in the New York Times, has been quoted as saying that the President has declared his own personal friend of the Soviet General Secretary, who he considered the main architect of the Soviet arms build-up, none of which has been reflected in the DEIS.

The quantity to be produced and deployed has not been reduced by one missile, as implied by the Alternative Proposal, which assigns the number of MI missiles to be deployed to the rail-garrison mode, by 1980. If the Air Force is using the President's announcement of December 19, 1980 as its authority for advancing the rail-garrison mode, it must consider the whole arrangement, not as in a draft, piloting and choosing only the issues which appeal to it.

In summary for this part: The Air Force requirement that territory on the DE ICBMs be restricted to its permanent deployment and operation has no legal authority, while the Air Force 1984 draft contains such language, subsequent DOD cases raised such language. The President's announcement to the Senate, 1984, and the rail-garrison mode declared the two as an integrated package, yet the DEIS fails to recognize any potential impact resulting from such an integrated program.

The President's announcement also states that the total quantity of systems to be produced and deployed under the size of the Soviet threat and progresses toward some control agreements. The DEIS ignores the improved relations with the Soviet Union, ratification of the INF treaty and the dismantled threat.

In the notice of intent, published in the Federal Register February 19, 1980, the Air Force cites the President's announcement as its authority to proceed with stopgap arrangements and prepare an EIS for the rail-garrison deployment mode. In pursuance of the President's action under the Executive announcement, the Air Force is designated to consider all components contained therein.

By restricting territory to environmental impacts of permanent deployment and operation, the NEPA process and democracy have been ill-served. Democratic process does not rely on partial information to fulfill its vital functions. Full disclosure of facts, favorable or unfavorable, is fundamental to the process. Any thing less is a sham, designed to serve narrow interests interests only.

5.

First, what is a safe distance? How determined. What criteria are used. and by whom? What impact of radioactive materials in an area not readily accessible to DOE and EPA "contingency zones".

Second, the statement assumes at least two conditions which may not exist: a) the dispersal of radioactive materials either in garrisons, or in an area readily accessible to DOE and EPA "contingency zones". b) that the dispersal would be confined to rail contamination, hence not mobile. The statement seems to preclude water or air dispersal. Within the last two years, a truck carrying nuclear fuel rods from Savannah was over the side of a bridge into the Savannah River. Fortunately the rods were not irradiated.

The systems described in the DEIS is not substantiated by data or documents. Rather it seems to be a polyvalent view of technological infallibility, but people living over 150 miles from Savannah are today living with diseases induced by dispersal of airborne radioactive releases from Savannah reactors in the 1960s and 1970s.

6.

The last sentence on p. 5-4 says in part: "Even in the event of a successful attack on the system, no impacts worse than those described in Section 5.4... are expected." Turning to 5.4, there are some of the impacts that can be expected from a variety of forms, both solid and liquid, solids being propellant or payload fuel, chemicals, vapors and other sources: severe injuries loss of life, flying debris, secondary fires, possible groundwater contamination total collapse of light structures major damage to heavy structures, flying glass causing possible human injury, disorientation, nausea, vomiting, fever, irritation of eyes, nose, throat and respiratory system, possibility of fire igniting the aerial stage, lung hemorrhage, third-degree burns, ejection of intact W& fuel rods, a slight possibility of exposure of the W& rods at 6 miles - no life threatening effects not clear if this risk applies to the very young, the elderly, those afflicted with respiratory diseases and those chemically ill, vegetative spotting, acidification of surface water supplies.

SANTIE

§ 5.1.2 and § 5.1.6 address the question of sabotage sightly, leaving more questions unanswered than otherwise. e.g. in § 5.1.2 the DEIS is careful to narrate the requirements of security clearance, drug testing, medical and psychological exams, but neglect to list the number of personnel treated for drug or alcohol related causes over a given period of time. Request is hereby made that these figures be sent to each identifier or commentator, prior to publication of the DEIS.

4.

1. The two statements above, while not diametrically opposed, are in conflict. If the health effects of low doses of radiation cannot be measured accurately, how can it be assumed that there is a very low possibility that an exposed person may develop cancer? What is the scientific basis for the latter statement? What epidemiological studies, if any have led to the latter conclusion?

2. If radioactive materials were dispersed, the public would be kept at a safe distance and all contaminated areas would be treated to comply with EPA cleaning standards.

3. First, what is a safe distance? How determined. What criteria are used. and by whom? What impact of radioactive materials in an area not readily accessible to DOE and EPA "contingency zones".

4. Second, the statement assumes at least two conditions which may not exist: a) the dispersal of radioactive materials either in garrisons, or in an area readily accessible to DOE and EPA "contingency zones". b) that the dispersal would be confined to rail contamination, hence not mobile. The statement seems to preclude water or air dispersal. Within the last two years, a truck carrying nuclear fuel rods from Savannah was over the side of a bridge into the Savannah River. Fortunately the rods were not irradiated.

5. The systems described in the DEIS is not substantiated by data or documents. Rather it seems to be a polyvalent view of technological infallibility, but people living over 150 miles from Savannah are today living with diseases induced by dispersal of airborne radioactive releases from Savannah reactors in the 1960s and 1970s.

6. The last sentence on p. 5-4 says in part: "Even in the event of a successful attack on the system, no impacts worse than those described in Section 5.4... are expected." Turning to 5.4, there are some of the impacts that can be expected from a variety of forms, both solid and liquid, solids being propellant or payload fuel, chemicals, vapors and other sources: severe injuries loss of life, flying debris, secondary fires, possible groundwater contamination total collapse of light structures major damage to heavy structures, flying glass causing possible human injury, disorientation, nausea, vomiting, fever, irritation of eyes, nose, throat and respiratory system, possibility of fire igniting the aerial stage, lung hemorrhage, third-degree burns, ejection of intact W& fuel rods, a slight possibility of exposure of the W& rods at 6 miles - no life threatening effects not clear if this risk applies to the very young, the elderly, those afflicted with respiratory diseases and those chemically ill, vegetative spotting, acidification of surface water supplies.
A possibly low rate of death and illness (undeclared in text), irritation of eyes, nose, throat & skin, and ground water contamination by radiactive solid waste; chemical contamination by firefighting chemicals; what chemical agents might be used; possible contamination of aquifers; impacts on natural vegetation, plant mortality; burning sensation in eyes, nose, throat & skin; deposits of hydrocarbons & halogen acids on arable soils; human skin irritation; possible formation of toxic to biota chemical reactions with aqueous solutions; penetration of MH into the soil; possible removal of top soil; small trees, shrubs, small trees, large trees, and the lower branches of large trees; animals - burning of eyes, skin & respiratory tract; possible systemic effects; human health effects – possible eye damage; respiratory tract inflammation; absorption through skin or localized area; possible systemic effects; whether impacted or localized; systemic effects involve the central nervous system; can cause tremors or convulsions; severe local burns; death; liver and kidney damage at close range or pulmonary edema with a potential mortality rate as high as 50%.

Consequences of an MH explosion: the vapor cloud which would immediately detonate solid propellants could cause the nitrogen tetroxide vapor to break which would result in a fire in the solid storage.

The list of consequences, potential and actual, goes on, but as can be readily seen does not involve anything more serious than human and animal mortality. Injury, environmental contamination to the air to the land and water and some of both. However, where and whatever damage, of whatever kind, by whatever cause would occur, there at that spot in that immediate vicinity, an environmental impact document to the earth, the air, the water, to animals and vegetation, and to humans would occur. The consequences of such damage would vary according to the nature of factors, but there can be no question that harm would occur.

10.


Since all of the above-mentioned documents are referenced only in the DEIS, request is hereby officially made that the Air Force supply each and every document to all persons who have testified. To those who have requested a copy of either the DEIS or the FEIS, to all organizations similarly situated, and that the current NEPA process be suspended until the documents have been distributed, and that each person concerned have had a minimum of at least 60 days to peruse, digest and comment on these documents before they relate to the DEIS and the entire NEPA process.

Request is also made that because this material was not available at the start of this process, that the entire process be reinitiated, from the Notice of Intent on.

It should be noted that none of these documents were available through the Repository library system. Request is also made for all other documents, rules and regulations referred to in Chapter 5 of the DEIS Safety Considerations. Without access to all of the documents in this chapter, the DEIS is vague, confusing and incomplete. The statement on p. 5-2 that the DEIS is responsible for associated aspects of nuclear materials, prior to legal acquisition by USD or the Air Force, does not relieve either entity of the responsibility to inform the public in an EIS, nor of the responsibility to discuss these aspects with a potentially adverse impact.

References to documents unattainable locally and within the time frame allows does not relieve the Air Force of its responsibility to either provide these documents or to make a bona fide effort to make them available to the public. No such attempt was made to provide the public with these documents necessary to understanding. The Air Force has not made a good faith effort to discharge its obligation.
SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS Patakihans AFR

Table 4.6-1. p.46.7. Annual Direct Employment for US Hallertourt Service Program by milestone year -- Full-time equivalent jobs

Table 4.6-1. "Selected Socioeconomic Indicators" shows the ROI Employment (Jobs) for the proposed action, but not for the alternative. In this table only the annual "Direct Jobs" figures are related to table 4.6-1 (p.6.6.5), but since they are exactly the same as the totals shown for that table, they are for the ROI.

10. While the text (pp. 4.6-8, 4.6-10) and Table 4.6-1 show a multitude of figures relating to jobs, there is no data or documentation to substantiate these figures. Nor is there any indication that these are new jobs created by the proposed action, rather than existing jobs and employees presently working at other locations.

11. In Table 4.6-1, the total of the column figures is at the top, but all figures listed in the column are not to be added into the total, unlike Table 4.5-1. Why the change in methodology in two consecutive tables?

12. In Table 4.6-1, using the 1990 figures, it appears there will be a total of 225 persons related jobs, only 75 of which are direct jobs, 67 of these civilian jobs, 6 military. The table shows 155 secondary jobs, offering no explanation as to what type of jobs, union jobs, minimum wage jobs, part time jobs. Only the job numbers and total program related spending is shown. Without clarifying information these figures are meaningless and uninformative to the public trying to analyze the DEIS.

The 4.6-1 table again using figures from Table 4.6-1, the year 1995 shows a total of 294 persons related jobs only 170 of which are direct jobs, the remaining 124 being secondary ones. The text shows the proposed action would generate personal income of $23,000,000, but does not state whether this was a direct result in the proposed action, or the "inducer" effect on the economy.
The document contains text in English, discussing topics such as programming, computer security, and radiation exposure. The text is fragmented, with various paragraphs and sections discussing technical details and theoretical concepts. The document appears to be a technical or academic paper, possibly related to computer science or cybersecurity, given the terminology used. The sections are numbered, indicating a structured format, but the specific content is not legible due to the image quality.
The projected discharge rate for the rail gravel project is estimated at 30
m³/yr (4.6-3-2). Again using 198,900 gallons as equivalent to 30 m³
(8,600,000 gallons total annual wastewater discharge, divided by 416
persons (direct putes) yields 23,520 gallons per acre of wastewater
discharge per capita or a daily rate of 84.45 gallons per day discharge rate,
less than 4% of the per capita use as Fairchild AIR or in Spokane.

By whatever method these estimates were calculated, the rather large discrepancy
needs to be investigated, and corrections made where appropriate. Other potential
disparities are shown on pp. 4.6-37 and 4.6-38. The former page states that 1,000
m³/yr (0.861 MGD) of percent wastewater effluent is discharged, while the latter
page states the groundwater discharge is 1.540 m³/yr. I.e. a difference of
1.410,000 gallons of wastewater -- hardly an inaudible amount, unexplained.

While the DEIS (4.6-30) states that an additional 30 m³/yr would have
other effects on the local groundwater, no supporting data or documentation is
presented to confirm the statement. If the 30 m³/yr addition in wastewater
discharge is added to the unexplained 40 m³ (4.6-30) that constitutes an additional
70 m³/yr from that shown on p.4-9-31. What figure is correct? Where is the
supporting evidence?

Part 4.6.2.7, Water Resources, shows a direct mixing of existing water resources
such as water from aquifers, and wastewater effluent discharges, either into
the Spokane River, or into drainfields. What is the justification for considering
wastewater effluents a "water resource"? Please address this question in the EIS.

In this direct mixing, the DEIS has not addressed several areas of concern, even
if one assumes the supply of water will not be sufficiently diverted to the environment.
The problem of Fairchild AIR wastewater should not be discounted with a few
persons in an urban setting. While the entire base is not subject to mining in this
DEIS, the effect of additional contamination caused by the rail gravel project is.
Not addressed, except for a 10% dismissal, is the potential contamination of the
area adjacent to and under the base drainfield the possible contamination of the
Spokane aquifer and other local aquifers referred to on p.4-8-32. Is there migration
of wastewater effluent? In what direction? What is the rate of migration, if any? How calculated? By computer simulation?

The potential harmful effects of wastewater contamination and contamination
which may occur as a result of the additional wastewater generated by the rail
gravel project? Have these potential effects been investigated? Please reply.

When we speak of the human environment, we are indeed speaking of every
component of that environment, including the human. What is the distinguishing
characteristic of the human species? The ability to laugh. It has to be
an ability to reason. And, what does a human reason with? What does human use
paint, culture, and produce this DEIS? Obviously they used their minds, contained in their bodies. The decision to include a discussion of morality, national security policy, or psychological effect from the DEIS was itself a psychological
decision, respecting the human mind.

If one can exclude the human mind, and its potential reaction from the human
environment, then anything can be excluded. What is more intrinsic to the human
environment than the human? The mind which encompasses every thought and emotion. Psychology is a product of the human mind, i.e., of the
"human environment." To exclude it from discussion in the DEIS is a violation of
the letter and spirit of the NEPA process.
In addition, there are local chapters of the Audubon Society, Friends of the Earth, and the Sierra Club that might reasonably be expected to identify environmental aspects of the proposal. None of these organizations or individuals were notified prior to the scoping hearings. Requests to hereby make an observer of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, or any of its officers, was notified after the scoping was announced in the newspaper. The public notice of a scoping hearing did not appear until 6 days prior to the hearing, allowing the public an inadequate amount of time to consider or prepare written comments regarding the scope of issues to be addressed in the EIS.

This interpretation of the requirements of the NEPA process (§ 1900.1-4) "letter and spirit of the Act" by the Office of the Deputy, § 1900.3 setting the NEPA process into the public, § 1900.3 "to comply with the Act and the letter of the law" and § 1901.7 "early as possible" for determining the scope of issues to be addressed.

By neglecting its duty to invite "early and equal" participation in the scoping process, the Air Force, or anyone else, should have known, then public participation and input into the NEPA process would be diminished, contrary to the intent expressed in Part 1901, 40 CFR. For this reason alone, the entire NEPA process must be maintained, beginning with a notice of intent to the Federal Register. Such notice and process must make available to all NEPA and regulatory procedures, affecting the public a truly "open" process.

AL Morgan

Al Morgan

37.

DOCUMENT 482

20 CFR Part 5000

§ 5000.1(b) "Just as sure that Federal agencies are serving in the letter and spirit of the Act."

b) NEPA procedures must ensure that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken.

"Most important, NEPA documents must concentrate on the issues that are truly significant to the action in question, rather than making needless details."

§ 5000.2(b) "Environmental impact statement shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that agencies have made the necessary environmental analysis."

"Encourage and facilitate public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment."

"Now if the NEPA process is to identify and assess the reasonable alternatives to proposed actions that will avoid or diminish adverse effects of those actions upon the quality of the human environment."

§ 5000.3 "The provisions of the Act and these regulations must be read together as a whole in order to comply with the spirit and letter of the law."

§ 5000.7 "There shall be an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action."

COMMENT: Regarding § 5000.7, the scoping process was not open insofar as the notice of intent and the hearing officer requested a list of interested persons to be prepared by the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, or any of its officers, was notified after the scoping was announced in the newspaper. The public notice of a scoping hearing did not appear until 6 days prior to the hearing, allowing the public an inadequate amount of time to consider or prepare written comments regarding the scope of issues to be addressed in the EIS.

This interpretation of the requirements of the NEPA process (§ 1900.1-4) "letter and spirit of the Act" by the Office of the Deputy, § 1900.3 setting the NEPA process into the public, § 1900.3 "to comply with the Act and the letter of the law" and § 1901.7 "early as possible" for determining the scope of issues to be addressed.

By neglecting its duty to invite "early and equal" participation in the scoping process, the Air Force, or anyone else, should have known, then public participation and input into the NEPA process would be diminished, contrary to the intent expressed in Part 1901, 40 CFR. For this reason alone, the entire NEPA process must be maintained, beginning with a notice of intent to the Federal Register. Such notice and process must make available to all NEPA and regulatory procedures, affecting the public a truly "open" process.

36.

By determining questions and criteria regarding the environmental impacts of nuclear war, the Air Force disregarded § 1901.1(a) to concentrate on the issues that are truly significant to the action in question. The Air Force also disregarded § 1901.7 to hold an open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action.

If truly significant environmental issues are excluded at the outset, by unilateral, arbitrary fiat, the document obviously will not contain, hence cannot concentrate on those issues, as the agency is instructed to do, in § 1900.2(b).

During the scoping hearing, and the hearing on the EIS, both hearing officers Lt. Col. Peter Halen and Col. Michael H. Shaw, stated prior to the hearings that testimony must be confined to "preliminary questions and determination of the role of the public in the scoping process, but offered no documentary proof that testimony regarding the impacts of nuclear war, due to the EIS scoping hearing, was prohibited.

Requests to hereby officially made that the Air Force furnish itself, and every person who testified at the hearings, or submitted written testimony, a copy of the document or documents legally prohibiting and excluding testimony on potential environmental impacts regarding the use of NEPA during scoping questions.

§ 1901.7(a) 1) "Invite the participation of other interested persons including those who might not be in accord with the letter of the law, unless there is a particular exception under § 1907.3 c)." Note: no such exception applied to the public scoping or DEIS hearings held at Medical Lake, Wa.

The Air Force, through the Commerce Structure at Fairchild AFB, was aware and should have been aware for over 4 years that individuals such as myself (and they do have my phone number on file) and organizations such as the Peace and Justice Action League of Spokane, were opposed to nuclear weapons on any grounds including environmental ones, since we had been holding periodic vigils at their base for nearly 4 years, and more frequent ones since March 5, 1986.

35.

DOCUMENT 482

This section details the procedures the Air Force must follow before and during public hearings on draft environmental impact statements.

a) "...holds informal public hearing ..." in the DEIS.

Comment: The DEIS hearings held August 4, 1986 at Medical Lake, Wa. was conducted as a court-martial type hearing. The hearing officer, Col. MC Jones is a court-martial officer. No public input was allowed on the general rules, arbitrarily imposed by the Air Force, the procedure, or the arrangements. It was not conducted either in the letter or spirit of the law, contrary to NEPA regulations.

b) 1) "Announcement of the hearing should be distributed to all interested individuals and agencies, including the print and electronic media.

Comment: Announcement of the hearing was not distributed to all interested individuals and agencies. An announcement may have been distributed to the various Chambers of Commerce and to the print and electronic media, but not to other interested persons and agencies.

b) 2) The notice should include:

a) Any limitation on the length of oral statements

Comment: The notice in March for the scoping hearing, carried no such limitation. The July 1986 notice carried no such limitation. In August, a few days before the DEIS hearing, a 5 minute limitation appeared in a newspaper notice.

b) A copy of the draft EIS should be available for distribution to the public or other suitable place in the area of the proposed action and public hearing.

Comment: Untrue a person had signed and checked a form distributed at the scoping hearing, copies of the DEIS were generally not available. One copy was sent to the Medical Lake library and one to the Spokane library. I personally called the public affairs office at Fairchild and was told that no copies were available for distribution.

38.

39.

40.

41.
3) "The hearing should be held at a time and place and in an area readily accessible to military and civilian organizations and individual interested in the proposed action."

Comment: Both the opening and DEIS hearings were held in medical clinics, a small town of about 3500 population, which is indeed adjacent to the military base, but only to the north of the base, and in the city center, which is a service area in the "most" certain to be affected by the base.

If the purpose of the hearing is to encourage and facilitate public participation in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment." 104 F.R. 5500 (1968), the decision to hold the hearing matter, and that the hearing date rather than in the city and other locations along the right of way considered the impact of the DEIS regulation, which is binding on all federal agencies, including the Air Force.

e) "The hearing officer ... participate personally in developing the project." Such was not the case at the DEIS hearing, but was the case at the hearing hearing where (29, 20) was a member of the proposed committee, and evidence in the Notice of Intent, Federal Register, 27/24/68 and the DEIS 27/24/68. This part of the regulations should be amended to provide for special hearing officers rather than Air Force personnel, subject to order and discipline of their superiors.

Comment: one of the persons around the table by the hearing officer at the DEIS hearing was that all respondents were to address their remarks to him.

There is to be such regulations in these regulations, except in cases of special or local situations, is there to be a hearing, and in so far as open to the public is concerned, there is no necessity for such a requirement.

As for a reasonable opportunity to speak, 22 minutes is, almost by definition, a reasonable opportunity. This particular DEIS addressed (2 resources categories, including the executive summary, program overview summary and comparison of program impacts, environmental impact methods and site considerations.) A great proportion of the respondents under such categories and reasonable time would continue over three minutes.

August 29, 1968

Environmental Planning Section
AF/SEP, Office of Civil Affairs
Air Force Headquaters
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. H. Perl Witchell,

Subject: In consultation with the above agency, I write to express our concern that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed project be completed. The EIS must be used in order to determine whether the proposed project should be carried out, and The EIS is not to be used as a way to deny a decision that has already been made about a proposed project. The Air Force has made statements in the past and is now saying that the EIS is to be used to determine whether the project will be carried out, and that the EIS is to be used as a way to deny a decision that has already been made about a proposed project. The Air Force has made statements in the past and is now saying that the EIS is to be used as a way to deny a decision that has already been made about a proposed project.

I would like to express my concern that the Air Force comply with the NEPA law and that the EIS be prepared in a manner that is reasonable and that the public be adequately informed of the project. I would also like to express my concern that the EIS be prepared in a manner that is reasonable and that the public be adequately informed of the project.

I would like to express my concern that the Air Force comply with the NEPA law and that the EIS be prepared in a manner that is reasonable and that the public be adequately informed of the project.
### Table: District's Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>2024-25</th>
<th>Projected 2025-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- Estimated figures for 2023-24 and 2024-25 are based on historical trends.
- Projected figures for 2025-26 are subject to market conditions and economic forecasts.

---

### District Overview

The Board of Directors of District XYZ has approved the fiscal year 2024-25 budget presented by the General Manager. The budget aims to balance revenues and expenditures while maintaining service levels and sustainability of critical infrastructure.

- **Revenues**: Projected to increase by 5% due to higher utility rates and expected economic growth.
- **Expenses**: Significant investments are planned for infrastructure upgrades and maintenance.
- **Net Income**: Expected to remain stable, ensuring financial health and readiness for future challenges.

August 31, 2023

General Manager
### Environmental Impact Statement

The report concludes appropriately the overall regional environmental impact. This statement is based on a thorough presentation of potential consequences of having a rail system in operation, including the proximity of the proposed system.

#### Overall Program Environmental Impact

The report's presentation of potential consequences of having a rail system in operation is thorough. Overall, the proximity of the proposed system in the final report will be a key factor in determining the overall environmental impact.

#### Potential Consequences

1. **Proximity of Proposed System:**
   - Potential for increased noise, dust, and vibrations.
   - Potential for visual impact and loss of property value.

2. **Public Health:**
   - Potential for exposure to chemicals and hazardous materials.
   - Potential for increased traffic congestion and local pollution.

3. **Wildlife and Ecosystems:**
   - Potential for fragmentation of habitat.
   - Potential for disturbance to migratory patterns.

4. **Economic Impact:**
   - Potential for increased property values and economic activity.
   - Potential for increased transportation costs and reduced efficiency.

5. **Traffic and Safety:**
   - Potential for increased traffic congestion and accidents.
   - Potential for increased travel times and reduced safety.

The report concludes that the overall environmental impact of the proposed rail system is acceptable, and no significant impacts are expected. The report is supported by detailed analyses of potential consequences, and recommendations are provided for mitigating any identified impacts.
Lt. Col. Thomas Bartol
United States Air Force
Director, Progress & Environmental Division
Regional Civil Engineer
Missile Site Support (MSSP)
Hunt Air Force Base, CA 92409

Re: Proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program

Dear Lt. Col. Bartol:

We have completed our review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for this project. This letter will include our general comments regarding the DEIS and provide clarification, where necessary, of state agency comments and questions. The state agency comments and questions are attached herewith to supplement this letter.

Your office has already answered many of the questions we raised regarding the classification of various issues. Information is also being gathered to respond to some other questions. Comments and questions presented here are those that should be addressed in the Final EIS (FEIS).

1. It is understood that Peacekeeper specific training will be provided at F.E. Warren base for personnel to be assigned to other bases. The DEIS is a little unclear on this point and a clarification would be helpful in the FEIS.

2. In various locations in the DEIS, the train deployment was described as being two, four, or possibly six trains per garrison site. You have asked that the numbers of trains being considered be maximized to include the impacts to be derived from the DEIS modeling. This can be addressed, as to provide the worst-case scenario, we would be helpful in eliminating the reviewers confusion.

3. The lighting systems are still under preliminary design so you indicated that the visual impacts cannot yet be determined. The design should aim to reduce the lighting impact to residential areas and the FEIS should address this matter.

4. The DEIS will identify the preferred alternative. The cultural sites could affect the site selection at F.E. Warren. The affect of the cultural sites on the alternative selection should be identified in the FEIS.

5. Your staff has already contacted Carl Ellis of the Industrial Sitting Administration regarding the Region 2-3 Review. The Region 2-3 Review has different implications. It is used to assess economic, labor market, transportation, and other issues. Due to the Region 2-3 Review focusing on the RGI and the protected impacts, the remaining questions on this issue should be resolved before the FEIS.

6. There may have been a change in some of the significance criteria used to address transportation issues between the previous Peacekeeper EIS and this DEIS. Any differences in the significance criteria should be resolved before the FEIS.

7. Further classification needs to be provided in the FEIS regarding water quality standards and impacts. The FEIS should address both federal and state water quality standards and how the proposed project would impact water quality. The project mitigation should identify that construction standards will be established to meet the water quality standards.

8. Additional information has been made available concerning housing impacts identified in the DEIS. The FEIS should include this new information.

9. The DEIS needs to be modified to reflect enrollment, pupil-to-teacher ratios, and revenue and reserve data from School District No. 1. The FEIS should reflect the new data and the resulting changes in the impacts.

10. The employment, revenue and reserve data from Cheyenne and Laramie County also needs to be updated and the impacts reassessed based upon the new data.

11. The impacts to the education system do not reflect the cost impacts that will be accrued to the school education program. Other local impacts, such as for public utilities, may be able to be covered by potentially generated revenues to project related sales and use taxes. The Foundation program provides a substantial annual funding stream. This program is funded through mineral royalty and ad valorem taxes. Locally generated revenue will go into the Foundation program. The enrollments from Table 4.2-1 are anticipated to generate demands for funding from this program.

The impacts to this program need to be discussed. A map of the school Foundation program application is enclosed with this letter. The program will be discussed with area school districts for the funds. A map from Mary Byrne of the Wyoming Department of Administration and Local Control regarding Foundation program funding is also enclosed.

12. The current expansion program under way for wastewater services is at the Dry Creek Plant. The other public utility coordination issues, including solid waste, need to be coordinated with the City of Cheyenne.

13. The Public Service Commission has reviewed the Draft EIS in more detail and has consulted with representatives of the gas and electric utilities. These utilities have stated that they feel the actual impacts on their system will be less than that identified in the Draft EIS. Their only concern was regarding the identification of measures that will be taken to avoid damage to existing utility services in the area.

14. The transportation issues are difficult to assess based upon the information presented in the Draft EIS. Traffic problems already exist at Randall Avenue for a variety of reasons including the short distance between the gate and the interchange. The same traffic volume is assumed for the south gate, as was used in the Peacekeeper EIS. There are changes, existing gate access only under way, on the site since that time. Traffic problems are expected to increase in this area. The traffic at this gate is not discussed in the Draft EIS. It is unfortunate that the work at Missile Drive and Happy Jack is not complete since this project will have a significant effect on traffic distribution. Also, under the site gate option, traffic will be under way simultaneously across the base. Project-related traffic could be dispersed uniformly over all three gates. It is even conceivable that traffic redistribution when Missile Drive is reopened may add to the project's explicitly impact the traffic situation at Randall Avenue. The Draft EIS should provide additional information to help review this such as:

a. What on-base projects (outside of this action) are being considered for traffic improvements? Even though they are

Lt. Col. Thomas Bartol
August 31, 1988
Page Three

State of Wyoming
Office of the Governor
Cheyenne 82002

August 31, 1988

4. The FEIS will identify the preferred alternative. The cultural sites could affect the site selection at F.E. Warren. The affect of the cultural sites on the alternative selection should be identified in the FEIS.

5. Your staff has already contacted Carl Ellis of the Industrial Sitting Administration regarding the Region 2-3 Review. The Region 2-3 Review has different implications. It is used to assess economic, labor market, transportation, and other issues. Due to the Region 2-3 Review focusing on the RGI and the protected impacts, the remaining questions on this issue should be resolved before the FEIS.

6. There may have been a change in some of the significance criteria used to address transportation issues between the previous Peacekeeper EIS and this DEIS. Any differences in the significance criteria should be resolved before the FEIS.

7. Further classification needs to be provided in the FEIS regarding water quality standards and impacts. The FEIS should address both federal and state water quality standards and how the proposed project would impact water quality. The project mitigation should identify that construction standards will be established to meet the water quality standards.

8. Additional information has been made available concerning housing impacts identified in the DEIS. The FEIS should include this new information.

9. The DEIS needs to be modified to reflect enrollment, pupil-to-teacher ratios, and revenue and reserve data from School District No. 1. The FEIS should reflect the new data and the resulting changes in the impacts.

10. The employment, revenue and reserve data from Cheyenne and Laramie County also needs to be updated and the impacts reassessed based upon the new data.

11. The impacts to the education system do not reflect the cost impacts that will be accrued to the school education program. Other local impacts, such as for public utilities, may be able to be covered by potentially generated revenues to project related sales and use taxes. The Foundation program provides a substantial annual funding stream. This program is funded through mineral royalty and ad valorem taxes. Locally generated revenue will go into the Foundation program. The enrollments from Table 4.2-1 are anticipated to generate demands for funding from this program.

The impacts to this program need to be discussed. A map of the school Foundation program application is enclosed with this letter. The program will be discussed with area school districts for the funds. A map from Mary Byrne of the Wyoming Department of Administration and Local Control regarding Foundation program funding is also enclosed.

12. The current expansion program under way for wastewater services is at the Dry Creek Plant. The other public utility coordination issues, including solid waste, need to be coordinated with the City of Cheyenne.

13. The Public Service Commission has reviewed the Draft EIS in more detail and has consulted with representatives of the gas and electric utilities. These utilities have stated that they feel the actual impacts on their system will be less than that identified in the Draft EIS. Their only concern was regarding the identification of measures that will be taken to avoid damage to existing utility services in the area.

14. The transportation issues are difficult to assess based upon the information presented in the Draft EIS. Traffic problems already exist at Randall Avenue for a variety of reasons including the short distance between the gate and the interchange. The same traffic volume is assumed for the south gate, as was used in the Peacekeeper EIS. There are changes, existing gate access only under way, on the site since that time. Traffic problems are expected to increase in this area. The traffic at this gate is not discussed in the Draft EIS. It is unfortunate that the work at Missile Drive and Happy Jack is not complete since this project will have a significant effect on traffic distribution. Also, under the site gate option, traffic will be under way simultaneously across the base. Project-related traffic could be dispersed uniformly over all three gates. It is even conceivable that traffic redistribution when Missile Drive is reopened may add to the project's explicitly impact the traffic situation at Randall Avenue. The Draft EIS should provide additional information to help review this such as:

a. What on-base projects (outside of this action) are being considered for traffic improvements? Even though they are...
21. The mitigation plan for the rail garrison program must address such issues as payment of local sales and use taxes and methods of contracting. The failure of the plan to adequately absorb related program impact is directly related to program derived revenue. If local taxes are not paid, there is no revenue stream for this impact assistance. Also, various options for contracting could also affect the impacts presented in the plan. Questions remain regarding the level of impact. The mitigation plan should also address a monitoring program that will assess the impacts during construction and implementation to ensure that impacts are being adequately addressed and mitigation measures are adequate. The mitigation plan needs to address how cost impacts will be mitigated that are not offset by rail garrison related program income. An example of this is the Wyoming Foundation Program which could involve additional costs of $6,088,376 between 1989 and 1999. These costs are not offset by project related sales and use taxes. The FEIS is intended to address program impacts, assess those impacts and to develop mitigation measures to reduce adverse program impacts. The mitigation plan must address these issues or there is no assurance that the adverse program impacts can be adequately mitigated. Since program related adverse impacts affect all Wyoming residents, including defense employees, it is assumed that a thorough mitigation plan is of mutual interest.

22. The impacts of the cumulative assessment have not been addressed here. A separate FEIS would be completed to address any small ICRM deployment. The impacts of such a deployment would be more significant than the rail garrison, but we will evaluate those impacts at the time information on the small ICRM deployment is available.

I appreciate your assistance to date in answering the questions of the local and state representatives. We look forward to working with you between now and the FEIS to provide whatever additional data that you may need. We share your desire to have a FEIS that is a complete assessment of the proposed program from which component decisions can be made. Thank you for your continued assistance and help, and we look forward to hearing from you on these issues.

Sincerely,

Al
drew Tedrow
Natural Resource Analyst
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Mr. Edwards
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Only minimal habitat disturbances will occur as a result of the development of support facilities, because the small ICRM program will utilize existing airstrips alone.

The Peacekeeper Ball Gairoons will have some local impact on wildlife habitat. We crucial wildlife habitat will be directly affected by this project. The most significant adverse impacts to wildlife could result from the formal operations. Indirectly, the short and long term impacts to the area from the formal operations and impacts of utilizing similar facilities could have an impact on local terrestrial wildlife populations and their habitat.

The increased population in the Cheyenne area will lead to increased residential and road development, a greater demand for water, increased power line corridors, increased demand for recreational activity and access to the wildlife resources in Wyoming and increased wildlife for enforcement purposes. These impacts will be greatest within 100 miles of Cheyenne Air Force Base, while they result in an increased demand on the recreational and wildlife resources in the entire state.

The Peacekeeper Ball Gairoons could be based on the present facility (north site) or on a site in Section 10, T13N, R66W, about 3 miles east of L. Haree AFB (south site). The NEIS judges the impact on biological resources to be low and not significant, as it disagrees.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

20. It may be appropriate to consider these, as well as equipment needs, as mitigation measures for the proposed action. They would be a good mechanism to provide mutually beneficial training programs and strengthen overall emergency response programs. It would request that Robert Hail of the Office of Emergency Management be contacted relative to these points.

19. The health and human service program impacts were not addressed in the DEN. Any new project, public or private, can be expected to impact such programs as substance abuse and spouse and child abuse. Comments letters are included for programs under the Wyoming Department of Health and Social Services. The comments address the population impacts under the cumulative assessment model only. However, discussions with the program personnel indicates that their programs historically have been impacted disproportionately to the increase in population. In other words, a population increase of 20% would result in roughly the same increase in program cost, but to a considerably greater proportionate increase in program cost. The increase would be offset by rail garrison program related revenues. These community based programs are funded through annual local and state budgets and funding could significantly lag behind revenue increases.

20. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department has received comments which are included in the attached letter. The WGFND has been working with P.E. Weisen on several issues dealing with such topics as habitat and recreational enhancement. Their comments have combined typical mitigation recommendations for the rail garrison program with those of other on-going actions. It is their belief that more effective mitigation can be accomplished in this manner. As an example, the WGFND recommends mitigation for 200 acres of habitat. This includes the 10.1 acre project site, plus 100 acres for the fleet maintenance facility, and 100 acres for other on-going actions. The public access comments under modeling are consistent with the observations of access across private lands to public lands currently not accessible. With the rail garrison facility would be fenced with only one access. It is possible that wildlife such as antelope could be trapped within the enclosed area as fencing is completed. The WGFND would help relocate such animals but requests mitigation measures to address the time and expense of these activities.
The project would permanently disturb 91.6 acres and temporarily disturb 195.3 acres of grassland habitat. A 0.3-acre wetland and intermittent stream would be affected, as well as 1.6 acres of ponds and 0.3 acres of reservoir. Construction of security fences around the facility could potentially depress wildlife access to vital water sources and result in greater habitat losses for big game by restricting access to their forage range. Increased densities of big game are anticipated as a result of collisions with vehicle, fence, equipment, and other obstacles. The wildlife resulting at this site may benefit from the project site and may be disadvantaged. Fences constructed could result in increased water habitat if they are not trapped in fence corners as they move to the east during winter blizzards.

Impact to Federal, Candidate, and State-Rare Species

Construction of the project on either side could destroy nesting habitats for burrowing owls, least terns or colonies for Brown's and Forster's hawks, and area of acorns' fruit for. All of these species may occur on the site and either side on part of a breeding population in the local area. Table 4.1.2-1 lists the southern swift fox for a Federally Listed Endangered Species. This is incorrect, it is a candidate threatened species. A swift fox has been documented in an area adjacent to the south site (Section 12, TEQA, DNR).

Summary

The USACE indicators short and long term direct and indirect impacts to biological resources would be low and acceptable. However, local impacts to deer and waterfowl population could be significant, and seasonal habitat features could be lost. Construction of either side could result in loss of habitat for the southern swift fox.

If the Small ICWP program is developed concurrently with the Panhandle Rail Corridor program, the indirect impact on biological resources in the region of influence (ROI) from the increased human population in the Chippewa area could be significant, i.e., 4,000 additional people in Chippewa will significantly increase competition for the consumptive use of wildlife in

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

PLANNING/PETRA CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS

[Date]

[Place]
### Computation of Foundation Guarantee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ALLOCATION FOR GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES, less the base CAPA from Level 1</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL BUDGET FOR EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL BUDGET FOR EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANT COTATION COSTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Computation of State-Equalized Mill Levy

**State of Wyoming**

**SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM APPLICATION 1988-89**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FOUNDATION PROGRAM GUARANTEE</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EQUALIZATION MILL LEVY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Computation of Recapture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recapture</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Computation of Local District Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computation of Local District Resources</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- The information provided is a sample of a school foundation program application for the State of Wyoming. The specific details and amounts may vary based on the actual application and the specific conditions of each school district.
TO: Alan Edwards, State Planning Coordinator’s Office
FROM: Mary Byrne, Economist

SUBJECT: Foundation Program Funding

The funding of the School Foundation Program is supported by the mill levy and state mandated property tax assessment on property and also Federal Mineral Royalties. Sales and Use taxes do not play a role in funding education in this state. The only exception to this statement is the State General Fund appropriation of $67.2 million made to the School Foundation Program in FY80.

In regard to Impact Assistance Tax payments, they are paid to county and municipality governments out of the school districts. The Impact Assistance Tax payment is not an appropriate source of revenue to alleviate an increase in school attendance.
In reviewing the document, I found that the water resources were fairly well covered. I did notice a potential problem with the South Site. They showed that the South reservoir will be shared but they did not appear to address the water supply for the irrigated lands supplied from Snow Reservoir.

July 11, 1986

Wyoming State Clearinghouse
Attn: Mr. Alan Edwards
State Planning Coordinator's Office
Nursery Building, 2nd Floor East
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Re: 88-010

Dear Mr. Edwards:

Please refer to the Regional Water Supply Monitoring Program report completed in March 86, which was prepared by the University of Wyoming, Dept. of Geography & Recreation. This report assessed the resource recreation effects of development of the Peacekeeper missile system. It was contracted by the Office of Industrial Siting Administration [IDA] on behalf of the Wyoming Recreation Commission and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department.

The conclusion of this report stated that the Peacekeeper population has little impact on the recreation resources of this area of influence. It is anticipated that the Ballistic Missile will also have little impact on the recreation resources.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lori Hall
Water Resources
Planning & Development Section
State Parks Division

JWK
The Division of Public Assistance and Social Services serves the Laramie County area through their Cheyenne Field Office. The field office strives to offer services in providing financial, medical, and food services to eligible residents of Laramie County. In addition, the agency provides a number of services to abused and neglected children and their families. In any given month, the agency will serve: 300 households under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program; 1,000 households under the Food Stamp Program; 2,000 households under the General Assistance Program; 250 children under the Emergency Assistance Program; and 1,200 children and their families under our Social Services Program. The monthly costs associated with serving these clients are: Aid to Families with Dependent Children $350,000.00; Food Stamps $250,000.00; General Assistance $200,000.00; Emergency Assistance $100,000.00; and Social Services $175,000.00.

The projected impact of the Peacemaker-Ball Garrison and the small CWM program would mean increases in all of the areas mentioned. The projections in the environmental impact statement were not conservative estimates since if this figure was to be taken into consideration, more children would be placed in the agency's care for services and placement. Consequently, with these projected increases, additional staff would be needed to meet the demand. At a minimum, we would need an additional social worker, two public assistance workers and one clerical support staff. The costs associated with these increases is estimated to be, on a monthly basis, $15,000.00 in program costs and $7,000.00 in staff costs.

In the last analysis, however, additional state staff and resources will be necessary to meet the demand created by these projects.

34

35

36

37

38

39

Based on the projections indicated in the draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Division does not feel this will provide or cause any degradation of health in the immediate community. Population increase based on the figures presented by the U.S. Air Force would be minimal in the community. Water, wastewater, stormwater and air pollution are covered by the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. With this in mind it is not felt that any environmental health impacts need be addressed by the Department of Health and Social Services will be indicated.
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August 11, 1968

Mr. Richard Miller
State Planning Coordinator
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

At: Pacheco Road Garriison Program Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Miller:

Ms. Nancy and Mr. Chapman of our staff have received information concerning the aforementioned draft EIS. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment.

Management of cultural resources on USAF projects is conducted in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Advisory Council regulations 36CFR500. These regulations call for survey, evaluation and protection of significant historic and architectural sites prior to any disturbance. Wyoming has followed the procedures established in the regulations, we have objections to the project. Specific comments on the project's effect on cultural resources will be provided in the USDA when we review the cultural resources report.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Nancy at 377-5494 or Mr. Chapman at 377-5930.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Neuman
State Historic Preservation Officer

DOCUMENT 488

Gary G. Beach
August 3, 1968

Socioeconomic Analysis Methods

The draft EIS was an socioeconomic model developed for the Region of Influence (ROI) for P.E. Warren AFB in project future baseline conditions. Cheyenne and Laramie County are the only counties in Wyoming to have a population. However, the two counties to the north of Wyoming are four to six times the size of Laramie County in terms of population and employment. They will also be very socioeconomic model and have an analysis concerning Cheyenne, Laramie County, and Laramie County. West and Laramie counties should not be in the ROI (and another section). They should be excluded because they are not "inhouse" and major communities where most of the demographic changes attributable to the proposed program would be expected (DEIS, p. 3-2).

The EIS for the Pacheco Road Garrison Program initially used this approach and local units of Wyoming government decided that it was accurate or good enough. Therefore, the Department of Defense did the analysis again and created Final Environmental Impact Statement. (DEIS) (DEIS, p. 3-2).

The analysis suggests that the authors did not recognize the differences in the results of this type of socioeconomic model to be. For example, this draft EIS anticipates a ratio of secondary jobs (or non-transportation) of 0.51 during the operating phase. This ratio is too low if it is to be included in the analysis of the project (DEIS, p. 3-2).

The EIS for the Pacheco Road Garrison Program initially used this approach and local units of Wyoming government decided that it was adequate or good enough. Therefore, the Department of Defense did the analysis again and created Final Environmental Impact Statement. (DEIS) (DEIS, p. 3-2).
In order to minimize noise and use the maximum number of local governments to operate, and to minimize the time of training, assistance payments, the following measures shall be followed for all activity in operating:

1. All contract agreements shall be followed in accordance with all contracts and agreements as defined by the assistance program and all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program shall be followed.

2. The assistance program shall be followed in accordance with all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program and all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program shall be followed.

3. The assistance program shall be followed in accordance with all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program and all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program shall be followed.

4. The assistance program shall be followed in accordance with all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program and all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program shall be followed.

5. The assistance program shall be followed in accordance with all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program and all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program shall be followed.

6. The assistance program shall be followed in accordance with all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program and all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program shall be followed.

7. The assistance program shall be followed in accordance with all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program and all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program shall be followed.

8. The assistance program shall be followed in accordance with all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program and all contracts and agreements as agreed to by the assistance program shall be followed.
A. The Peacekeeper project's responsibility for capital facilities costs is limited by local support under the provisions of Section 621 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1986. The local facility costs shall be funded through a grant under the provisions of Section 622 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1986.

B. The parties agree that the Peacekeeper Deployment will require an additional 100,000 acre-feet of Cheyenne Municipal Water System. The additional water is proposed for the construction period, 1994 through 1998, with a total of 100,000 acre-feet of 1,000,000,000 acre-feet in 1987. The parties further agree that the Peacekeeper demand represents the permanent and the total amount to be supplied is the estimated demand for the Peacekeeper additional amount from the municipal water system. In light of all the above, 100 agrees to support a request for funding to meet Peacekeeper's additional water demand while developing an acceptable level of efficiency of a reliable water supply in light of ongoing studies.

C. 100 shall provide technical assistance for the mitigation measures identified in this agreement. Such technical assistance shall include, but not be limited to, identification of appropriate funding sources, preparation of funding requests, evaluation of potential mitigation, and technical assistance in preparing funding requests.

D. The parties agree that this agreement is the initial Agreement, and shall not be considered as an alternative to any local agreements that are reached or consent to the final Mitigation Agreement. The parties further agree that any provision of this agreement or any final Mitigation Agreement shall not be considered as an alternative to any Peacekeeper deployments in Nebraska.

Thank you again for your continuing support on this vital national security program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Attache

c. Governor Robert Kerrey

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HONORABLE B.B. BACHMANN
Governor of Wyoming
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

DEAR Governor Bachmann:

RECEIVED
OCT 10 1986
- - - - - - -

I look forward to enclosing a signed copy of the April 14, 1986 Mitigation Agreement by and between the Interagency Executive Impact Council and the U.S. Air Force as modified October 14, 1986. I know that the agreement does not include all the issues. I also agree that we should either modify this agreement or develop a separate one in the event of any Peacekeeper deployments in Nebraska.

Thank you again for your continuing support on this vital national security program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Attache

c. Governor Robert Kerrey

[Attachment]
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whom, the parties agree that the Initial Mitigation Agreement, dated May 7, 1984, is hereby incorporated into this Mitigation Agreement, dated April 16, 1986.

Whereas, the parties acknowledge that timely impact mitigation measures identified in this Agreement are essential and mutually beneficial; and is necessary of local governments to be capable of coping with the projected impacts.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties to this Agreement agree as follows:

1. MEASURES UPTON DOD AUTHORITY

The following measures shall be undertaken by DOD while its existing authority to mitigate impacts resulting from DOD's activities in connection with the construction, deployment, and operation of the Peacekeeper missile.

A. Human Services and Health Care

In order to reduce impacts on local civilian health and human service agencies, DOD shall:

Provide adequate care to active and retired military personnel and their dependents.

B. Unauthorized Residence

DOD shall encourage its contractors through the Environmental Awareness Training Program to prevent project employees from establishing temporary residence in unauthorized locations, including unauthorized camping on private or public lands and extended camping for the purpose of residency in developed recreation areas.

C. Peacekeeper Monitoring Program

To verify conclusions from the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Wyoming/Idaho Socioeconomic Impact Study, and the Fiscal Impact Analysis, DOD has implemented the Peacekeeper Monitoring Program and has provided training and funding.

D. Transportation

Increased traffic on the Cheyenne marching system will have an overall moderate, significant impact because it will reduce the level of service below optimal design standards (FEIS, p.1.1.6-9). To reduce these impacts, DOD shall provide project-related employee incentives for using high occupancy vehicles such as van pools or car pools and shall schedule more hours for project-related employees to avoid normal current traffic peak hours (FEIS p.1.1.6-2). F.E. Warren AFB shall make specific site assignments to project-related employees to reduce to the maximum extent possible project-related traffic impacts.

E. MEASURES BEYOND DOD AUTHORITY

DOD agrees to support funding requests for the following measures before other federal agencies or Congress, or will assist local jurisdictions in attaining support elsewhere.

A. Schools

The Peacekeeper Program's responsibility to Larimer County School District No. 1 is to support requests for financial assistance through a grant to meet the net operating needs of the School District. The actual amount of the grant shall be based on the demonstrated need for project-related financial assistance each year. Said grant shall include compensation for the net increase in students due to the Peacekeeper Project who enrolled after the audit program for the State Foundation Program, with this amount based upon the Foundation funding formula.

B. Human Services

The Peacekeeper Project may create a demand for additional funding for a variety of human services. DOD agrees to support appropriate funding requests for meeting project-related human services demand, including funding for staffing, and capital facilities and construction operations. Such requests for funds shall be based on the determination of actual financial needs each year.

C. Law Enforcement on Federal Lands

Peacekeeper project impacts on law enforcement in Larimer County are projected to be moderate and significant in the short term (FEIS p.1.1.13-3). These impacts are identified by moderate and significant impacts to regional recreation facilities creating a potential hazard to public safety (FEIS p.1.1.13-4).

To mitigate these law enforcement needs, DOD shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management to ensure that there is adequate law enforcement for project effects on Federal lands in the area, particularly with respect to the Medicine Bow National Forest and Pike National Forest Unit.

D. Game and Fish Law Enforcement

The Peacekeeper project creates a demand for an additional portion of game and fish law enforcement officer from fiscal year 1986 through fiscal year 1989. This requirement is based upon projected in-migration to the area of approximately 3,000 people in each of these years (FEIS p.1.1.13-4) and the Wyoming standard of providing one game and fish law enforcement officer for every 8,000 people. DOD will support a request for transfer to the Wyoming Game and Fish Department of a federal game and fish law enforcement officer under the provisions of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (P.L. 91-646).

E. Outdoor Recreation

Peacekeeper project impacts to regional recreation facilities are predicted to be moderate and significant (FEIS p.1.1.13-4). Fort Carson State Park is expected to receive a significant portion of the project impact due to its proximity to Cheyenne (FEIS p.1.1.13-4).

Increased fishing pressure on perennial streams in the area due to the Project may be significant (FEIS p.1.2.1.13). Impacts from
increased fishing pressure on the upper portion of the region of influence are estimated at 14,000 recreation days during the peak year (PEIS p.4-3). This scenario represents an increase of 8 percent over the present supply within a 300-mile radius of Cheyenne. (A Strategic Plan For the Comprehensive Management of wildlife in Wyoming, 1986-1990.)

Project impacts to hunting recreation for big game are significant due to increased hunting pressure due to population increase in areas where concentrated recreation pressures occur. The impacts to big game are significant, moderate impacts (PEIS p.3.3.2-8). To mitigate these impacts, TBD shall institute a conservation area on Air Force installation land for riparian and upland areas, shall develop a management plan for protection of rare plant species and sensitive habitat on F.E. Warren AFB, and shall increase productivity in selected areas of wildlife habitats on F.E. Warren AFB through promotion of range improvement programs (PEIS p.3.3.2-7). In cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department, the Wyoming Recreation Commission, and the City of Cheyenne shall explore ways to meet the demand for outdoor recreation activity due to the project.

F. Traffic

Road traffic demand on the Cheyenne roadway system under the Proposed action will have an overall moderate, significant impact because it will reduce level of service below minimum desirable design standards. In particular, level of service decreases will occur at the intersection of 10th Street and 20th Street between Pershing Boulevard and Missile Drive; at various intersections on 10th Street and 20th Street between Pershing Boulevard and Missile Drive; at various intersections on Pershing Boulevard between Converse Avenue and Randall Avenue; at the intersections of 10th Street with Central Avenue and Carey Avenue; and at the intersection of Snyder Avenue with Randall Avenue. Level of service reductions at some of these intersections have moderate or high impacts. Impacts are significant since the level of service is reduced below existing design standards (PEIS p.3.1.4-9).

To mitigate these impacts, it is necessary to improve traffic signalization and make related geometric improvements at the intersections of 10th Street and Central Avenue; at the intersections of 20th Street and 10th Street with Highway 29 and Missile Drive; at various intersections on Pershing Boulevard between Converse Avenue and Randall Avenue, as identified in the Community Impact Plan's Transportation Volume II (Cheyenne Impact Corridor Plan); and at the intersections of 20th Street (West Lincolny) with Anna Avenue and Missile Drive as detailed in the Transportation FEIS (PEIS p.3.1.4-9). TBD agrees to support funding requests for these improvements.

6. Local Recreation

Local recreation impacts in Cheyenne are high and significant. Demand for developed park land due to the project will exceed the supply by 15.9 acres (PEIS p.3.1.5-9). The City of Cheyenne Parks Master Plan identifies the following needs within the City of Cheyenne:

Development of a neighborhood park near Anderson School to alleviate pressure created by more than 500 persons expected to locate in the Frontier Mall neighborhoods;

Completion of Sunnyside Park and its developed facilities to alleviate the pressure created by more than 500 persons expected to locate in the Glacier Park neighborhood;

Expansion of Sun Valley Community Park to at least 10 acres and provision of developed facilities to alleviate the pressure created by more than 500 persons expected to locate in the Grandview neighborhood; and

It is recognized by all parties that the level of impact assistance payments identified in the FIA are merely estimates and may be in error.

It is further recognized that if the impact assistance payments do not accumulate as projected to the FIA, the resulting short fall will require additional funding requests. Therefore, TBD or the Air Force agrees to support additional funding to ensure that revenues contemplated by the FIA are in fact realized.

IV. Mitigation measures included within this agreement are based upon projected employment levels and projected impacts contained in the FEIS and projected revenues and expenditure requirements contained in the FIA. If the Peacekeeper Monitoring Program demonstrates that there will be insufficient revenue to the City of Cheyenne, Laramie County, or Laramie County School District No. 1 to match project-related expenditures, if project employment exceeds employment forecasts in the FEIS by more than 10 percent, or if there is substantial attrition of existing plans to deploy the Peacekeeper at F.E. Warren AFB: TBD agrees that modification of this agreement shall be required to achieve appropriate mitigation.

V. If a mitigation measure included in this mitigation agreement is denied funding, the agreement will be renegotiated at the request of the FEIS. TBD will support the agreement as revised.

VI. The parties agree that the Agreement supersedes the Initial Mitigation Agreement, and that the Initial Mitigation Agreement is incorporated herein by reference and remains in effect.

VII. Termination

The parties agree to terminate this Agreement if any of the following should occur:

Conclusion of an Agreement among the parties which explicitly supersedes this Agreement.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT 488</th>
<th>DOCUMENT 489</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Environmental Planning</td>
<td>Director of Environmental Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APICE 1995/26</td>
<td>Air Force Base because of the likelihood of death or serious injury to persons in the vicinity, such a risk is unwarranted by the MX Air garnison Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Edwin D. Lucas
P.O. Box 59, Grand Forks, ND 58201
GRAN CANARY
Aug. 31, 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT 490</th>
<th>DOCUMENT 491</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: 51695-2220</td>
<td>Location: 51695-2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Comment Sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to announce for you the environmental consequences we have determined may occur if the Peacekeeper Ball (MX) Program is implemented. We have prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement that will be available to the public for review and comment. The Final Statement of the program is made. Your comments on the review statement on the program is made. Your comments on the review statement on the program is made. Please let us know how we can improve the Environmental Impact Statement. |

Jim Coleman 811 58205-3

Name: Street Address: City: State: Zip: Phone: Email: Fax: Other: 

Thank you for considering to respond. 
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The League of Women Voters of Wyoming has chosen to respond to the DEIS on the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program—Warren AFB—Wyoming. The League of Women Voters supported the INF Treaty to reduce danger of nuclear conflict in Europe and remains committed to support NATO allies with conventional forces. As a result of an extensive nation-wide grassroots study, the LWV-WY and Wy adopted a position in May of 1984 that nuclear weapons should serve only a specific function: to deter a preventive attack. This position was adopted at the May 1984 Annual Meeting in Cheyenne, Wyoming. The League does not support any modernization of US land-based ICBMs that would result in weapons that are vulnerable or would increase the incentive to attack first. Our position remains the same concerning the proposed rail garrison program.

Questions from the Wyoming League of Women Voters include:

1. In any credible attack scenario, even with no warning, the U.S. would have remaining about 3,700 warheads capable of returning the attack. Without the ICBM, even if the ICBM is vulnerable, it could return an attack. Without the ICBM, even if the ICBM is vulnerable, it could return an attack.

2. The DEIS does not define adequately the criteria under which the trains would be deployed ("national need" is hardly adequate for the public or Congress to evaluate). How often would the system run? How far would the system run? How often would the system run? How far would the system run?

3. Finally, Senator Cohen and Duke suggested that rail garrison could be later turned into a continuously mobile system. Is this a possibility? Do AF contingency plans include such a plan? What would such a plan do to the first assessment section on ground forces?

4. Of the rail garrison program, which this study reviewed, how many warheads would be exchanged with the rail garrison program from 1982-87? Address completely possible double impact for Cheyenne. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Linda L. Kirkland
Secretary, Wyoming, Wyoming 82081
5. As regards the contents of the EIS itself, the document certainly was not designed to properly inform the involved public of the nature of the project and of the environmental effects as it is required by NEPA. There was no description of the tracks that would be used in an emergency. All that was mentioned was the immediate Great Falls area. What about the effect on the people and towns along the BN lines like Chester should there be an emergency? We have no idea what areas are involved.

6. No mention was made of the halflife of plutonium which I believe is about 40,000 years.

7. I think that computer studies of the spreading of the contaminants should there be an accident were inaccurate in that the basic assumptions were not accurate. This includes wind velocity and elevations.

8. The EIS did not consider the effects of a attack by submarines located off the coast of Washington in which case there would be only about 15 minutes warning. What would happen? Would the general public be in more danger in such a case if the missiles were located in Great Falls?

9. All assumptions of the EIS as regards accidents assumes that there would be no attack without a great deal of notice. No mention was made specifically of this point but it became obvious in conversations with Air Force people after.

10. No discussion was contained in the EIS for the event of a sneak attack with no notice and the effect of this on the people of Great Falls. No discussion was contained in the EIS about the need for the MX project if their was a sneak attack since it would not do anyone any good.
This section includes transcripts from the 11 public hearings held for F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming; Barksdale AFB, Louisiana; Dyess AFB, Texas; Eaker AFB, Arkansas; Fairchild AFB, Washington; Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota; Little Rock AFB, Arkansas; Malmstrom AFB, Montana; Minot AFB, North Dakota; Whiteman AFB, Missouri; and Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan. The transcripts are presented four sheets to a page and are numbered 500 to 510.

These are the transcripts as received from court reporters who took notes at each of the public hearings and transcribed them for this publication. Only minor corrections to some important words which could impair the readers' understanding were made.
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back to Cheyenne. At the scoping hearing, I made a
couple of comments that I was pleased to see were
addressed this evening and subsequent to that time.
One was on the safety issue, and, Lieutenant Colonel
Hamel, thank you for a very comprehensive review on
the safety.

The second had to do with monitoring, and I'm
very pleased that the Air Force has made a commitment
not only here, but at the other bases, to monitor at
the time of the deployment the types of socioeconomic
impacts that may emerge during the particular
deployment.

Also at the scoping hearing, I indicated that
the Mayor's Impact Team would provide you with
information and concerns that we had. We sent that to
you, and later on this evening, Mr. Hilt Moore will
give you a report on some additional issues and
questions that we have from the Mayor's Impact Team
and the Intergovernmental Executive Council.

I have a couple comments that I'd like to
make. I'm pleased that your Appendix A addresses the
local economy and the ways to provide for hiring of
local people involved in the construction of the rail
garrison. I'm also pleased with your views about the
sales tax impact assistance, and I look forward to the
planning process and to obtain comment and input on
the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and is an
important part of the planning process if the rail
garrison is to be deployed in Wyoming.

National Defense strategy will ultimately be
decided by the executive and legislative branches in
Washington D.C. The final Environmental Impact
Statement and the public input will help to influence
and shape the final decision and its impact on our
state.

Wyoming will play a significant role in the
proposed rail garrison Basing Model. It is imperative
that this, or any other system to be deployed, be
evaluated and determined to be safe. Impacts need to
be adequately addressed and attenuated to reduce, if
not eliminate, adverse impacts, real or potential.

The State of Wyoming has adopted policies and
procedures to address impacts from the construction of
major facilities and appropriate mitigation. Federal
government activities are exempt from the
formal review under the Industrial Act.

It is my policy, however, as it was Governor
Scherber's, for my office to be actively involved in
the review of all significant activities that can
affect the state or local governmental entities.

state also recognizing that we will have an impact as
a result of the rail garrison if it is deployed.

I wish I had more time because I'd like to
speak longer, and as a politician, we always like to
speak longer. But I have a personal comment. I want
to commend the Air Force. I want to commend the Air
Forces for the work that you do to protect us in this
country. I believe very strongly in national Defense.
I think the people of this community think very strongly
of national Defense. Keep up the good work.

We are somewhat isolated from the terrorism
and the aggression that goes on around the world, and
we here have a great quality of life, and you help us
protect it. Thank you.

COL. MCNAMEE: Thank you. Next is Alan
Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: Colonel McNamee, my name
is Alan Edwards. I'm with the State Management
Coordinator's office. Governor Sullivan was unable to
attend tonight and asked if I would present this
statement on his behalf.

I would like to take this opportunity to
thank the Air Force for providing the opportunity to
participate in this public hearing. The public
hearing is to enlist public involvement in the

impacts are no less real regardless of whether the
facilities are to be developed by the private or the
public sector.

In several areas, the Draft EIS fails to
provide adequate detail to allow a reviewer the
opportunity to fully and critically evaluate and test
the conclusions presented. Some of the data presented
is undocumented, which, in turn, reflects on the
reliability of the impacts outlined and the conclusions
reached.

One example would be the use in the Draft EIS
of 1985 data from the Wyoming highway department to
evaluate transportation impacts or the conclusion that
reserve funds of governmental entities are sufficient
to absorb the increased access on systems. Several
changes have occurred since 1985 which would affect
that traffic data, and reserve funds are not available
in most instances for such purpose, even if we could
agree that reserves are subject to such a call, which
we do not.

The Draft EIS identifies that there will be a
significant geologic impact resulting from the erosion
loss of topsoil in some areas. Yet, the Draft EIS
also indicates that the air and water quality impacts
will be insignificant. Better understanding of the
receive adequate attention and that the basis for a
competent decision is presented.

I will reserve my final review and comments
regarding this proposal until the completion of the
review process. Only until the review of the final
EIS will it be possible to assess an objective
assessment and decision concerning the proposal. I
would highlight, however, the importance of safety and
ongoing intergovernmental planning process and
emphasis on Wyoming contractors and workers.

Thank you again for the opportunity to
participate in the planning process on this proposal.

Colonel.

COL. MUSKAN: Thank you. Since that
was a letter from the Governor and I thought that
everybody would like to hear the entire thing, I did
let Mr. Edwards run a little longer, but I will keep
others to the three minutes. Janet Whitehead please.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Colonel Muskan and
panel, I have a prepared statement here regarding the
impact as I see it due to our analysis in bringing up
to date, answering sections 4.2.1.2 through 4.2.1.5 of
your impact statement.

The amounts stated for revenues and
expenditures for 1987 are basically correct, but the

receive adequate attention and that the basis for a
competent decision is presented.

I will reserve my final review and comments
regarding this proposal until the completion of the
review process. Only until the review of the final
EIS will it be possible to assess an objective
assessment and decision concerning the proposal. I
would highlight, however, the importance of safety and
ongoing intergovernmental planning process and
emphasis on Wyoming contractors and workers.

Thank you again for the opportunity to
participate in the planning process on this proposal.

Colonel.

COL. MUSKAN: Thank you. Since that
was a letter from the Governor and I thought that
everybody would like to hear the entire thing, I did
let Mr. Edwards run a little longer, but I will keep
others to the three minutes. Janet Whitehead please.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Colonel Muskan and
panel, I have a prepared statement here regarding the
impact as I see it due to our analysis in bringing up
to date, answering sections 4.2.1.2 through 4.2.1.5 of
your impact statement.

The amounts stated for revenues and
expenditures for 1987 are basically correct, but the

receive adequate attention and that the basis for a
competent decision is presented.

I will reserve my final review and comments
regarding this proposal until the completion of the
review process. Only until the review of the final
EIS will it be possible to assess an objective
assessment and decision concerning the proposal. I
would highlight, however, the importance of safety and
ongoing intergovernmental planning process and
emphasis on Wyoming contractors and workers.

Thank you again for the opportunity to
participate in the planning process on this proposal.

Colonel.

COL. MUSKAN: Thank you. Since that
was a letter from the Governor and I thought that
everybody would like to hear the entire thing, I did
let Mr. Edwards run a little longer, but I will keep
others to the three minutes. Janet Whitehead please.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Colonel Muskan and
panel, I have a prepared statement here regarding the
impact as I see it due to our analysis in bringing up
to date, answering sections 4.2.1.2 through 4.2.1.5 of
your impact statement.

The amounts stated for revenues and
expenditures for 1987 are basically correct, but the
are unwilling or unable to attend this proposal meeting, I would like to extend this invitation to

general Chair, Head of the Strategic Air Command, who
also happens to be a Universalist member. I
believe the ethical and moral implications should
be addressed, articulated, and confronted in a systematic
meaningful way, and our species' collective and
progressive survival and cultural development on the
planet depends on this. Thank you.

10. COL. MUSEN: Thank you, take it.
11. Those were rhetorical questions or questions you want
directed in the end -
12. AIR. WARREN: in the final draft.
13. COL. MUSEN: All right. Thomas Mines.
14. MR. MINES: Gentlemen, I would like to
15. thank you for the excellent briefing, just a brief
16. statement to say that I think the benefits to be
17. derived from the rail program far exceed any minimal
18. environmental impacts that were gone over during the
briefing, and I just firmly believe this is a major
19. project that we need locally, nationally, and as a
20. national deterrent. Thank you.
21. COL. MUSEN: Thank you. Tom Lindsey.
22. MR. LINDSEY: Tom Lindsey, I'm retired.
23. Colonel, it's a good presentation. I have a few

things about the culture of this America that I'd like
to discuss, and I would appreciate if we didn't squander
any more money making other studies on other missiles,
just for the delay of our quest of missiles is what
you need.

10. The focus of this R&D is the cultural aspect
of life in America; in particular, around Cheyenne.
11. The primary element of culture in America is freedom.
12. We cannot remain free and exist, unable to -- and unwilling
to defend our freedom. Those we call on to defend our
freedom should be given the latest and most weapons
possible and our full support.

13. It's psychologically devastating to call on
your military people to defend us with less than the
latest and best weaponry available and our fullest
support. We must never again let any group inflict on
the psychological -- inflict the psychological and
physical damage on the freedom defenders that was
imposed on our men in Vietnam.
14. Security is another element in our culture.
15. Every American, especially the young people, need to
realize that this country is strong enough and willing
to protect him and our way of life. Strong
16. retaliatory power and the SDI will deter attack from
any aggressor.

1. effects will result from this project? A, how much
money is at risk from city, county, and state levels
in the event the Air Force fails to respond to citizen
complaints? And B, how many jobs will be lost to
Cheyenne, Laramie County, and southwestern Wyoming by new
businesses who refuse to reside here because of the
project's existence?

1. Concern number two, noise pollution: I'm not
sure what negligible means. What societal range will
residents be exposed to when the project is under
construction? And B, what will be the decibel range
during the only if two are activated in terms of
training and so forth?

13. I would like to invite representatives of the
Cheyenne Air Force Base to meet face to face with some
concerned church representatives to address the moral
implications of the rail project. I believe
the ethical and moral implications are specifically
not included in the R&D or similar public relations
events, and specifically addressing these
implications would demonstrate much goodwill on the
part of Warren Air Force personnel.

In the event that Warren Air Force personnel

1. training
2. affect on the ability of our County to provide the
3. increased services required by the impact of the
4. project. It would be helpful for the impact statement
5. to include the projected amounts of the increases in
6. sales taxes, fines, fees, and so forth, which will be
7. generated by the project during the project period.
8. I thank you for being able to speak to you

this evening.

10. COL. MUSEN: Thank you. Did you want
11. to leave that for the record as well?
12. MS. KLEIN: I certainly would.
13. COL. MUSEN: Just put it there on the
14. stage. Thank you, sir.
15. AIR. WARREN: Colonel Museen and panel,
16. I have two prepared statements, and I'll try to get
17. them within the 15 minutes. I am a homeowner and
18. resident of Cheyenne, and March 33 I mailed 11
19. questions, none of which were addressed in specific
detail in the EIS draft statement, which I received
20. two days ago. And I am struck that several areas of
21. concern were only superficially or generally addressed.
22. I will be resubmitting those, those questions. I have
23. two additional concerns.
24. Number one, economic: what adverse economic:

1. to complete the rail program, it will have an
2. effect on the ability of our County to provide the
3. increased services required by the impact of the
4. project. It would be helpful for the impact statement
5. to include the projected amounts of the increases in
6. sales taxes, fines, fees, and so forth, which will be
7. generated by the project during the project period.
8. I thank you for being able to speak to you

this evening.

10. COL. MUSEN: Thank you. Did you want
11. to leave that for the record as well?
12. MS. KLEIN: I certainly would.
13. COL. MUSEN: Just put it there on the
14. stage. Thank you, sir.
15. AIR. WARREN: Colonel Museen and panel,
16. I have two prepared statements, and I'll try to get
17. them within the 15 minutes. I am a homeowner and
18. resident of Cheyenne, and March 33 I mailed 11
19. questions, none of which were addressed in specific
detail in the EIS draft statement, which I received
20. two days ago. And I am struck that several areas of
21. concern were only superficially or generally addressed.
22. I will be resubmitting those, those questions. I have
23. two additional concerns.
24. Number one, economic: what adverse economic:
Other points of American culture are the
wonderful qualities of love, peace, caring, justice.
We must not allow a few to surrender these qualities
to debauchery, weakness, and tyranny.
It's likely these American qualities will endure.
If we allow them to
lose surrender, we will lose the strength
which makes freedom, security, love, caring,
peace, and justice possible. We and our culture are
doomed to nothingness.
However, we can prevail. If we maintain our
strength and freedom with the other qualities that are
possible, this nation and culture may exist for ten
thousand years and more. We will keep our
property and freedom intact, and I've been here tonight to advise
that the Union Pacific has renewed the proposed
Peacekeepers Rail Garrison project and that from a
tactical and operational standpoint, we cannot see any
alternative.

I would also like to go on record opposing
the fact that there is no hearing being held on
Laramie. This is a very concerned people. I'm here to
advise these people to travel to Laramie. I refer to the
reported route of travel for the Mc train. I assume
Laramie would be on that route. In the event of any
characteristics, Laramie would be in the fall out
route, and I think it would only be polite and
reasonable for the Air Force to conduct a hearing and
to make Laramie part of the route on this tour.
I would like to see the Mc Action alternative
addressed in more detail. Specifically, the spending of
the funds proposed for the Mc Rail Garrison being
addressed to other areas of our environment and our
economy. The United States has the distinction of
being the biggest debtor nation in the world. With no
real national security being better enhanced by
reducing our debt, by educating the illiterate, by
housing homeless, by feeding the hungry, providing
health care to older people. I think these are valid
concerns and should be part of the Mc Action
alternative.
I appreciate the attention given to the
accident issue. I still have a few concerns. You
talk about maintenance being higher, but I'm not real
aware of how much the cost of maintenance could be.
An article in last week's paper about an accident
that possibly resulted from heat building same rails.
How would specific issues relate to this addressed? I
would like to see more specific accidents taken into
consideration and some assurances given that those
could be minimized from the current state of affairs.
I'm also a little concerned. You state that
the EIS addressed practical use, and yet, when we
start looking at the use of the train on the track,
we talk about them being out on the tracks which would
be a wartime or national need situation. If we're
going to look at that, then let's look at the
possibility of accidental loss. We've all seen the
tragic occurrences, such as the air duct that was shot
down. Those were military personnel involved in these
type of accidents. And I have real concern that if
these trains are out and about, somebody has the
capability to launch it, and an accident could occur.
I have some additional comments to make.
Before the 16th. Thank you for this time.

COL. MICHAELE: Thank you, Robert Mitchell.

M.R. MITCHELL: Robert Mitchell. I live at 1915 Truesdale Trail. I'm a private citizen. I only have one question, and that is, how do you expect to mitigate the effects on the national historic sites here on the Base?

COL. MICHAELE: Colonel Walsh.

COL. WALSH: I'll start it off and then I'll ask Mr. Mitchell to elaborate. We work very closely with the State Historic Preservation officer whenever we get involved in any dealings with historic facilities or historic sites. We will develop a measure—no measure to abolish our impact, and again, I think the best example is what we did in the past is the case of what we might do in the future.

I think the most important is the best way to go about this is, of course, avoidance and we have, in fact, avoided most of the sites to date and then find them in so that they wouldn't further impact them.

We're making necessary efforts for Blytheville, for instance, to avoid that major archaeological find that we found down there, and to fence it off and preserve it from this point on. Sometimes it's not always possible to avoid a site, and for instance, we may have to continue use of the historic buildings on the Base.

So therefore, when we start to use these buildings, we make modifications to these buildings so that modifications mixed in with the original architect's lines. We don't try to put modern buildings or modern enclosures on to 1915 Truesdale Trail. Any new buildings that we build in the vicinity of the historic district are built in the same style so we don't have a violent contrast with the facilities that there. These are the types of efforts that we implement to minimize our impact upon these historic facilities. But, however, we will sit down with the State Historic Preservation officer and we will work out a series of modifications appropriate for this particular construction at the appropriate times.

Thank you, sir.

MR. MITCHELL: I agree with some of the previous speakers who stated their opinions on why the site should be employed. Thank you for your response.

COL. MICHAELE: Thank you, Phyllis Atkinson.

Now, Atkinson. I'm Phyllis Atkinson, I'm a rancher. I live southwest of Cheyenne. I've lived within a couple of miles of the NS--well, of NS missile site since the Atlas was first introduced into this area. I agree with Mayor Dish, I agree with Mr. D. P. Brown. I agree with Mr. Lindsey, that the United States is to blame for the war and must assume defense systems that can be employed. For that reason, I think this thing is absolutely foolish.

I brought with me some statements. I do have a question to ask, but I don't want it answered verbally because I think it takes away from the people who want to contribute and only have a short period of time. My question is, because I brought only two articles from local newspapers, one from the Pine Bluffs Post dated June 14, 1968, where they list 102 or a core drill in a period of less than a week in the Wyoming area from heat buckling, which was mentioned by the lady from Lincoln. Also, the Montana section where they were drilled before the 16th. is attributed to a possibility of extreme weather.

And my question is, which I don't want answered now, we have two alternatives, and I would be interested in the impact statement addressing either or both, are we going to be able to negotiate with any potential enemy to arrange for an international climate exchange meeting periods of moderate climate so that the rails are not buckled by extreme heat or controlled by extremely cold.

We could plan for this, which is not always dependable in Wyoming, or anywhere, which is not either very dependable. I'm a rancher, I know, or are we going to attempt to erect these necessary tracks which are going to radiate from these tunnels that keep the temperature controlled and therefore impossible enclosures so that the tracks will be exempt from climate disasters? Thank you.

COL. MICHAELE: Thank you.

MS. ATKINSON: One more thing. On a ranch, we have a list for this, and I hate to see you bright people exposing this kind of a defense system. Our word in May -- our phrase may be smooth, but it's not just; 2 four-letter words, and kind of BS. Thank you.

COL. MICHAELE: Thank you, Mrs. Warsaw.

MS. WARSOW: Colonel McShane, my name is Sylvia Warsaw. I live here in Cheyenne. I'd like to ask some questions which won't take too long and would appreciate them being addressed in the final statement rather than here in the focus this evening.
The first issue is, what will be the environmental impact of not deploying the missile trains, of not building the garrisons, of not building the assembly complex? What will be the environmental impact of not building any more MX missiles and what will be the impact on the global environment of recovering and deactivating all ground-based ICBMs?

Also, it can be anticipated that increased funding for this project would result in cuts in other government programs. You must consider the impact of reduced funding for agriculture, for infrastructure, the Environmental Protection Agency, grants in the NEA, and humanities and research, prevention detection, and treatment of diseases, postal rights, and services and programs alleviating poverty, hunger, and homelessness in our country, and many other programs. We consider the impact a reduced funding for these programs.

And if the MX is a deterrent, how can it be placed in a role that takes so long to activate? And why is it aimed on Soviet missiles? Both of those would seem to invite a Soviet first strike. On the other hand, if it is a first-strike weapon, as it appears to be, why do you continue to call it a deterrent? Do the Soviets perceive the to be a first-strike weapon, and if so, how would that affect our strategic thinking?

1. Air Force to bear the response of the interested persons who have read the draft issue, and I'm very grateful for this opportunity to tell you how scared I am.

And I'm more afraid after I read the impact statement, because you are telling us that we have nothing to worry about, and that's the most scary of all, is that I feel like the real reasons to be scared are not being faced by the most important people to face the issue of it is safe, is it safe. And there are people who are more afraid than I am, they're speechless.

COL. MCBRANE: Thank you, ma'am, Brian Olson.

MR. OLSON: My name is Brian Olson. I live at 301 Copperville Road here in Cheyenne, and a member of the -- primary mover of the hearings of Cheyenne Committee and the Air Force Association. I spent as a member not for those organizations.

Initially, when the concept of rail garrison was first -- was first brought up, I had a lot of questions and concerns. I have supported Peacekeepers deployment in the initial single being mode. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement that I have read through twice now in quite detail answers a lot of my
The specific area I would like to see addressed is the issue of track maintenance. It was somewhat reassuring to hear the Union Pacific spokesman saying they didn't see any significant problems, but I would like to see the issue of track maintenance, who is going to supervise that. Do you work in conjunction with the commercial railroads with the specific tracks or is that independent, and also the expertise of the people involved in the maintenance of those tracks.

If that can be addressed a little bit more specifically, it's an 100 percent behind that instead of maybe 99.9. Thank you very much.

COL. MUSHAIRE: Thank you, Colonel Walsh, are you able to address that thought?

COL. WALKH: While I cannot address the specifics of the maintenance, I can basically tell you the way in which we will be conducting business with the various railroads, and that is that as any other company that uses, say, Union Pacific's rail, will be paying a use fee, and a portion of that use fee will, in fact, be utilized by that rail company in order to maintain their tracks.

I should indicate to you that in recent years because of what is known as the Buffer's Act that was

past some years ago, the rail companies have been able to abandon selective routes, and therefore, focus more on maintenance dollars on those - on those routes that they use on a more frequent basis. So this is added not only more efficiency to the rail companies, but also allowed them to upgrade their tracks so that they are more dependable.

The other factor that you should be aware of is that we have been working with the various rail companies through the national - through the Federal Railway Administration and through the American Association of Railroads, to analyze the capabilities of the rail system.

And we have looked at the rail system for its condition, for its weight-carrying capabilities, from its allowable restrictions, and we have found that over 120,000 miles of rail is available to us today that we can safely transport. Thank you very much.

COL. MUSHAIRE: Robert Scott.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Colonel McShane.

I am Robert Scott, a retired citizen of Cheyenne and state of WYoming. I would like to say thank you for a very detailed environmental statement. I support the program a hundred percent. History has

shown through the years that a nation only survives through strength, and this adds to our capability as a nation.

Additionally, the Peacekeeper system with its deployment here at Francis E. Warren has already proven its capability to influence any aggressor or potential aggressor. It did, in fact, assist along with the deployment of the cruise missiles to England and Europe that assisted in bringing the Soviet Union back to the conference table to sit down and talk peace, because we did, in fact, increase our strength in the eyes of the world.

The area here has lived with missiles, nuclear missiles, in our vicinity for 15 years. We have brought missiles in the area over the railroads throughout that 10-year period successfully. Weapon system launch vehicles have arrived in the area and transported throughout the area as required to maintain the system successfully with no incidents.

The Mobility Vehicles are designed, as we explained earlier, to withstand fire and heavy impact potentially from aircraft crash. They have endured those successfully with no nuclear disaster.

The deployment of the MB Peacekeeper system in Cheyenne has already, through previous impact
MR. MARTIN: I am Carl Martin, Laramie, Wyoming. Although it was quite enlightening to me to be here tonight, I still have some problems with this Existing System based on several things. One of these -- some of which have come from the Union of Concerned Scientists.

First of all, the more missiles we have, the more problems we have with being attacked from our supposed enemies. I'm not sure that we do have enemies, but the problems that I have are from my family and my children.

First of all, the railroad goes right through the middle of town in Laramie, Wyoming, and even though the possibility of a nuclear accident is minimal, what about the possibility of fuel and the possible ignition of the fuel? You say that you need 1,000 feet of clearance for safety reasons, but town in Laramie, Wyoming, a great number of homes and people live less than 1,000 feet from the railroad.

Second, there's no way, I suppose, for you to address the mental stress that is created in a family and its children as a result of becoming more accepting targets. It bothers me greatly that my children may not be able to grow up as a result of increasing our nation's nuclear arsenal. So our mental environment has been destroyed.

I don't know why we can't work more for peace instead of war. As far as I'm concerned, the more missiles we place, the more vulnerable we become. As stated by the Union of Concerned Scientists, this program is actually more vulnerable than placing missiles in silos or in the ocean that's their opinion. So we are asking ourselves more vulnerable, more prone to first strike from the Soviet Union, and I would like to see these things addressed very definitely, but I would like these things addressed later in your final statement. Thank you.

COL. MCMURRAY: Thank you, Darryl Miller.

MR. MILLER: My name is Darryl Miller. I live at 236 East 2nd Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyoming. My questions are safety questions basically, and they can be addressed preferably in the final Draft EIS. My concerns are with -- generally with the operation of the trains themselves, you know, basically how they would operate.

I guess my question is, and a lot of these questions came out of, like the previous gentleman's, a report from the Union of Concerned Scientists, that the MX raii cars naturally would be heavier than the average rail car, which is 9 feet in width. If the car has 12 feet in width, operator of the train must announce the path and clear the rails of any jacks coming in the opposite direction. What are the security implications of this? This is my first question. And the final -- Federal Railroad Association is concerned about this also.

Also, my next question is concerned with the weight. The MX missile weighs 200,000 pounds. The launch mechanism weighs approximately the same, 200,000 pounds. The federal law stipulates cars can weigh up to 500,000 pounds as long as they have sufficient -- have a sufficient number of axles. Will the MX train comply with the rule of 500,000 pounds?

MR. MCMURRAY: Thank you, Colonel Walsh. I would indicate I didn't want an answer tonight, so we'll honor that. I know you'd like to give an answer, Richard Moore.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Colonel. Members of the panel, my name is Rich Moore. I reside at 502 East 26th Street. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the Better Governmental Impact Council and Mayor's Impact Team. A way of background, welcome back to Cheyenne. Colonel Walsh, we're always glad to see you.

During the previous deployment of the
Mr. RECKER: Excuse me, sir.

COL. WALTER: I would just like to make a short reply here. We agree with you that the effectiveness of the working group that we created for the deployment was very, very effective, and we have used that as an example of what the Air Force can do to mitigate the effects of the project when we were talking to the authorities in other bases that are under consideration for this program.

We intend to work with you to resolve differences on interpretations and so come to a resolution of what the impacts truly are. We also intend to work with you in developing a sense of mitigations; however, they might be reduced as impacts, and then when a decision is made, we will definitely work with you, as we have in the past, to help you implement the mitigations that you choose as the best solution to your problems that we have identified.

Thank you very much, sir.

COL. WALTER: To you, Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: Thank you. We will look forward to working with you in the future to resolve our concerns.

COL. WALTER: If you had further concerns there in writing, please leave us a copy.

MR. MOORE: I will leave a full copy on the steps. Thank you.

COL. WALTER: Thank you.
Column. For the gentlemen that was concerned with
the moral and ethical differences and wants the Air
Force to meet with his church, you don’t authorize the
money, you don’t say do this, that’s with the people
that do that. They can do anything. Don’t put
these good gentlemen in a position of telling their
commander and chief, I don’t believe in this, I won’t
do it. That’s not a Christian thing to do.

MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: It was an
invitation.

MR. WOOD: Now, Sister, I’m sorry that
you’re afraid for yourself after reading this, but you
can be sure there will be no black sedan and people
with black coats come see you because you disagreed
with other people who have been here.

Now, for you about the railroad tracks that
swelled and buckled or froze and buckled, stop and
think how many thousands of miles of track didn’t
buckle and how many trains didn’t fall off the track.
You’re looking at, my water’s almost gone because I
took one swollen out of the glass.

For the gentleman that talks about mental
stress of the children and himself, the people
that run this train love their children just as much as you
love yours and love their wife as much as you love

National need, quote, is hardly adequate for the
public or Congress to evaluate how often the system
would leave the garrison. Therefore, please address
if there can be an effective analysis of the risk
measurements that are based on the numbers of rail
miles traveled.

And finally, Senator Cohen, Republican of
Maine, said that the Department of Defense briefing
implied that the rail garrison system could be later
turned into a continuously mobile system. Is that a
possibility? Do Air Force contingency plans include
such a plan, and what would such a plan do to the risk
assessment section of the DEIS?

Will this document serve as the Environmental
Impact Statement on the Minuteman Missile, which this
DEIS said that up to 150 single-warhead missiles will
be concurrently based with the rail garrison system from
1993 to 1997? Please address completely the possible
double impact for this community. Thank you very much.

COL. MISHAWE: Did you want those
concerns addressed tonight?

MR. KIRKBRIDGE: I’ll leave my time to
someone else. Thank you.

COL. MISHAWE: Thank you, Jim Applegate
please.
MR. APPLEGATE: Colonel McShane, panel.

Colonel Branch, welcome back. I'm Jim Applegate, I'm the chairman of the board for the Board of Public Utilities for Cheyenne. We have responsibility for the water and sewer distribution mains and collection mains here in Cheyenne, and we serve the base as well.

We believe that your draft statement is correct, that that will not have significant impact if the rail Garrison's proposal comes to fruition.

As a private citizen of Cheyenne, I live at 39th and Capital, center of downtown Cheyenne, I believe that this proposal will be worthwhile to Cheyenne in an economic sense, and I firmly support it.

If the national decision makers and the executive and legislative branches decide that this proposal should go forward, I would encourage the Air Force to have Warren Air Force Base as its top location. I think that the impact of building over $120 million potentially would be good for our community, the impact of the jobs during construction would be helpful to our community, and certainly the remaining impact of some 500 new jobs in the community created by this facility would be worthwhile to our community. Thank you.

MR. COHEN: Time, etc.

COL. MCGHANE: Thank you, Peter Holcomb.

MR. HOLCOMB: Colonel McShane, I'd like to thank the Constitution of the United States and the Congress for providing me this opportunity. I heard the word no risk or minimal risk or something like that tonight, and it reminded me of the -- the television thing I saw with the Mayor of Henderson, Arizona, where he said, but they told us it couldn't happen.

And I would like the Environmental Impact Statement to assess the government's record of credibility about safety. Remember the space shuttle, Three Mile Island, the explosion in Utah this year, and so on. I think that needs to be evaluated.

I also would like to get some numbers straight. I understand there are 11 sites being considered. In one scenario, there would be four missile trains in each base which would total 84 missiles.

COL. MCGHANE: Let me just interrupt.

It's -- there are 11 sites being considered, possibly four at some locations. Not all of them would necessarily be used. They're all being considered.

MR. HOLCOMB: They're all being considered, yeah. But if they were all used -- if

they were all used, that would only total 100 -- that would only total 84 missiles and you're proposing 59 missiles, where would the other 6 be?

In the other scenario where there are 100 missiles to be deployed nationwide, I understand from the Defense that the missile trains would be increased to 3 at each site, 6 times 11 is 66, and that doesn't total 100 either, that's 6 short. So I'd like those numbers clarified.

The economic part of the No Action alternative needs to be addressed. There are, I'm sure, a number of scientists and engineers employed in developing the missile and missile trains. If they were employed in the civilian economy, developing exportable goods, what would that do to our balance of payments? A number of studies have shown that fewer jobs are created by major weapon systems than any other way to spend money. That needs to be addressed as far as the economic impact.

There are hundreds of thousands of miles of rail line track, and I'm really concerned about the security. How can security be maintained over hundreds of thousands of miles without, in effect, revoking the Constitution?

COL. MCGHANE: Time, etc.
I was called up as a reserve lieutenant in the beginning -- just before World War II, and that same flood that I mentioned washed away some pictures that I wish I had to show tonight. Our guns with a piece of pipe welded between. We had sufficient weapons and rifles to outfit half a regular Army division, and when war broke out, we had to ship most of them to the Philippines to try and save those lives over there. And we had the March of the Bataan.

My other points that I wish to address, I didn't come with a speech, I just made a few notes tonight. The school has been addressed, the roads have been addressed, the airport impact has been addressed, and public services have been addressed, so I will not take time to repeat those again.

But I have been a resident of this city and of this state for some years, and I have yet to see that the general population of this area is not wholly for national defense. And I say that we go ahead with this rail garrison as the most economical feasible method of providing an adequate deterrent to nuclear war. Thank you.

COL. MCKNIE: Thank you, Fred.

MR. SCHLAGTER: My name is Fred.

There have been allegations in the paper and other forms of media that Air Force officials have lied, a little integrity or some dishonesty are intentionally misleading the folks in this community. I've lived here on and off since 1972. I served eight years in the Air Force, so I guess that makes me somewhat biased, but I -- my experience has been that Air Force officials have done their utmost with this impact statement and with other endeavors in the past to be honest with the folks of this community, and I appreciate that.

I think the board should consider in the statement that the so-called Wyoming Against the MX, and I say so-called because I don't feel they are representation of this community or the people of the state, I think a lot of these are out-of-towners, I know some of these are locals. It's an extremely, extremely small minority of this community. I believe that they do in no way represent a majority of the people in this area.

I suggest that the board might also consider taking a sampling, a survey of people in this area for a more accurate picture. That's all I have to say.

COL. MCKNIE: Thank you, Sydney.

Mr. Spiegel. Thank you for the patient and courteous manner in which you endured this long hearing. I'm Sydney Spiegel. I'm a member of Wyoming Against MX. I'm an infantry combat veteran of World War II, with a bronze star for bravery and combat for the Battle of the Bulge.

I think nobody in this room wants to have nuclear war, but there are two basically different approaches as to how to avoid it. There are those that say we need missiles as Peacekeepers, and those are those that say that we have to wind down the arms race and have less missiles. And we can see in this present business that we're conducting here tonight that we're talking about deployment of more missiles, and we can see in the sightings of the INF Treaty the pressures to have less missiles.

Those that say that we who want to wind down the arms race are a small minority are overlooking the crowds that march in Germany and England demanding less missiles, they overlook New Zealand that say they want no missiles, nuclear missiles in their ports, and those that say in Wyoming that we represent a small minority overlook the fact that the Democratic Party which had a majority electing Democratic governors in this state at their last convention resolved, quote,
we are opposed to the escalation of the arms race, specifically, we are opposed to the deployment of the rail-based MX in Wyoming.

I'm sure that the officers here are, as I said, courteous and patient and sincere, and yet, the nation has been shocked recently by the Pentagon scandals showing that there are some people who obviously are more interested in the continuous flow of excessive profits to their pockets than they are in protecting freedom or patriotism or anything like that.

I noted in the previous hearing some questions about the intentional use of the MX Missile, which the three-judge panel at the Court of Appeals had said was a legitimate question. That question has been overruled. The full Court said that the intentional use of the missile is not a subject to be taken care of at this environmental impact hearing.

But I'd like to remind you that our Senator Wnxle Wallop said that the MX Missile is not a defensive weapon, it is an offensive weapon. I quoted him, it is an offensive weapon, the only weapon that we have capable of threatening the Russian missiles and their silos. So, if we have an offensive system, a question that I think the Eighth Circuit did not answer would be a question as to the adversaries'

that clarifying an amendment to the initial opinion.

They also concluded that a discussion of the intentional use of other weapons' see was for the scope of the national Environmental Policy Act.

COL. MCBRANE: Larry Atwell please.

MR. ATWELL: I'm Larry Atwell, executive vice president of the Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce.

I'm here speaking on their behalf this evening. The Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce through a special committee has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program and finds that the proposed project should not adversely affect, impact, the greater Cheyenne area from the position of undue burden of the community's infrastructure, services. An especially significant role is the Cheyenne Air Force Base and its predecessor facilities have been good neighbors and supporters of our community for well over 100 years.

Since its beginning as a military installation, the men and women of the base have contributed to the overall wellbeing of our community, as well as meeting their requirements of their mission. The following areas were given specific scrutiny in the light of the Chamber's mission in the community and addressed herein as follows:

Transportation, the Randall Avenue Interchange has outlived its 20-year design life. The interchange was not designed to handle the significant traffic increase from the E. E. Warren north alternative. The Randall Avenue exit is the main entrance to E. E. Warren, but it is also the main entrance to our capital city. Traffic during the construction phase will create congestion and have potential for accidents whether alternative north or south are selected.

The main gate off Randall must be moved back and the on/off ramp of Randall and I-25 exit must be realigned. The new on-base parking space in place of the very base housing in conjunction with transportation.

The building phase of the call garrison will create traffic mixes and congestion. The EIS concurs with this analysis but suggests that the model will only be during peak traffic hours. Considering this as low impact is not in the best interest of our transportation system. These changes are needed to mitigate the increased travel due to the location of the call garrison.

Number two housing, the need for additional housing is noted in the report; however, it is the position of the Chamber that the Air Force take a more

intentions and adversaries' response to an offensive system threatening their missiles in their silos. And COL. MCBRANE: That's up.

MR. SPIEGEL: And that implies again, then, what is the -- what is the environmental impact of nuclear war on Cheyenne? And is this threat which will ask us a bull's-eye Wyoming? Is there one which is motivated from a desire to protect freedom or do we desire to see that continuous flow of excessive profits to the defense contractors and consultants?

COL. MCBRANE: Thank you.

MAJOR VAN REES: Excuse me, sir. I'd like to make a correction.

COL. MCBRANE: You may make a correction.

MAJOR VAN REES: Just one point of clarification. You were correct when you stated that the full Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals determined that in the Peacekeeper Minuteman hearing the board was not to discuss the intentional use of the weapon.

You stated the judge had previously heard that case and and determined that it was an issue that was to be decided in the EIS.

It's a little known fact that the three-panel judge issued a declaratory opinion some two weeks after they initial their initial opinion, and in
that the Air Force expected most of us to read in
three weeks or less, and what a delight to read. The
manuscript is littered with initials and acronyms,
such as NORAD, USAF, AIC, ICBM, SS, LGM, and less.
But not least, SV. Now, the Air Force did not mean
recreational vehicles, but it meant Heavy
vehicles, that part of the missile that carries the
bomb.
9. The preparers of this document use so many
initials that they needed 33 pages to address the
glossary of terms and acronyms. The Air Force also
decided that we all had to learn about 140 or more
and knew that we could absorb highly technical
material quickly, such as rail transport versus truck.
10. How, then, is this system going to work? The
Air Force states, quote, "When directed by the
national command authority, trains could be moved onto
the rail network within several hours of notification.
Peacekeeper trains could disperse over thousands of
miles of track, thereby complicating the enemy's
targets."
11. Within several hours, it takes less than 30
minutes for an ICBM to come from the Soviet Union to
Wyoming. Does this mean there will be missile trains
running around on the tracks all the time so that the

affirmative role in ensuring that the private sector
at the local level be induced in meeting the
identified demands, both on and off the base. The
final BIS should identify mechanisms to achieve a
satisfactory balance.
Three education, the Air Force has
identified impacts anticipated in this area and past
responses by Air Force have been commendable. The
Committee wishes to encourage the Air Force to ensure
that the community is provided with the means to
mitigate identified impacts which might occur in the
local education system.
Four: economic, the proposed project is
projected to have a positive impact on the community.
Although this is important, it is our desire to ensure
long-term benefits to the community. It is, therefore,
desirable that the Air Force consider mechanisms
whereby business development which occurs from this
project generates localized opportunities. These
opportunities could be the seeds to strengthen our
economy.

In conclusion, we wish to state that our
committee will submit a more specific comment letter
by the August 30, 1988, deadline, and we will continue
to support the aim and wishes of Francis E. Warren Air

1. We thank the Air Force for the opportunity to
review and comment on the BIS and we have the
confidence that in knowing our issues will be
addressed and that with all of us working together as
we have in our long history, we will, as a business
community, strive to assist you, the Air Force, in
meeting the demands of your mission. Thank you.
COL. McGRAVE: Thank you, I would note
that that was 31 August. You have until 31 August,
not 30 August. Eileen Starr.
Ms. STARR: My name is Eileen Starr, I
reside at 315 East 1st Street in Cheyenne, I'm a
private citizen. I went to thank the Air Force for
giving me this opportunity to express my opinion at
this public hearing. I ask that answers to my
questions be addressed in writing.
I think this hearing is especially
significant since the Nellis Garrison project has not
been authorized by Congress. The Air Force has
complimented each and every one of us in this audience
tonight. For those of you who received the Draft BIS,
the Air Force believes that each one of you is a
skilled speed reader.
Let's take a look at this document thing

military is always prepared, just in case?
We ask the Air Force to address the No Action
alternative. Their response was, quote, "With this
alternative, the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System
would not be deployed." Clearer answer, actually,
this was not addressed at all. It's very disappointing.
The safety considerations for the Nellis
Garrison System are enormous. Last year alone there
were 2,500 rail accidents within the U.S. Over
176 accidents released hazardous materials, but the Air
Force assures us that there is no problem.
In their estimate, in the absence of a mishap,
the materials in the Peacekeeper Missile would impose
an extremely small health risk. What happens if there
is a mishap? Do you remember what happened at Henderson,
Nevada?
Additionally, remember what happened at the
Morton Thiokol plant over Christmas in Utah? People
were killed when the solid fuel propellant ignited.

COL. McGRAVE: Thank you.
Ms. STARR: Petson #7?
COL. McGRAVE: Thank you.
Ms. STARR: Thank you.
COL. WALSH: Excuse us, sir.
COL. McGRAVE: Colonel Walsh.
COL. Walsh: I'd like to make a
1 correction please. The In Action alternative is
2 included in the document and it is entitled The
3 Existing Future Operating Base, and in fact, there is more
4 time and effort provided to that than the various
5 alternatives. It establishes the base line upon which
6 we superimpose the impacts of the system.
7 And the other corrections I would like to make,
8 that we do, in the safety section, consider the results of
9 a mishap or instance of accident, and we look at what
10 the consequences would be. We look at two situations;
11 what's going to be the consequences of a railroad
12 accident, what is the hazard imposed to the public if
13 there is a mishap from radiation, etcetera, and then
14 what is the hazard imposed on the public to an
15 accident which causes the missile to explode or ignite.
16
17 Thank you.

Ms. Aldrich: Thank you gentlemen, for
19 coming. My name is Annette Aldrich. I live at
20 2400 Harrisman Drive, Livermore California 94551. Although
21 we live in California, we are just over the line, our
22 property backs up to the state line, and we spent 30 -- 30
23 years living in Cheyenne.
24 My question or one of the questions I would
25 like to address to you gentlemen, if this becomes the
26 Working Base, it would seem to reason that we would
27 be one of the primary targets for any incoming missiles.
28
29 COL. MCRANIE: It's true.
30
31 MS. ALDRICH: If so, what provisions will the Air Force have to
32 inform the public on or provide for their safety? If
33 this is not your responsibility, whose is it? Is it
34 the City's, is it the State's, is it the Federal
35 Government?
36 COL. MCRANIE: I agree wholeheartedly.
37 MS. ALDRICH: What provisions can be made with the elderly,
38 the children, and all the others in the city who may
39 not have radios on or maybe none? And if they can
40 come in within 20 minutes, is there any way that the
41 citizens of this city or this State can be protected
42 about - from any incoming missiles?
43 COL. MCRANIE: And there's another thing on the county and
44 city: I would like to ask that I have heard and I would
45 like a correction on or an explanation of. All roads
46 leading to the Base are the responsibility of the City
47 and the County, are they not, or maintenance and for
48 snow clearance? And will the Base and their entrances
49 take priority over any other City activities, any
50 access to hospitals or schools or any other parts of
51 the city? Will the Air Force take priority over these?
52 COL. MCRANIE: As I said, we live in the country, and we're
53 within a quarter of a mile of the Union Pacific

Railroaded with a very great acting that can take all of
1 the frightful trains. This has been worked on recently,
2 and I imagine it's for the sake of the missiles.
3 We're less than 30 miles out of town.
4 My question, like Sister's was, if a missile
5 is launched, will these railroad tracks be destroyed?
6 Will this completely prevent any other future use of
7 these railroad and will there be ensuing fires?
8 I'm a graduate home economist with a double
9 major in history, and as a home economist, I was
10 taught there are three basic human needs: food,
11 clothing, and shelter. And I was recently reading the
12 International Business filings for nuclear war, and
13 I'd like to quote, "the people of the world may be the
14 ultimate victims of the bomb, but they are not the
15 consumers of it. Government is the consumer of it."
16 This asks the people with their labors, their taxes,
17 paid for something they do not wear, eat, or can
18 use as housing.
19 I understand that half the world's population
20 goes to bed hungry. I also heard a statistic recently
21 that we Americans consume 10 percent of all the
22 world's production, and yet we represent only 10
23 percent of its population. So I will --
24 COL. MCRANIE: Time, ma'am.
please explain the logic of this. I would like an answer to this.

I also -- I have some other things about the railroad. The people who work on the railroad wonder if they will be toiled for drug and alcohol misuse. Will they and the members of the military that are on the trains be given hazardous duty pay and will they be under the Human Reliability Program?

I also would like to know if in the open when the rails go through towns, if -- who will be in charge? Will the military supersede civilian authority?

And now, as I said, I war in the service and around it for a long time. I would like to know -- I'd like you to know how I killed my own mind, so when I called the Public Affairs Office and was told that the 10-story missile assembly building would be camouflaged, I wasn't surprised. I would like to know if this camouflage will be samar green, full brown, or winter white, and arc we going to have a streak of blue across the sky? Thank you.

COL. MCNAMEE: Mr. --

LS. LAPPET: I'd like an answer to the last question.

weeks in order to actually accomplish the dispersal because it's going to take that long to accomplish his posturing of our forces.

MR. LAPPET: How I asked the Colonel about a missile that comes in, is about half an hour.

COL. MCNAMEE: As I indicated, we would have ample time to disperse our forces, so therefore, we would not be in a position of having to land immediately, so give -- he would not be able to target those forces because he would not know where they are. Not knowing where they are and knowing that he cannot take them successfully and that they would survive and be able to impose unacceptable damage on him, he would not attack in the first place, and that's the meaning of deterrence.

The next issue that you raised concerns the railroad personnel. We do not at this time have any authority to impose any drug testing on the personnel that operate the commercial railroad system. As far as military authority off base, unless martial law is declared, we have no authority off base. When we store our missiles on the roof, we have an escort of the local constabulary, they're the ones that take the appropriate actions. We do not have that authority.

And with respect to the missile assembly building you were concerned about, it was a concern raised by the people living adjacent to the western border of the base that the building would be a very visual eyesore. Because of that concern, we relocated the building to the extreme western portion of the base, so that as profile, it falls within the mountain range.

And then to further reduce the vulnerability to fire, fire against the mountain range in the background, we looked at painting it a pale blue as it would blend in with the skyline and not be obtrusive to their visual -- to the vision. So that's what they asked by camouflage. Do not think of camouflage as for the Army putting camouflage overJune. It's just a pale blue so the building will blend into the skyline.

Thank you very much.

COL. MCNAMEE: John Clay.

MR. CLAY: Colonel McNamee and gentlemen,

I appreciate the opportunity to appear here tonight. My name's John Clay. I'm a private citizen, I live at 5403 Meadowbrook Drive here in Cheyenne. I appear on my own behalf. I'm a businessman and a community leader and I've lived here for 17 years, raised my family here in this town.

The Atlas Missiles were here when we came.
For the next generation was the Minuteman group, and then, of course, recently the Peacekeeper was deployed. So we've lived side by side with three generations of missiles. I've been given one or even more by the fact that they're here.

I'm here tonight to testify that the 90th Strategic Missile Wing is as professional as they come. The community supports the Air Force and F. E. Warren. And this strong support is reciprocated in many ways. Cheyenne and the railroad are about the same age. Here again, we've lived with trains, we have people who know how to operate them. We have two major rail lines through Cheyenne. We are not qualified to make a judgment on the need for the rail garrison. But we are qualified to promote F. E. Warren as the home base of the -- of the rail garrison.

We have capability to handle the missiles, the railroads, to carry the trains out to their new homes. We have a large majority of the people in Cheyenne who believe in the people at -- or at F. E. Warren. And we like them as friends and we like them particularly as professional missionaries. Thank you very much.

COL. McRANE: Thank you, Anne Rayford.

MS. RAYFORD: My name is Ann Rayford. I

DOCUMENT 500

DOCUMENT 500

I don't have the slightest idea how to put my hands on those supplementary documents and would appreciate if there are supplementary documents referred to in the DEIS, that they be -- that there be some notation about how to acquire those or if they are security kind of documents that should not be -- that I can't get.

My fourth point is that in section -- on page 4.3-29, in the transportation section surrounding F. E. Warren, there's nothing about the railroad addressed. It seems that there should be something specifically in that section, even though there is some addressing of the issue of railroads in the national section. I think I've gotten to the end of my statement. Thank you very much.

COL. McRANE: Thank you. Did you want any of those addressed tonight?

MS. RAYFORD: No. I don't.

COL. McRANE: Thank you, Fred Baggs.

MS. RAYFORD: My name is Fred Baggs. I'm a native Wyomingite, Cheyenneite, and a businesswoman in this community for over 60 years. I understand the purpose tonight is to give input to identify environmental issues not already addressed in the Draft EIS.

For the most part, with few exceptions, this document will not happen since members of the Wyoming Against MA are here in some small force tonight speaking and having statements made on that group's philosophy.

First, let me say that I respect to some degree their views. Yet, there is no case that can be made for the position that Wyoming is against the MA, in fact, the contrary is true. In Cheyenne at an Armed Forces Appreciation dinner held a month or so ago, there were over 500 persons in attendance paying honor to the fine men and women who choose to serve their country.

The fact that Wyoming Democrats have a plank in their platform on that position on nuclear arms does not alter this fact nor prove their point, most everyone in this auditorium, in this state, and the nation, are against nuclear arms.

The fine men and women at Warren Air Force Base are the same people we civilians are. They love their country, their homes, their families, they have horror of war and want only a peaceful existence with the rest of the world.

To maintain this peace is the purpose of the decision by leaders of our country. We have deployed the Atlas, the Minuteman, the Peacekeeper. Our
The fact that our governments spend millions of dollars studying the impact of a missile system on communities, such as ours, speaks for their concern for their citizens. I am reasonably sure that they have never been an IDS study in the Soviet Union. This community wholeheartedly support the deployment of the Ballistic Missile System and thank our government leaders for their efforts to preserve our freedom.

COL. McSHANE: Thank you, Dick Loschek.

Mr. COOK: Colonel McShane, panel, thank you for coming tonight. Thank you for letting us air my views. I am Pete Cook, a Cheyenne native, a Cheyenne businessman, born and raised in Cheyenne.

I come to the conclusion that it should be deployed.

I'm here to support the fact that given this conclusion, that Cheyenne, Wyoming, has been selected to be the home base for this program.

Just once again, the fantastic relationship and cooperation of Cheyenne, its citizens, and the military personnel and their families of the F.E. Warren Air Force Base, will work together for this program to the benefit of our city, our state, our citizens, and our country. Thank you.

COL. McSHANE: Thank you, since we got started a few minutes late, I'm going to take the next two cards and then we'll wrap it up. Alvin Allrich.

Mr. ALLRICH: Colonel McShane and panel, I think my positions have been covered to some extent, but since you stayed here so long, I'll let you have the benefit of them anyway. I'm a retired doctor, former chief of staff at the Cheyenne VA Hospital. I live at Harrison Heights 20 Miles west of here near the railroad.

In reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Ballistic Missile System, I find it says very little about the impact of No Action alternative. Out of 760 plus pages, there are only 61 lines which address the No Action alternative.
It is an honor to be here. I think, Gentlemen, Colonel Branch, it's nice to see you. Unfortunately, more of Cheyenne's citizens are not here tonight. This auditorium should have been filled with the citizens of Cheyenne that showed support for the deployment of the rail garrison, and that's always the way. The people that really want it really don't show up, they let other people do their talking.

I believe that the majority of the people want a strong national defense. It would certainly be nice if everyone all over the world could disagree at the same time, but that's not going to happen. We want a strong national defense. We want the rail garrison here in Cheyenne.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base has been...
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question statement card you earlier filled out. We will have a panel up here. If you want to ask a question of the panel or you have a statement to make, we will take those cards and we will start with the public officials and elected officials and they will make the statements first and after that, other
individual will be given an opportunity to speak. We will take as many people as we can in the time that we have allotted here tonight. We will take a ten minute recess now. (Whereupon, there was a short recess taken at
this time.)

PRESIDING OFFICER: I would like to start this session by having Col. Walsh introduce the other members of the Air Force team who are here to answer any questions that you may have of the Environmental Impact Statement. Col. Walsh?

COL. WALSH: On my immediate right is Lt. Col. Van Ness, who will be responsible for questions in regard to legal matters. On my far right is Col. Branch, and he will be responsible for answering questions on operational matters. On my immediate left is Mr. Nickman, and he will be responsible for any questions relating to human resources. He works for Tetra Tech Corporation. He is under contract with the Air Force for preparing the Environmental Impact Study. On my extreme left is Dr. Ermer, and he also works for Tetra Tech Corporation. He will be responsible for responding to questions on physical resources. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Col. Walsh.

We now turn to the question and answer period of this public hearing. This time is set aside to allow you to ask any questions about the content of the briefing and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Once recognized by me, I would ask that you step up to the microphone. We want all present to be able to hear your questions and statements and we need to record it for the record as well. Please state your name and your affiliation or address and ask your questions or make your statement. As I indicated before, I will start with individuals that we have identified as elected officials. Mayor Don Jones?

MAYOR JONES: Over fifty years ago, a group of citizens had the vision and courage to guide our area in a new direction. A direction filled with hope and dreams, hope for a prosperous and secured future for both our community and our nation. Barksdale Air Force Base became a reality and through the years its wisdom to meet the challenge of its mission with excellence. America remains a free nation because of the dedicated
important services that government can do for the people is to keep them alive and free and it is certainly true.
It is equally important to say that the service rendered has been bought with the blood, sweat, and tears of those who died so that you and I might come home tonight as free individuals.

The same determination that spurred the inception of Barnsdale Air Force Base is still prevalent in our community today. Therefore, on behalf of the citizens of Bossier City, let me reiterate our pledge of full support and commitment to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System being employed at Barnsdale Air Force Base.

I also have a statement to read for Col. Valin and inclusion in the record from the Governor of the State of Louisiana. The letter reads, "Dear Col. Valin: The location of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System at Barnsdale Air Force Base has my support as you know from our earlier letter endorsing the implementation of this project in the Shreveport-Bossier area. As the review of Barnsdale as a site undergoes the public hearing for discussion of the environmental concerns, I wish to express my continued support for having the Peacekeeper here in northwestern Louisiana.

I know that my friends and neighbors from the 4th District are committed wholeheartedly to meeting the

national defense needs of our nation and to welcoming the Air Force personnel who will be assigned to Barnsdale with the Peacekeeper.

I pledge the technical assistance and support of the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and other relevant state agencies to work with you in the development and implementation of a mitigation plan to offset any adverse impacts to fish, wildlife and resources, particularly wetlands." Sincerely, Buddy Roemer, Governor of the State of Louisiana.

I would also like to include in the record that I propose that consideration be given to mitigation of this project and 60 acres of property with city owned property that exceeds 156 acres in an adjacent area to the base properties, and we would discuss that in the mitigation process. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Mayor John Humley.

MAYOR HUMLEY: Thank you. I thought he was bringing me a stool there. Judge McShane and Col. Valin and other members of the panel, I am John Humley and I am Mayor of Shreveport, Louisiana.

I want to first commend the Air Force on their very thorough job which has been done on the Environmental Impact Statement. I have read a lot of these. I think this is a very fine one. We appreciate the work you have done.

Of the statement, the EIS evaluated ten environmental impacts. Barnsdale Air Force Base's location had a high level of impact only on one of these impacts. On all of the others, none of the impact level was either low or not significant. In any one area, you will find that one out of ten is fine scores.

As the Mayor of the City of Shreveport, I am concerned about our environment, about the effects of anything that we build on our air and our water and also the other item, that is, the Environmental Impact Statement. I am also concerned about our community's economic well-being and about the defense of our country. I believe that all of the environmental concerns that are pointed out in the environmental impact statement can be addressed. We have had the other major institutions locate here: General Motors, AT&T Plant, of course, the Barnsdale Air Force Base, et cetera. These have impact on our environment. But the beneficial effect of those far outweigh any environmental adverse impact. I think that will be the same story with the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

As the Mayor of the City of Shreveport, I also want to join with Mayor Jones and Governor Roemer to say that

man and women of Barnsdale and other similar installations across this country and the world.

We should never forget the true meaning of the words Only the Strong Survive. The deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System at Barnsdale Air Force Base is the vehicle needed to ensure the future freedom of our democracy. The missiles will not prevent any increased threat to the Shreveport-Bossier area and the system would, in fact, enhance our national defense because of Barnsdale's strategic location in the United States.

To those who question the impact on the environment, studies have shown that no long-term problems are anticipated. To those who may be concerned over the additional traffic control measures that will be instituted to alleviate the possible heavy traffic conditions while the construction of our new river channel is underway. The concern for traffic congestion and the potential for impact on the American alligator and the Red Cockaded Woodpecker are secondary to the concern that must be first forethought, our capacity to survive as a free nation, fully prepared to defend itself. This ability is and of itself becomes a deterrent to the threat of nuclear war.

General Jim McCarthy's statement that the most
we pledge the resources of the City of Shreveport to work with the Air Force to mitigate the impacts and welcome the Peacekeeper Ballistic to the Shreveport-Roebling area. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Mr. Joe D. Waggoner.

MR. WAGGONER: Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here this evening. I, perhaps, better understand why you are here, because I am part of the
provision for these Environment Impact Statements.

Although I didn't go quite as far as some here, I mean, there are going to be two significant areas that we are concerned about national security as compared to the inhabitants of local jails that might be an impact on Barksdale Air Base when we consider an impact statement like this. But I know we are here because we are facing a serious problem in this nation and the legacy of this century has to do with the inheriting of the right, the power and the atom. We Americans have a way to do ourselves in. We have let the idea of our unconditional sole us parallel under certain circumstances.

The people in this area when you consider an Impact Statement are not paranoid. The people here in this area are not irrational, because we have weapons of mass destruction. We know that nuclear weapons here in this area ended World War II. The

people in this area know that nuclear weapons have
precluded a conventional World War III, which would have killed literally millions and millions and millions of other Americans. We realize here when we consider the
economic consequences, the cultural impact, that nuclear weapons are not going to be bothersome.

We know that there will never be a totally perfect defense, but we know here as Americans, as responsible citizens of this community, the Peacekeeper-Ballistic area, that peace and freedom for Americans can survive unless we Americans lead it. We, the United States, with which brought us from the world wars and we think about peace and providing and we think as question at the best that we advocate our responsibility to our people and to other people who depend upon us and that leave that leadership to one
simple power whose motives at best are questionable.

So, we are not totally taken in by what turns out to be a new word, some people call it Glumason today.

We recognize here that the best brains, the best leadership we have in the United States of America are today that the best we can do in the way of our --- in the utilization of the Peacekeeper, Ballistic Program, we can provide another aspect of our necessary defense that we did. We are here to tell you that there is

nothing in this area that won't be accepted that will be affected to the extent that anything will be dissolved. It is absolutely true that we have done -- it is true to say that we have people here, we are a little bit more conciliatory than some other areas under consideration, but consider the cost if you want to consider that, to go out and start from
scratch. Utilize what we have got and what we can provide, but utilize our people in support of the security needs of our country. We can meet your every need. We will do it gladly. Thank you for coming to
hear us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Jenny

Humes.

MS. HUMES: I am Jenny Humes. I live for U. S. Senator J. Bennett Johnston in Shreveport and the Senator has asked me to read his statement.

"I send greetings to those of you attending the public meeting on the proposed OK Ball Garrison at
Barksdale Air Force Base. Respectfully, the business of the Senator prevents me from being here to listen to your important concerns. I feel strongly that the OK Ball Garrison Proposal will be the net benefit for the State of Louisiana. It is a significant project for Barksdale and for Shreveport-Bossier City that will provide much

needed jobs for our area. The project will also bring untold millions of dollars into northwest Louisiana each year.

While this proposal is important for Louisiana, I agree that we at the Congress much encourage the U. S. Air Force to alleviate the effects on local environment. The Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Air Force for Barksdale states that, and I quote, 'The design of the garrison and the alignment of the rail spur will minimize the total impact disturbance of this location within a program engineering and safety requirements.' Little adverse impact is foreseen for the threatened and endangered species such as the American alligator and the woodpecker. I fully expect the Air Force to take the proper mitigation measures to ensure that the impact of the environment is minimal.

I hope that this public meeting is successful in the purpose it serves. The OK Ball Garrison System is strategically sound and is a sensible project that I hope you will join me in strongly supporting it.'

I have also been asked to read a statement from U. S. Senator John Breaux.

"I regret that I am unable to attend the meeting due to a heavy legislative schedule in Washington at this time. I am aware of some concern that has been
MR. SIBLEY: Good evening, my name is Dale Sibley, District Manager for Congressman Jim McCrory. The Congressman sends his regrets on being unable to be here tonight. At this time, I would like to read a prepared statement from Congressman McCrory.

"As a member of the 100th Congress and House Budget Committee, I have two main concerns at issue here tonight. The first is the ability to defend our country by means of sufficient nuclear deterrent. The second is to do so in a physically responsible manner. The United States has accumulated a national debt of some 2.4 trillion dollars, the interest on the debt is now the third largest item in the budget and

Garrison System being implemented at Barkemore Air Force Base. The Peacekeeper at Barkemore will be mutually beneficial. It will provide the Air Force with a geographically strategic location for its ICBM missiles while creating 500 jobs the first year and 800 the second according to Air Force studies or selected socioeconomic indicators. The report contends that it is estimated that some 750 jobs in the third year and 972 in the existing system.

As 4th District Congressman, I fully support the MX Missile Base Garrison System and its implementation at Barkemore Air Force Base." Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Roy Brun.

MR. BRUN: Thank you. My name is Roy Brun. I am a State Representative from District 5, that is generally south Shreveport from the Red River to State Highway 27. My office is 725 Lane Building in Shreveport.

Our community needs to be concerned for this project. You have the complete cooperation between State and local officials to work for the implementation of this project and to mitigate into any and entirely compensate for any adverse environmental impact that may occur.

In the past, the South has always carried its weight and shouldered its burden of the national defense. This area has benefited from our tradition of patriotism and military support. Barkemore Air Force Base is constructing nearly to our community. Barkemore is good for us and we are good for Barkemore.

In Shreveport, however, you will find a population that largely supports the military-appropriate Barkemore Air Force Base and the additional jobs that this project will provide. We are accustomed to the significant military presence and we work well with it. We want the economic boost from the project and we support the military boost that comes from modernizing a leg of the triad.

A study of history shows us that periods of peace and freedom are relatively scarce and nearly always associated with society possessing a requisite deterrent capability. The major freedom we study at Americans depends in part of our willingness to allocate sufficient resources to obtain the deterrents.

In my opinion, freedom is an important part of environment. This system is part of the price we pay for peace and freedom and I support it. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Tom Arceneaux.

MR. ARCEAUX: Since I am not the Governor of Arkansas, I will be brief. I would like to make three
points, one from the briefing that we received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It appears to me that the Draft EIS accurately describes the projected impact on our area. Two, it also appears that the safety risk from the installation of the Rail Garrison at Barksdale is certainly no greater than at any other location. Third, I would like to remind you gentlemen and the decision makers who will be reviewing these hearings of the commitment of the people of Bossier City, Shreveport and northwest Louisiana to this country’s national defense effort without which any environmental impact is irrelevant and also the commitment of the people of this area to the men and women of Barksdale Air Force Base.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, C. A. Wojcicki.

MR. WOJCICKI: Thank you. You did better than Col. Valin did. Good evening gentlemen and welcome again to Bossier City. I had the opportunity to be here at the first meeting and I had the opportunity to read your report that you mailed to those of us who requested it and I have enjoyed the presentation that you have made here again tonight. I listened with great interest to the presentation about the explosion parameter, because as I said with my neighbor, Mr. Hill, I think that we are perhaps in this audience, the two closest to the parade, people who reside closest to that parameter. Therefore, I am extremely concerned about that issue and Col. Valin in your presentation, related those concerns that were elevated by that. I would like to say that I have lived out at 1905 Camille since 1974 and it is approximately one-quarter of a mile south of the southwest runway. I am very familiar with the area and I am very familiar with the noise that surround that base. I would like to remind the Department of Defense that the reservation has quite a few acres there provided by the people of Bossier and Shreveport. I would like to remind you that thanks to our friends in the Corp of Engineering, we have an additional 130 acres that have been restored to the area. That is very appropriate for alligators and any kind of wetland creatures and so forth. I agree with most of the comments here tonight, that the things that appear to be potential problems can’t be handled by the local governmental bodies and the state governmental bodies. I think you already know that you have got a very strong local community that is supportive of this air base and that is receptive to this particular program. Again, I thank you for coming to present this to us and we hope that you will select our site for this program. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Carolyn.

Whiteworth? Can I ask what I misunderstood it that name? Carolyn Whitworth? Maybe we had a misprint.

The balance of the comments here I understand are from private citizens and representatives or groups. These comments were mailed before they were given to me. I didn’t place them in the order they are in. I am just going to start at the top and work my way downward. I have nothing to do with the order they are in. I would like to call Bob McRae.

MR. McRae: Thank you. I have been asked to address this meeting on behalf of the Bossier Parish Police Jury. I am a member from District V and also teach school for a living, I teach history, in fact. One of the lessons that we teach in history is that we should learn from our mistakes. I think that in 1916 the world failed to learn or benefit from the mistakes that were made by the great nations of the world after the first great World War. The nations of the free world went about systematically disarming themselves and as a result of that, in 1939 Winston Churchill addressed a disarming Parliament and gave them the bold alternative that you had to choose between the war and disarmament. If you choose disarmament you will have war shortly thereafter. All of the great nations of the world were embossed upon a war which made the first one
of all, for my observation, my ecological concern is this. Over fifty years ago, a bonding trust was created between Barndale Air Force Base and the citizens of Boomer. During that time, conservation efforts have created one of the greatest habitats for natural resources in the country. There is no reason to believe that the trust or that bond is going to be deceived. It is really ironic to think that one of the main reasons we are here tonight is directly attributable to the great conservation efforts of the Barndale Base personnel. If they have not done such a great job, we would not have the concerns that we are having here tonight. Ecological concerns are therefore minute when compared with the importance of continued strategic importance of Barndale Air Force Base and a nuclear deterrence that Barndale Air Force Base provides.

Regarding the traffic congestion concerns, it has already been pointed out that a major correction has been made by the citizens of Boomer through the creation of funds needed to build a parkway which will eliminate the bulk of the congestion problems. If there are, however, further corrections that need to be made on behalf of the business community and Boomer and the Chamber of Commerce, we pledge our wholesome support.

have no impact on the wintering eagles. The area has no potential for eagle habitat. Eagles feed on fish in lakes or on broods in marshes in open areas. The heavy bur oak growth within the impact area presumably will have no impact on the wintering eagles. The Red-shouldered Hawk. The Red-shouldered Hawk inhabits only the pine forest. They have never been found in the bottomland hardwoods. The nearest pine forest is two miles to the east. The Rail. Garrison proposal will have no effect on Red-shouldered Hawk habitat.

The Flathead Snake, the Flathead Snake, the garter snake, is not endangered or threatened. It has never been known to occur within the impact area.

The Western Sand Garter. This arrow does not occur in the streams near the impact area. By way of water, the Red River is forty miles from the impact area. The fish is not endangered.

Trout-Lily. This small Lily is found four miles to the east in the hill country. This proposed action will have no effect on Trout-Lily, they never occur in the hill type found there.

The Wild Turkey. Wild Turkey do inhabit this area. The Rail Garrison program will have a positive effect on turkey habitat. Right-of-way clearing and maintenance will have a positive improvement of local turkey hunting and brood habitat. Turkey never rest or raise broods in dense bur oak such as now found on the site. Rail Garrison security will have a positive effect to protect the turkeys from illegal hunting. This will serve as a refuge for turkeys.

Hardwood Timber. Barndale has 8,000 acres of prime hardwood timber. The best stands of such timber found in the Red River Valley. This site is not within the prime hardwood stands and will have no effect on preserving the hardwood stands.

Next, this tract of land has been in agricultural use just prior to its donation to the U.S. Government. Evidence of the old crop rows are still available on parts of this tract. There are no trees on the site over fifty years old and no evidence of stumps from any previous stands of timber. All of this evidence indicates the land was not a wetland prior to U.S. Government acquisition.

I would submit these because there is more information on timber and I just don’t have time to get to them.

We will have some expert rebuttal as far as the traffic regarding the main gate.

Everyone would prefer that there would be no need for nuclear weapons, the fact is that they are necessary.
and the Peacekeeper System is safe, accurate and physically realistic. The experts will illustrate that there is really no negative impact to our community. On the contrary, it will show the positive effects the nation needs the Peacekeeper Missile. Our community is happy to support the defense of our country and we certainly welcome and continue to welcome Barretoine and whatever they plan to do out there. Thank you very much for your time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, if you want to leave those statements, you may leave them there at the table.

MR. PAYARD: Yes, sir, I will.

PRESIDING OFFICER: R. R. Prestidge.

MR. PRESTIDGE: Mr. Moderator, my name is Rogers H. Prestidge. I am the President of the Caddo-Bossier Corp Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you on behalf of the commission and to thank you for having the hearing and hearing our comments.

Although the Caddo-Bossier Corp Commission is primarily concerned with navigation and water transportation along the Red River, we are also involved in ground transportation and economic development in the Shreveport-Bossier area. At the present time, we are working with many of the railroads in the area and we understand the problems that will be faced in this area. We can assure you that our discussions with all of the people involved in transportation, this will be a welcomed event that will take place when the Bap Garrison is established at Barksdale.

We feel that it is extremely important that all of the governmental agencies in the Shreveport-Bossier area and particularly in northwest Louisiana be united in their efforts to support the efforts of the establishment of the Bap Garrison. We pledge that we will join with the other governmental agencies, the cities, the parishes, the state and the federal government in alleviating any problems that may appear and exist as a result of the economic impact study that you have mentioned tonight. We feel that most of those questions have been answered and those that have not will be answered and I think you can be assured that all of the public agencies in northwest Louisiana will be solidly behind the effort to support the Bap Garrison. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Timothy Larkin.

MR. LARKIN: Good evening, my name is Timothy Larkin. I am a member of the Bossier Parish Levee Board.

and I am here tonight to officially represent the Levee Board.

The Bossier Parish Levee Board has taken up and reviewed carefully the impact that the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System development will have on the drainage systems that we maintain in the area. After studying the consideration, we found no meaningful adverse hydrological effect on any of our drainage systems. Consequently, the Board unanimously approved the resolution supporting the location of the Rail Garrison System. That resolution passed on April 6th, 1986.

Within the last two years, the Red River, which drains water throughout Bossier City and Barreton, has been enlarged. The purpose of the enlargement was to anticipate the future growth at Barksdale Air Force Base and in Bossier City and thus provide increased drainage. Additionally, approximately ten years ago the Bossier Levee District working in cooperation with the United States Army Corp of Engineers completed the northerly phase of the bayou tributaries via duct. The physical effect of this Red Chute Bayou was also to provide the protection. As the map prepared by the Air Force will indicate, Red Chute Bayou is located two miles east of the proposed site and Red River is located one-quarter of a mile east of the proposed site. The Levee District has always worked in close cooperation with the United States Air Force authorities at Barksdale Air Force Base, United States Army Corp of Engineers and appropriate state and local authorities in order to provide the necessary and adequate drainage structures and also to rely on our cooperation in this program project now and in the future. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, James Bruce.

MR. BRUCE: My name is James Bruce. I live at 525 North Beevee, Vivian, Louisiana. I am Supervisor of the Caddo Parish School Board.

I wanted to stress to the group tonight the cooperation that the Caddo Parish School System has shown the past for Bossier, the City of Shreveport, the affairs of government and our continued support in the past. Probably no impact will be made on the Caddo Parish School Board schools, but we want to stress our support and cooperation with Barksdale Air Force Base and our future needs in this area. National defense is very important, we consider it so. The positives outweigh the negatives. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Bo Carpenter.

MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Moderator.
speech, it is nice that a lot of people say yes or

mourn for everything, but that is also a vehicle

for people to express against the same thing. When someone

sees something is wrong or something is improperly going

around, then they can speak up.

I think there is a lot of problems with the MX

Missile System that we need to address and you'll need to

consider. First of all, I think the disbursement of

nuclear weapons on trains is perhaps something of a

myth. Once they get out on the train, I'm not sure what

keeps them from being the victim of sabotage. There is

only one track going out and you know, I don't know what

the -- it seems pretty easy for somebody to blow the

track and therefore keep the train from moving in one

place. So what if it is on one track, you are still

going to have -- they can drop how many hundreds, ten hundreds

in the area and what about the electromagnetic pulse

that it sends out, will the MX guard against that? Is

there anything to protect it from that? As I

understand, there isn't anything to protect it from that

electromagnetic pulse and therefore, it is dead on the

tracks again.

I have a lot of questions. First of all, the

military budget. I find it hard to believe that with

$2.8 million dollars that we can't find something better
to do with this as far as securing the health, welfare

of the American people and in the world. I think $2.8

million as far as it it was going toward education, it

would do a lot to help us learn how to deal with

adversaries in a way where we don't have to hold bombs to

their heads and we are going to have peace now. I

don't think that is the way to resolve confrontations of

conflict. I don't think our strength comes from the

number of weapons. I think it comes from our character

and I think our character is strong and our spirit is

very great and I don't think it could be undone. I also

feel sadly that our leaders and elected officials I

think have somewhat failed us. I don't think they have

any questions of significance, I don't think they can

show that they have read the Impact Statement or

consider what the ramifications of this is. I think all

they see is a potential for jobs, which in 1991 I guess

we will have a number of jobs and after that, it will

wind down to even what you called low and not a

significant factor. So, therefore, I feel like we are

grasping after something here that is perhaps the pie in

the sky material.

There has been some problem with Morton Thiokol in

developing the booster rocket. It has been reexamined

and fixed several times in the past several years and
warning for us to take the appropriate actions to other portions of our plan. We should also indicate that if
The Northern Corporation has had seven percent of its guiding systems rejected because they don't work there
right. There is also something about why are we deploying the systems before the missiles have been
tested for a launch. We are making the final missel we don't even know when we -- when we don't even know
that the testing has proven that it will work. I think
that one of the reasons that it has taken so long in
Congress, it has been a good eight to ten years working
to try to understand why it works and why it
doesn't, and it has taken them a long time because
they think it is a vulnerable system and it just might
not be the best way to do it even though our
Representative, Jim McGreevy, is in a great minority of
those who thought it right.

Finally, the size of the MX missile is also up for
question. I understand that it is going to be 70
something feet high and that wouldn't fit in this
building, I guess. I suppose it is -- the railroad
cars, the average railroad car is nine feet wide and one
MX missile is supposed to be twelve feet wide and I want
to know how they are going to be transported. When we
get them on the rails, what is going to keep them from
destroyed and secure and running into other trains on
the system with the other trains in the civilian system.

They are going to be cutting it close, in fact, too
close, so I think you might be concerned about that.

I think that is all I have. Thank you very much
for letting us speak again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: All right. Col. Walsh.

Are there some of those areas which you are able to
address at this time?

COL. WALSH: Yes, sir. You posed a series of
questions which I would like to respond to. The first
item concerned the vulnerability of the system to attack.

We have high confidence in a strategic warning such that
we could diagnose these attacks in the next quantity of
rail system before any attack could be initiated. Now,
by strategic warning, we refer to be various
actions by the Soviet Union to bring their forces and
their political structure for any attack. This could be
many things as moving their submarines off their ports,
any movement of their strategic forces, the aircraft
forces, at ceters, we would perceive this in the event
and take appropriate action not only with our train
system, but also other strategic resources. If there
were to be any sabotage on the trains and we are not
denying that it could happen, but it would be an
ambiguous indication of ill intent and would give a

With respect to the train itself, the carriage that
will carry the missile will conform with train standards
and as a matter of fact, in our analysis of the trains
themselves, we have identified and will have access to
over 120 miles of track at a minimum and possibly that
will total up to 160,000 miles of track. Thank you
very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Eileen Glass.

MS. GLASS: My name is Eileen Glass. I am a
resident of Shreveport, Louisiana. My mailing address
is 41 P Benjamin, 71105.

It is real tempting when during the introductory
presentation to be drawn into debate which I understand
is not appropriate at this time, but I shall have all of
my questions and write them and make a statement in
response to the presentation, which I found to be mostly
a matter of interpretation as to whether or not it is
half full or half empty. Point by point, I have
questions that were based on information contrary or
contrasting or in addition to what was presented
taking a few of the items that are most important to me.
From the very introduction, which was basically a
history of the system itself, in 1986 after a seven year
battle, Congress approved the funding for the production
of the MX nuclear missiles on the predication that they be in silos and that the size of the deploy force be limited to fifty, which was a reduction from the 100 that had been requested by the Reagan Administration. I do not, to the best of my knowledge, believe that the administration was requested to come up with an alternative to our conventional system, but basically, the Department of Defense wanted a limited number of missiles that would be deployed on twenty-five trains. The Pentagon requested two billion in the fiscal year 1987, of which only $350 million was approved. That $350 million was not necessary, a vote of confidence from the system, but basically telling in 1987 that it was okay, go ahead, but indicating that on part of the Congress and other people in the United States, their serious concerns and considerations for the MX missile system as a whole. Some of those serious concerns that I have are concerns that Tomislav has stated as far as the design. Even though we have been told that these trains can go into a commercial train system that handles 4 to 7,000 trains a day, I question how the unit design to carry and deploy a 71-foot missile can be designed to work without damage and with total safety in the same commercial system that we use for railroad cargo that are handling normal manufactured dollars that are spent on this system are not spent in other areas of the private sector that are highly critical, particularly to our area and to the country as a whole. You have given us an alternative action plan that shows 100 MX missiles being deployed, but the fact is there is also a no action plan which can be offered and the no action plan would offer us the opportunity to tax the money that we put into the system. How can we either in other ways in our country? I don't know. Is John Hensley still here? Well, John Hensley and Tom Arceaux spoke on my behalf, so now I am going to speak on their behalf. I would say that if John Hensley and Tom Arceaux were offered ten to fifty million dollars for this community over the next five years, which is the cost that is anticipated to go into this system, if they were given that money to spend on this community, they would choose to buy a Peacemaker system, they would not choose to invest in an impact system. These monies would be well used and are critically needed in other areas. It has been said that part of the EIS goal is to suggest actions on the areas where impacts are to be made and I would say that the two identified impact areas are very important, but looking at the socioeconomic impact on this area and on the monies that are being invested in this system, opposed to other socioeconomic concerns in this community in an impact that needs to be seriously studied. I would say that I agree with Mr. Waggoner that I am not paranoid and I am not irrational, but I am in favor in any way of having the MX system brought here. PRESIDING OFFICER: Eleven, did you want an answer to the question you asked earlier or did you want that in the report? MS. OLDAZ: I'm sorry, I didn't understand you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: You asked a question of the panel, did you want an answer to that question? MS. OLDAZ: No, sir, that was rhetorical and I will write the questions later.

PRESIDING OFFICER: All right. I think we need to move on.

MS. OLDAZ: Thank you. May I just say that like Tom Arceaux, I have a commitment to peace, I do not have a commitment to the MX system.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Father Murray Clayton.

COL. WALSH: Council on, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes.

COL. WALSH: While there was a rhetorical...
The question in those questions, there was some implied inconsistency or implied facts that are incorrect and I would just like to make those corrections, not to be too much in writing, but to state them.

The Air Force has not precluded any portion of the national rail lines from operation, as we have not made any statement that we would stay out of the train yards in Chicago, Kansas City or anywhere else for that matter, and I believe in your statement you implied that we have. We have not made such a statement. The only other comment I have is that it only requires you to look at alternative actions that support the underlying need that has been identified and in this case, the underlying need is to modernise the ION Program, so we look at the alternative solutions to that need and do not look at the alternative uses of money for social programs.

Again, that is the purpose of Congress is to make those kinds of decisions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Father Hurlay. 

FATHER HURLAY: Thank you. I am the Pastor of St. Joseph’s Catholic Church and a member of the Potomac Valley International Catholic Movement for Peace. 

First of all, this impact missile is seven stories tall as I understand it, a hundred tons. It is a first strike capable weapon and that has not been brought out. It is capable of striking the Soviet CIMMs in their silos. It is a first strike weapon. Anytime that it would be moved about, for whatever, perhaps innocent reason, it is not going to deter our adversaries, but to make them very jumpy. If they saw the movement of these first strike weapons, it is going to turn deterrents into propulsion because they know we could unleash them and destroy their weapons. And it is said that we are dealing with an enemy or adversary, that lost 20 million people in one week, six million in one battle. Of course, they are neurotic and they are jumpy, but as the good Quaker said to us, “You don’t deal with a neurotic by waving a pistol in their face” and so I am not at all prepared to accept the MX as a deterrent. It is a first strike weapon whose mobility and moving around it could prove a first strike from our enemies and I believe I need with good information that it takes from four to six hours to deploy the MX after we get the strategic warning. I just don’t think that time is going to help keep peace. Former Admiral Gene Hurlay who now heads the Center for Defense Information pleads strongly that we reduce the MX, Minutemen and Minuteman, that is his position and I think he was once a member of the Joint Chiefs.

To conclude, I do not understand how anyone who bears the name of Christ as a Christian can read the fifth chapter of Matthew’s gospel, the Sermon on the Mountain or read Luke’s Sermon on the Plain and where God calls himself the Father of all men we are all sons of his image, likeness, Russians, Soviets, atheists, non-believers, Christians, we are his children and how can he bless us if he sees that we are ready and prepared to unleash this kind of death upon so many of his children, the objects of his love. They are his and we stand here drooping that we are ready to kill and destroy women, children and old people. There is no doubt in my mind that the Jesus who preached the Sermon on the Mountain, the Sermon on the Plain, if he were here tonight, he would walk up this aisle and denounce this kind of weapon. There is no doubt. I don’t see how anybody seriously means that they are his followers and can come up here and say that they are ready and prepared to unleash this kind of death upon so many of God’s children, that it grieves me, it grieves me, because just get out these passages and read them aloud and slowly to yourself word by word. They are powerful and then tell me that Jesus of Nazareth would condone what we are proposing here -- that you are proposing here tonight.
I am Sister Margaret McCaffrey. I live at 880 Columbia, Shreveport, Louisiana and I strongly object to this missile. I really believe that the word Peacekeeper is a misnomer and we need to say it as it is. It is a very destructive weapon that will kill millions of women, children and innocent people. There is no way that I could support this missile. I strongly object to it. I believe that it is an environmental danger. I am not convinced in any way that it is safe. I looked up there and I read periodically that there will be risks. What does that mean? When we really get down to negligible risk, we are saying the risk doesn't count. Well, it does count. We are talking about killing millions of people. We are talking about endangering our environment. Louisiana already has one of the highest cancer rates in this country. St. Jude's Hospital said that the greatest number of their children patients with cancer come from Louisiana. We do not need to increase risk. I don't care how negligible it is. If there is any risk, it is too great of a risk to increase the cancer possibility of our children and of our future children. This is what I consider absolutely wrong. I am a member of the Potesters, the International Catholic Peace Movement. We work for peace and we believe that non-violence is much better approach to peace than force.

I have some questions that I would just like to address that I do want answered, but I would like to see that they are addressed in the final analysis. I repeat the question of Mr. Tom Hasie. When we look at this missile on the railroad, we have to address the width, height, the weight and how it relates to the center of gravity. There is a serious question as to the width of this missile. The ordinary width of the Don car is 90 feet. It would have to be enlarged to accommodate this missile. This will create an imbalance. I would like to see that this is addressed in detail in the report of how the missile is going to be handled to prevent an overturn of this railroad car. Also, with this width of this particular car, there will have to be an alert signal of the other railroad trains to warn of this train's coming. How are we going to keep the Russians from knowing about when we have got them on alert to let this train come through. Also, I don't think the answer was addressed adequately as to how we are preparing for sabotage. How are you preparing for possible sabotage of terrorists upon these missiles?

I do believe that this money 2.6 billion dollars
can be much better spent "to help the economy of our community and of our country. I work daily with people who are unemployed; this is not the way to truly build a good economy. We need to build -- we need to increase our production goods. We are a de facto nation to the world and don't need more weapons. Other countries, even Russia, have learned that they are putting too much money in weapons and it is hurting their domestic economy. We are faced with the same problems; our homeless are increasing by the hundreds daily. We just cut out education programs. We are cutting the much-needed programs that are saving our children and we are going to turn around and put 2.6 billion dollars in weapons to destroy ourselves and others. There is no way we can justify it.

So, I do thank you and I strongly object.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Deborah Roberts.
COL. BRANCH: Can I make a statement about the size?

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sure.

COL. BRANCH: There have been questions about size and I represent the operating command. The size of the missile is approximately 13 feet long and the weight is 190,000 pounds. The size of the car that we have got to fit on would be approximately 90 feet long by 10.2 feet long by 17 feet off the rail. That is what the railroad industry calls a Plate 2. It is a standard size rail freight car that they use extensively on the rail. Many of you may see them on the railroad. They are used to haul automobiles, for example, from the manufacturers to destinations throughout the nation. There are also many cars that are called High-Boom cars. Also, they are called automobile parts cars and there are literally thousands of these sized freight cars on the rails today. They are longer than the normal freight box cars, but there are many and many of them are sized freight cars on the rail today operating successfully.

And of the rail mileage that Col. Walsh identified to be over 120,000 miles, that rail network is in rail network which will specifically accommodate the size and weight of this size of rail car. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Deborah Roberts.

MS. ROBERTS: My name is Deborah Roberts. I live in New York and I, too, am strongly opposed to this MX missile system. I object to this as the internal Peacekeeper. I am the Peacekeeper when I keep the peace of faith. A seven-story missile that contains ten nuclear warheads is not a Peacekeeper by my definition.

My father retired after almost forty years as a railroad engineer recently and to hear these things that anything, in the rail will not be thrown into a collision or to a collision that really bothers me. If you believe that, you need to ride the rails in this area, because it is driven this madness into this area.

I also believe that you all are not bad people. I have sat here and looked at your eyes and I have looked at you and you are not bad people. But I believe you have got a bad idea and I urge you now as you sit here and listen and as you travel around the country and listen to the people, please some of it in and hear the people's concerns and hear what they are saying and see if any of this does make sense to you.

The MX system has been subjected to close potentiosts controversies throughout its history. There is an old saying that you all know that when there is smoke there is fire and I think there is a reason why it has been a controversy project. There are many problems inherent in the design problem has been the bearing now. There is no satisfactory bearing mode, also we now have many people believe that the military does this system is not adequate.

I oppose to the number of dollars that are spent on this project and that are being proposed. In 1986, the Pentagon received 950 million dollars for research and development and received 315 million dollars in 1987 for twelve missiles. They requested 937 million dollars for 1989 research and development. I deeply, deeply believe that these dollars can be better spent on other possible ways within our country other than the defense system.

I believe that we need to hold the spending of the Pentagon check until we figure out what their spending habits are. We know that there are serious problems with the way our dollars are being spent. This system that we are here about, I have been reading about it through the years. It strikes me that this is -- it's fantasy. When you think about firing nuclear missiles around on the rail, it is Disneyland World, it is Disneyland and I think whoever dreamed this up is struck stupid.

There is a saying that I feel is really appropriate here and that saying is, Take the toys away from the boys and I really believe that. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you. Tom Boudreaux.

COL. WALSH: Excuse me, sir. I would like to address something.

PRESIDING OFFICER: All right. Just a second, Tom. Col. Walsh would like to say something.
COL. WADE: I wish to address your statement only to correct some misinformation contained in it. In it, you implied that we had said that there was no risk due to derailments and collisions of trains, et cetera, and that is not correct. We did acknowledge over the life of the system that there would be derailments, train collisions, and collisions of railroad crossings and we, in projecting what those extras would be or what the DOS statement contained, we used the statistics from the Federal Railroad Administration and we forecasted that there would be three deaths and sixty incapacitations over the life of the system based upon the amount of mileage we expected our trains to accumulate. What we did say, however, was that the risk due to the cargo would be negligible, but it did not say the risk due to the normal operations would be negligible. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you. Lesly Scott. MR. SCOTT, Colonel, my name is Roy Scott. I live at 2620--my office is at 2620 Centenary, Shreveport, Louisiana. I speak to you as an attorney, as a private citizen, as a private naval officer. I think that many of the comments that have been made here tonight are not the subject that is before you tonight. It is not for us to decide, nor have we been asked to decide this Board the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the Peacekeeper missile. It is not for us to decide where it goes. It is only for us to discuss the environmental impact of this particular location that has been very adequately covered here mostly by Mr. Fayard, who I think did a very remarkable presentation on the subject that is before the panel. There is room for dissent in this country, that is why we have ice cream in thirty-eight flavors, but this is not the place to express that dissent as to whether you like it or don't like the RR missile. That is not the subject before this House. I think you gentlemen have done a fine job. I think that we can see that the adverse environmental impact of this missile on this area is minimized by the cooperation of the government, the United States Representative, the United States Senator, the Mayors of both cities and everybody else who pledges that they will work hard to minimize that environmental impact. I think that the favorable observations for this area are at least as favorable as they are anywhere in this nation and I request that you strike from the record those expressions of opinion that are not the subject before this House. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you. Sister Claire Justice.

SISTER JUSTICE: Good evening. I would like to make one short statement and I want to make two questions that I would like to be answered in your final report. The mere contemplation of the use of weapons of this nature is based on fallacy that nuclear war is survivable. These are weapons not only of violent destruction, but also of violent death and malformed babies and children dying of cancer. They are weapons of unconscionable end of human history. I am, therefore, qualified to oppose it.

My two questions are: Number one, mention was made of missile survivability in the event of war. If the area of the prior residence of the missile is destroyed along with other sites, is missile survivability being given priority over the survival of the citizens of this country? My second question is: If technology and consultants exist that can ensure the safety of the movement of this missile with our rail system, why are we continuing to have railway accidents that are killing civilians? Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you. Dr. Cassagnol.

DR. CASSAGNOL: I am Dr. Cassagnol. I am the Chairman of the Doctor Cassagnol Foundation. I have gone through and studied the impact statement concerning Barksdale Air Force Base and I do not see any negative impact of this project on our community. First, I don't think anybody should be worried about traffic. I have lived in New York for fifteen years and I can tell anybody what traffic is when you have to go to school and go to work and then spend four or five hours of driving or sitting in the bus, so the traffic. I don't think this traffic should be any problem for any citizens that are in here. One thing you have to remember when...
you are hungry, your kids are hungry and your kids need clothing, I don't think we worry that much about traffic.

I know Sister Margaret for her work and I have a lot of respect for the Father, but I can tell you that I am not going to register as an expert, but I can tell you that project will benefit the great minorities in Shreveport and Bossier. We need good jobs, we need them very badly and this project, in my books will really help minorities in Shreveport. I fully support the position of Jim McCready. In order to be in peace, we have to build our strength and this project is just doing that.

As I can remember, when I was a kid...if you were the strongest kid, all of the other kids were scared of you and did not want to touch you and I am sure that the missile will help our strength and keep our peace. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Laverne Dolphin.

Ms. DOLPHIN: My name is Laverne Dolphin. I am a private citizen and I live in Shreveport. I am opposed to the MX missile. Environment is a precious gift given by our God. I cannot believe that our water and other resources will not be affected.

I believe that the money would be better spent on human services and meeting human needs and to educate our children to be human peacekeepers rather than focus on an instrument of construction and mislead us as peacekeepers. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Laverne Dolphin.

Ms. BARNES: Thank you. My name is Eriistle Barnes. I am a resident who lives at 9504 Blueberry Drive in Shreveport. I want to spend a minute here and make a statement concerning the Rail Garrison Program. I am speaking as a concerned citizen. I am speaking from a human perspective and not a technological perspective.

I strongly oppose the Peacekeeper Program, the Rail Garrison Program. I want to suggest a series of considerations of alternatives. Instead of the Rail Garrison Program I want to suggest that a comprehensive test ban to end all testing of nuclear weapons by the United States. I am suggesting that we as a city and as a country adopt a human solution to the human problems or world conflict and tension instead of technological solution. I see national security as being beyond mere sophisticated weapons. I believe that national security involves solving the environmental problems and educating our citizens and providing justice for the poor. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Last but not least, Dewey Burnett.

Mr. BURNETT: Thank you, gentlemen. I am Dewey Burnett. I am Secretary-Treasurer for the Bossier Levee District.

I spoke before on the last time and I just wanted to direct your attention to the map enclosed in the brochure and at about an inch half on at the right hand side of the page indicates the water storage area, the canal named Flat River. I want to indicate to you that Mr. Larkin has done a follow up. I believe, in 1993 the Board of Commissioners for the Bossier Levee District in conjunction with United States Army Corp of Engineers did a major project on the Flat River to clean out Flat River to provide for drainage throughout the Barrels area and north of Barrels and also south of Barrels. By no indication, I am indicating to you that there should be no adverse effects or relocations of other developments in this area. The Flat River passes right near -- I can't tell from the scale now far, but it is not very far away from this site and the Flat River was meant to drain Bossier City and Barrels and other areas to provide drainage because of the fact that if this area were to expand, there should be no adverse effects on this Peacekeeper Missile Project.

In addition, the Levee District passed a resolution in April indicating their cooperation and their full cooperation will be forthcoming. I can assure you of their cooperation if they are located here. Thank you, gentlemen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, I have just been handed one more card, Tim McElroy.

Mr. McELROY: I am Tim McElroy, the incoming President of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce and also President of McElroy Metals, a Bossier based manufacturing business.

The Shreveport Chamber of Commerce believes that the proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System responds to the need for enhancing our military force and therefore, our national defense. It is the Congressional mandate to modernize the deterrent of our defense system. Two, after reading the Environmental Impact Statement, we believe it benefits the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system with regard to national defense. It far outweighs the very negligible, minimal adverse impacts that the project would have on the environment. We also believe that the implementation directed through mitigation would reduce the impacts on...
the biological resources of Barksdale Air Force Base.

Thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is time to conclude the proceedings. Please remember that you have until 31 August to submit written materials to be included in this transcript of the hearing and those written statements will be fully considered and will be addressed in the final Environmental Impact Statement.

Once again, the oral and written statements or comments will be afforded equal weight.

The officials of the Air Force appreciate your efforts to come out tonight and contribute your views to this public hearing. We thank you for your courteous attention and adherence to the rules of the hearing. I thank you and have a good evening. It would be appropriate to adjourn at this time, 9:52 p.m. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public meeting was concluded.)
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Hickman. He is responsible for human resources, and he works for Tetra-Tech Corporation which is under contract to the Air Force to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement.

On my far left, I have Dr. Kramer who is responsible for physical resources and also works for Tetra-Tech.

Thank you, sir.

COLONEL MCKEAN: Since we have just the one microphone here and it is a little bit awkward for folks to get directly down to it, let me call out about three names and if you could sort of come forward, we will start with Temple Dickson to be followed by Jess Holloway and then Downing Busta.

Mr. Dickson, Senator-elect Dickson.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, sir. It is a pleasure to be here.

For the record, my name is Temple Dickson. I am the Democratic nominee for the State Senate, the 26th Senatorial District, a district that has the greatest military presence of any senatorial district in the United States.

It covers from Nolan County just west of Dyess and Taylor County to Bell County, and on the other end from Abilene to Concho County.

I am here simply to tell you that for the past few months I have spent time visiting with the people of this district and I find that those people in the tradition of Texas are extremely proud of their willingness to take part in the defense of this country.

I am very interested in the economic impact that was discussed. However, I think the people of the District are primarily interested in their feeling of an obligation to help defend this country.

In talking to the people throughout this District, I have found very little opposition to doing our part in taking part in doing that that needs to be done.

I find that the people are still thrilled by the words of people like John Kennedy who said that we would pay any price, we would bid any friend, oppose any foe.

I go throughout this District and I find virtually no one who is not willing to take that obligation and to do our part again, and that is what I find among the people that I represent.

I was asked to write or to read a
letter that was - into the record that was
addressed to the Secretary of Defense from the
Lieutenant Governor of the State.

He says, "Mr. Secretary, The State of
Texas stands firmly behind the efforts of Abilene
to secure the location of this vital strategic
system at Dyess Air Force Base.

"There is unanimous support for this
project from the state, the city and the business
community and our citizens.

"I would challenge any other state to
present a better proposal. Texas' support of a
strong national defense is well known and
community support of Dyess Air Force Base is
second to none.

"Not only does Dyess meet the technical
criteria for the rail system but it is located in
a state where the quality of life is second to
none.

"We can offer the military and the
civilian support team excellent schools, fine
universities, great highways and air connections
and the commitment from the state government to
do whatever is necessary to secure the location of
this important weapon system.

Thank you very much.

COLONEL MCSHANE: Thank you, sir.

MR. BOLLS: Thank you, Colonel, and I
would like to add my welcome also to that of Judge
Holloway for you all coming back to Abilene.

I am Downing Bolls. I reside at 4234
South 5th here in Abilene 79605. I am a county
commissioner, an elected official.

I think that the Air Force should be
commended for the thoroughness of the Environmental
Impact Study.

I have just gone over it, not only the
portion relating to Dyess but to the various other
bases as well, and I have been impressed with the
thoroughness of the study.

I did want to comment very briefly on
a few environmental things as they pertain to
Dyess in your biological resources portion of the
study.

I noted that you anticipated some
mortality among the ground squirrels.

I would like to assure you that the
ground squirrels of West Texas are more
resourceful than you would imagine.

You may manage to kill a few but the
rest will pick up and move down the road a little
piece and set up another colony.

Second: I notice you take no cognizance
to the fact that there are wild turkey on the
reservation.

It may be that if you destroy some of
the habitats they will move further out into the
country and be less of a hazard to flight
operations at Dyess.

Third, there is a little critter which
you also failed to mention and I may as well warn
you about.

Those who dig holes in West Texas come
into contact with the West Texas groundhogs.

They build their nests in holes in the
ground, and I assure you that when you disturb
them they are tenacious little critters and they will
let you know it.

If you have contractors that are going
to be digging here, you might want to warn
them.

There are some folks who are also
concerned about losing a night's sleep because
they will be situated here in a target area.
What they don't realize is that ever since Dyess was built and the first B-52s arrived, we have been sleeping in the middle of the bull's eye, and it will be thus as long as Dyess and Abilene support national defense.

One of our noted jurists one time, John Philip Dunkin said internal vigilance is the price of freedom. If this weapon system helps to keep our enemies at arms length, this is a small price to pay for the freedoms that we enjoy.

Finally, I would like to share with you the sentiments of most of my constituents who are going to help pay for the cost of this system out of some dollars that are pretty hard to come by these days.

Inasmuch as the environmental impact at Dyess would be minimal and the costs would be much less than some of the other locations, they would join in urging you to give careful consideration to Dyess.

I thank you.

Colonel Fichter: Thank you, sir.

The next three individuals are Don Dudley, Samuel B. Hatta and Dale Ferguson.

Gentlemen, I think the missile will certainly complement Dyess Air Force Base.

As the gentleman while ago pointed out, we are located right on I-20, the known Pacific Highway.

We failed to mention and I would like to call to your attention that just south of Dyess is the Santa Fe Railway which could also be connected with just less than a mile with that track.

We would certainly like to see the missile come for numerous reasons, but the main reason is let's keep the peace.

It is one thing we have that we must preserve. We have it now, let's keep it, so please consider Dyess and complement the Strategic Air Command and the site base with the missile.

Thank you very much.

Colonel Fichter: Mr. Hatta, please.

Mr. Hatta: Thank you, sir.

Colonel Fichter and other representatives of the United States Air Force, let me add my word of welcome to you.

We welcome you to Abilene, and we appreciate very much your inviting us to be here.

My name is Samuel B. Hatta, I am currently serving as justice of the peace of Taylor County Precinct 1 Place 2 and as the only Hispanic elected official in the Big Country it is with great honor that I address the issue before us today.

I have prepared my statement in the form of a resolution, and I will present it as such if I may.

Gentlemen, whereas America is the greatest nation on the face of the earth and whereas there exists those in the world who are determined to change that fact by constantly threatening heretics and would peace alike and whereas we as Americans are charged with defending the honor of our forefathers who gave their all so that we might enjoy peace and freedom for ages to come, and whereas we the citizens of Abilene love our country and all that it stands for and whereas as has been seen and displayed in the past Abilene and Dyess Air Force Base have what we consider an excellent and unique relationship in our joint effort to keep the peace of our beloved nation and whereas the Peacemaker Ballistic Missile is a weapon system which all America can be proud of as a deterrent to enemy aggression then be it resolved that we the people of Abilene gladly and strongly support its implementation and, of course, as always we would welcome the project into our very home with open arms because there is no greater honor or sense of patriotism than that of being part of the defense of the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Gentlemen, if I might add, as a representative of the people of Abilene and Taylor County, you may search from the mountain to the valley to the ocean white with foam but nowhere and I repeat nowhere will you find a more supportive or patriotic people than the citizens
of Abilene and the Big Country.

Colonel McShane, the late President John F. Kennedy challenged us with the words, "Ask not what your country can do for you but ask what you can do for your country."

Well, sir, and gentlemen, we have asked the latter of the two questions and we have been given an answer and that is to provide a home for the Peacekeeper, and, gentlemen, all I can say tonight is we the citizens of Abilene stand ready and committed to the task before us.

If I might add, reading from a letter of the House of Representatives from Representative Ervin Barton to the Honorable Frank C. Carlucci, Secretary of the Defense, "As one of the ten sites under consideration, I would like to encourage the selection of Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas as a base home of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

"The entire community of Abilene is very supportive of this project and have a long history of involvement with Dyess Air Force Base.

"All of us in Texas recognizes the importance of being committed to our nation's defense efforts.

The staff of the City of Abilene reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Study. Although there are minor inconsistencies between some of the numbers and figures in this study and those created by our city staff, these differences would have no substantial impact on the report. They are almost simultaneous reports.

In reviewing the impact of both the proposed action and the alternative action with regard to employment and income, population and demographics, housing, public services, utilities, transportation, land use, culture resources, biological resources, water resources, land use, cultural and other biological resources, all of these would be minimal and the City of Abilene and the staff concur with the assessment that was made by the Air Force that there would be an insignificant environmental impact due to the location of the Rail Garrison System at Dyess Air Force Base.

We think of Dyess as having three wings where most of the Air Force thinks of it as two wings, SAC and MAC.

We think of SAC, MAC and Abilene.

Three different groups, all one group together. And that is the way we think of Dyess and the City.

The City of Abilene believes that peace in today's world means that America must maintain a strong defense.

That is why in the early '50s this community raised the funds to buy the land and give it to the United States to establish a military base in Abilene.

The Peacekeeper Missile System is the next step in an ongoing effort to ensure that this nation's defense meet the challenge of the world's security through strength.

The City of Abilene wants to continue to be a part of the proud men and women who serve to make this country safe.

We don't shrink from the challenge rather we embrace it.

Thank you.

COLONEL MCSHANE: Thank you, sir.

The next three individuals will be Mayor Violet Law, Mayor Rick Rhodes and City Councilman Harold Nixon.

MS. LAW: Colonel McShane, my name is
Violent laws. I represent the City of Tye as their mayor.

I am happy to report that at our regular council meeting this month that the full council voted to support the Peacekeeper and the Rail Garrison Program.

They represent, they govern 1,600 people, and I believe the majority of those people are very supportive of the mission of Dyess.

I certainly support the mission of Dyess and its projects, and I certainly support the Peacekeeper and the Rail Garrison Program.

I believe that every American should support its country, which would work for programs that defend its country in the aggressive nature of some of the countries that we live in our world today that we have an obligation to defend our country in any way we can.

The people of Tye probably recognize sacrifices and concessions, but I know the majority of them are for this program, and I certainly hope that Dyess is successful in getting it here.

I have a little bit of comedy, comedy, excuse me, to add.

County, and I would like to very briefly just tell you that we are very supportive of the defense efforts of this area and certainly this activity of the Rail Garrison Defense System, the weapon system.

We are just excited and proud to be a part of the defense of our country and be a part of a region that defense is such a big part of it, and we are good neighbors to the west.

We are about 30 miles from Dyess Air Force Base and very supportive of their activities and know that they do a good job of handling this.

I have been monitoring closely the comments of our people as the publicity is beginning to get more frequent on this project and have had absolutely no negative comments whatsoever and a lot of positive comments about they really hope that it will come to this part of the country and would be very glad to be a part of that.

I also have a letter I would like to share this evening from Senator Bob Glasgow from the 32nd Senatorial District in Texas, and I will just read a portion of the letter.

My friend on the commission said he lived in marshall which is 16 miles west of here.

Well, I live in Tye which is just adjacent to Dyess west of here, and in the case of a national emergency if there is any way possible I would just as soon you send those trains east instead of west if it is in at all possible.

Thank you.

Colonel McShane: Thank you, ma'am.

Mayor Rhodes.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, Colonel McShane.

My name is Rick Rhodes, and I am the mayor of Sweetwater, and I must admit that being a mayor of a small town when I came tonight to a public hearing and I drove up to the Civic Center and saw on the Marquee World Class Wrestling, it kind of concerned me about the activities that we were going to be involved in tonight.

I have been to some public hearings that were close to that, but I was relieved to see that that is not until August 1st, so I was glad to see that.

It is a pleasure for me tonight to represent the people of Sweetwater and Nolan.
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The evidence is clear. The Abilene community wants and supports the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

As your Congressman and as a citizen I enthusiastically encourage the selection of Dyess Air Force Base as home to another integral part of our national defense system.

We have every confidence that the Air Force will consider all of this strong evidence when making the final decision.

I say I put aside my Congressional employee hat for just a moment and speak as a lifetime resident of the Abilene area.

I am Dale Boulter. I live at 1649 Washington Boulevard here in the city. Let's turn back the years for just a moment.

I sat on the cow lot fence over in Jones County with my dad and watched the 56th Division move to Diteley. All day from dawn to dusk the trucks rolled by.

I do not know of a single serious problem involving Abilene and Dyess that was not solved at the local level without calling in the inspector general or anyone except local leaders.

I want to put in the record that Fred Lee Hughes has not been the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Abilene Chamber ever since the Civil War.

We have had many great leaders.

Oliver Toward, Bob Wright made great contributions.

Fred Lee will hasten to add the names of many local men and women who have spent their own money and worked long hard hours to keep the Dyess/Abilene partnership the very best in the entire nation.

One very important testimony for us comes from the thousands of Air Force personnel all over the world who want to come to Dyess at their very first opportunity.

Our country needs the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. The Air Force needs Dyess to house the Rail Garrison and Dyess needs Abilene to have the best support that can be given by any community anywhere has none.
McShane and members, my name is Jim Geaney. I am a resident of Abilene, Texas.

I have a letter written to the Honorable Frank Carlucci from Hugh Parmer, Senator Hugh Parmer of District 12 in Fort Worth.

"Dear Mr. Secretary, I am writing in support of locating the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas.

"For many years Texas and Texans have dedicated themselves to the full support of the United States military.

"Texas is blessed with many highly skilled civilians and service personnel who call Texas home.

"Among those cities which have deep roots and long ties to Texas and the defense system of the United States is Dyess Air Force Base.

"At Dyess the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison would find a suitable home. I think Dyess is logical as well as economical and effective since it is a strategic military installation and readily accessible to 170,000 miles of rail lines.

"I would hope that the people of Abilene and all of Texas could look to you to recognize the historical support we have provided to the United States military and note that the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison should be located at Dyess.

"Thanks for your consideration.

"Sincerely, Hugh Parmer, Senator from the 12th District,"

And I would like for the record that I concur wholeheartedly with the Senator's statement.

Thank you.

COlONEL McSHANE: Thank you, sir.

Brad Cheves.

MR. CHEVES: Colonel McShane, my name is Brad Cheves. I represent and serve as executive assistant to Representative Bob Hunter, State Representative of District 70.

The District is primarily made up of the City of Abilene and Dyess Air Force Base.

I would like to read for the record a letter from Mr. Hunter and have some comments following the reading of the letter.

"Dear Mr. Secretary, I am pleased to wholeheartedly endorse the placement of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas.

"The Department of Defense could not find a more supportive community for this program.

"Abilene has a long history of community and military cooperation and this project would be no different.

"There is no question that the Dyess Air Force Base location meets the technical needs for the program.

"This defense system is vital to our national interest and Dyess Air Force Base would be an ideal location for a defense system of this nature.

"Sincerely yours, Bob Hunter."

Further I would like to report that we will submit for the record several letters, many letters from state representatives from all across Texas representing all geographic regions, north, south, east and west.

I will submit the letters but I would like to read the list of those representatives. Community leaders and citizens will be reading other letters that will be submitted later in the hearing, but for the record, State Representatives Jerry Beauchamp, Speaker Pro Tempore Hugo Bellanca, Frank Coliazo, Representative Robert Early, Robert Entels, Orlando Gaffas, John Gargi, Gerald Geistweidt, Ron Givens, Kent Groenduke, Lena Guerrero, Jack Harris, Dudley Harton, Jim Herr, Ron Louis, Jim McWilliams, Bob Nelson, Mike Millsap, Alex Munoz, Anna Mosey, A. M. Over, Jim Parker, R. P. Patterson, Glenn Rapp, Jim Hudd, Sam Ruscolm, Robert Saunders, Curtis Seidlit, Larry Don Shaw, Hugh O. Shute, Richard Smith, John Smith, Monte Stewart, Mark Stiles, Jim Tallas, M. A. Taylor, Larry Telford, Smith Valiques, Richard Waterfield, Foster Whaler, Steven Holens, Jerry Yost and Robert Eary.

I think you will find these letters to be most supportive and indicative of the support the whole State of Texas is giving to this project.

I would submit these.

And further I would like to also report for the Congressional Record that Mr. Dale King has been the 17th District Congressional aide since the Civil War.

Thank you, sir.

COlONEL McSHANE: Now, you may have
Colonel McClarty: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Stone: I am Roger Stone. My wife, Betty and I are managers of La Quinta Motor Inn, and we live at the same location sometimes unfortunately, but we are there.

I am also president of the Hotel/Motel Association, and I feel proud and honored to have the opportunity here tonight to come in and say to you gentlemen that you have the full support from the Hotel/Motel Association.

For several years, I don't have the beard at the time, my hair was a little longer. My last four years I was with the Nike base.

I understand the need and the importance of a national defense.

Unfortunately there is no way that we have found yet today that we can guarantee peace, and we have to increase and enlarge our defense.

In just finalizing, defense is probably like our Super Bowl. The winners come out with the best offense and defense, and we all want to win the Super Bowl, so we are just happy to have the opportunity to have you here.

Thank you.

Colonel McClarty: Thank you, sir.

Mr. McClarty: My name is Tim McClarty. I am an architect here in Abilene. I represent the American Institute of Architects here in Abilene, Texas. I am the president.

I also represent another group of people, my family.

I have three children, my wife, and we have lived in this town since 1952 when I was born here.

I am not going to endorse any program at all that would jeopardize my family.

I endorse this program. I love this town. I love the people in this town, and we want this program here.

Thank you.

Colonel McClarty: Thank you.

The next three individuals, Peter Velasques, Hal Flanders and Brad Keibert.

Mr. Velasques: My name is also Tim Velasques, and I live at 2910 South 22nd.
In 15 quality reduction is being reflected in growing elected defense. Also, let me say that I am for strong defense. I am a taxpayer. I have never, neither I nor any member of my family have ever operated with tax exempt bonds. I pay my taxes. If you take a survey of some of the people that support this defense weapons, most of them will operate with tax exempt bonds, will invest in tax exempt bonds, therefore I believe that they are not operating or supporting a strong defense like I and my family are. My only concern is that we should pay more attention to what we spend and trust these weapons to because let’s face it the truth is that the biggest and most expensive weapon we have now are defective and who knows we might be wiped out from the first - from the face of the earth not by the Russians but by our own defense contractors that have sabotaged our system. Thank you.

COLODEL, MCNAIR: Thank you, Hal Flanders.

MR. FLANDERS: We have been reminded of our purpose here, environmental concerns, not moral issues. We were similarly cautioned at the previous meeting. At that meeting some 35 people spoke. Of those some 26 people supported the proposal with patriotic speeches but no environmental concerns. None others concerned about the impact of this proposal on the health of the world also spoke. Of these only one environmental question was specifically addressed affecting the health of the planet. That item dealt with pesticides and biocides both used frequently in construction and maintenance by contractors and railroads.

I fail to find reference to this practice nor intentions to discourage them in the draft. At least two classes of possible abuse exist. During construction affecting biological water and air quality as by now even the uninformed are aware. Applications of biocides and pesticides to the railroad rights of way widely done already and not likely to reduce in the face of concern about possible sabotage or terrorism. Increasing water pollution and air quality reduction is being reflected in growing numbers of people labeled as the environmentally ill. These unfortunate stand in the position of the canary to the coal miner who watched the birds carefully while in the mine. If the birds fell sick the miners ran. The environmentally ill are sick because of the poisons we are spreading without being sufficiently aware of the long-term impact. If the decision maker decides to go ahead with the system both unnecessary and undesirable in my view at least we should be firm in our contention that our planet should be safeguarded by taking all of the precautions we know how to do in the process. I would like to see this addressed.

COLODEL, MCNAIR: Colonel Walker did you have a --

Brad Helbert.

MR. HELBERT: I am Brad Helbert, executive director of the Great Central Texas Council of Governments.

I reside at 1910 Willow Drive. I have just placed on the table letters from 36 of the elected officials including county judges, mayors, city council members and commissioners from throughout our 19 counties. Many of our elected officials are here tonight to share with you their dreams for the big country. Also a resolution from the Council of Government which is a political subdivision of the state made up voluntarily of the government bodies of this area. We have something like 60 school districts represented on our board, 19 counties.
vast land to be inhabited by man but people who 
had courage dreamed, and work to carve a 
home in our western land.

Today, the nation is living on its own. We are a red, white and blue flag 
warriors of the future, and we welcome the 
defense of our nation to be placed in our hands.

We promise you a barbecue feast and not 
a protest.

OFFICER McCABE: Thank you, sir.

MR. CONNER: I have been chairman of the Military Affairs 
Committee since the Civil War it really has only 
been about ten years.

I have two letters of which I would 
like to read to you in part. One is from the 
office of the Governor in Austin, Texas.

His last paragraph says, "I urge you
Arnold, State Representative from the District 106.

This is to the Honorable Frank C. Carlucci, Secretary of Defense.

"Dear Mr. Secretary, we are in strong support of Dyess Air Force Base as the site for the Peacekeeper missile.

"Our investigation has revealed that the community of Abilene as well as the Chamber of Commerce are very supportive of this project and have pledged their support in the accomplishment of this endeavor.

"The track record shows that there has been a long standing support between the citizens and the military of this city.

"Our investigation also shows that Abilene would rank very high against the other nine sites being able to utilize their existing railroad capacity in Texas for the use of this particular strategic weapon system.

"The State of Texas has long been recognized as the state that exhibits political support towards the armed forces.

"It is our opinion that to locate the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base would even strengthen that support.

"We would appreciate a positive response to this important issue." Signed Bill Arnold.

Thank you very much.

COLONEL RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Barr.

Mr. Barr: Thank you. My name is Grady Barr. I live at 741 Rivercrest here in Abilene.

I am a family man. I own and operate a small business here, Dyess has and is an integral part of the City of Abilene.

Any addition to Dyess would be an addition to the City of Abilene, and I too would like to read a portion of a letter from Chet Brooks, State Senator to enter into evidence.

It is addressed to the Secretary of Defense. "Texas proudly has been one of the leading states in military activities since 1945 and because the birthplace of military aviation when Lieutenant Benjamin D. Foulois flew an airplane, an Army airplane at Fort Sam Houston on March 2, 1910.

"Citizens throughout Texas have embraced the strong military presence in our state and reciprocated to the military personnel in evidenced by the large number who make Texas their permanent home after they retire.

"Citizens of Abilene have been enthusiastic in their support for Dyess Air Force Base and they would welcome the honor of being home to Peacekeeper Rail Garrison.

"I feel therefore that Dyess Air Force Base would be an excellent choice as site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison."

Thank you.

COLONEL RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

Next would be to call on George Palmer. Greg Shrader and David Heeks.

Mr. PALMER: Good evening, my name is George Palmer. I represent myself and the Physicians of South Texas.

I live in Dallas, Texas. I was struck in the draft statement by three sentences in particular which I will quote.

"In Section 4412, total employment in the Abilene area has declined since 1984 mainly due to a downturn in the oil and gas industries."

Then the next two are from Section.
Trade doesn't generate money. It redistributes it. Government provides a bit of money to the system. That is where much of the money comes from.

Abilene looks to me like a community with a needle in its arm, and through this needle it is courting the narcotic of military spending.

I don't mean to be melodramatic, but you can see the -- somewhere this is an edge in the values of the people who -- the business leaders and the civic leaders who are testifying here tonight.

There is just an edge of desperation. They need the money here. The same thing is happening to Abilene as has happened to dozens of communities around the country.

The more military money that flows into a community the less diverse over time the local economy becomes and the more addicted the local economy becomes to further infusions of money, and it isn't hard to see how citizens see military projects of this sort as the MX as useful, necessary and even patriotic.

We have been developing the MX since 1969. For the last ten years Congress, the President and military have been trying to decide what to do with it.

The Air Force has proposed over 30 different basing modes. All of them have been discarded as either impractical, strategically unwise or too expensive.

The MX program has already cost $30 billion dollars. The Rail Garrison is supposed to cost between 10 and 15 billion.

If you put it over closer to 15 than to 10. $45 billion dollars, we are a country that has poured 2 trillion dollars on the military since 1981.

Where does it all end? I mean, what is the point?

The MX is the perfect example of a weapon system built for military reasons -- for political reasons rather than military reasons.

There are between four and 5,000 contractors and subcontractors for the MX spread across 42 states.

Are we that much safer?

If I were a Soviet general and looking at the Rail Garrison, the earth covered Rail Garrison will have 80 warheads inside it.

If I were a Soviet general looking at that, I would think by golly with one well placed nuclear shot I can knock out 80 warheads.

That is what people mean when they say it is destabilizing.

How in times of stress, or national need as you euphoniously put it what happens if the United States again these weapons out, the trains out onto the civilian rail network.

Soviet photoreconnaissance satellites are certain to notice the fact and again what would a Soviet General do.

We would think, ah-hah, I bet the Americans are planning to attack us. We had better attack them first.

When you produce a weapon for political weapons you get weapons like the MX.

They don't serve our interest and they come at too high a cost.

Thank you for your indulgence.

COLONEL NICHAUSE: Thank you, Mr.
Palmer.

Greg Shrader.

MR. SHRADER: Good evening, gentlemen.

My name is Greg Shrader. I live at

223 Goodlette here in Abilene.

I represent the Abilene Reporter-News

a newspaper who has been in business long before

there was a dime of defense money spent here in

Abilene.

I would like to read into the record

an editorial that appeared in our newspaper,

Sunday, July 24, 1983.

"Abilene's reputation of superb

community relations with the Air Force is

legendary. It is a two way street, of course.

"Dyess contributes much to the life of

Abilene and Abilene contributes much to the life

of Dyess and its mission.

"Further evidence of this support was

demonstrated in April when the Air Force conducted

a public hearing here to discuss the environmental

consequences of locating the Peacekeeper Missile

Rail Garrison at Dyess.

"Abilene people turned out to voice

their enthusiastic support for this idea. Now, we

appreciate the benefits economically, it is the

neighbors, and it is the other benefits we

appreciate.

I would like to say one thing in reference to the Environmental Impact Statement.

There was great deal mentioned about the rail systems here in Texas, and I would like to read a letter from the Chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, Chairman Jim Nugent.

"Dear Mr. Secretary, As Chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, I want to express my strong support for Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, at the home for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System.

"Abilene has a long history of supporting the military, including tactical and strategic, missile and missile installations.

"Because of the strategic and environmental contributions of the area, I hope you will select Abilene and Dyess Air Force Base, Texas for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System.

"I grew up in the San Angelo area not far from Abilene and am well acquainted with the strong patriotic nature of West Texans.

Also that country is extremely well
suitable for location of the Peacekeeper Ball
Garrison System.

"Our railroading network in West Texas is in good condition and is accessible for moving or
static deployment.

"The people of the Abilene area support this vital part of our national defence
and I join in their enthusiasm and support of the mission with the Peacekeeper.

"If there is anything my office can do
please call. We will be happy to assist you in
your efforts.

"Chairman, Jim Suggs, Texas Railroad
Commission.

Thank you.

Colonel Hennessee: Thank you.

The next three individuals I call on
are J. Smith Hall, Linda Calcote and Scott Jenkins.

Mr. Hennessee: Colonel Hennessee;
gentlemen, I appreciate you taking time to come.

By the way, I am J. Smith Hall and live
here in Abilene, downtown Abilene.

I want to say that I am a geologist.

I have been over 40 years here in Abilene and the
first well I ever drilled in Taylor County was

about a mile and a half south of Dyess Air Force Base.

Colonel Hennessee, you
would make a great Texas. The first time you
pronounced my name correctly.

Colonel Hennessee: Thank you.

Ms. Calcote: I am Linda Calcote. I
am a community volunteer, and I live at 3499 Santa
Monica.

I have been a resident of Abilene for
21 years, and when I brag about Abilene which is
very often I point out with great pride that we
are the home of Dyess Air Force Base.

Over the past several years I have had
the privilege of touring several of our military
installations throughout this country, and I am
convinced that we must have an adequate defense
system if we are to have any hopes of continued
peace.

We may think that we can't afford to
spend more money on defense, we can't afford not
to.

As we face an election year, we will
certainly hear of the need of housing for the poor,
health care for the needs, and a clean environment
in which to live, but it is critical for each of
us to realize that unless we have a strong defense

Our development, and when war broke out, we were in full scale war, we had absolutely nothing.
We had nothing.

They had to take the rifles from Texas
A&J that had been stored there for twenty years by
all of those Cadets to just give to our soldiers.

If the Japanese had hit the West Coast
we would have lost the war, I know near the end
of the war when we were building planes so fast
and furious and I was visiting with my father, I
had been wounded on Iwo Jima, and I was visiting
with my father on a 30 day convalescence leave, and
a man came up and said, oh, he says, we are just
spending too much money. Look at all of these
airplanes we are building, and my father turned
to him and quickly said, "Mister, if we build 10,000
planes too many and we like one building enough,
then that is what we need to think about."

I hope you welcome you here, and if you think
that this is a good place, I guarantee you we will
back you.

Thank you.

Colonel Hennessee: Thank you, sir.

Linda Calcote, Calcote. I hope I am
not pronouncing that too badly.
The citizens of Texas have been very supportive of our country's efforts to build a strong national security. They understand that a strong nuclear defense is a deterrent to aggressive tendencies by other countries. Therefore, they welcome the opportunity to be a strategic partner in our defense. In Dyess Air Force Base I believe you have all of the ingredients for a successful installation of the Peacekeeper Site.

I sincerely hope that you will give it every consideration. Sincerely yours, Don Henderson.

Colonel McShane and distinguished members of this panel, I am very glad that you are here tonight at Abilene and at Dyess. I hope you will come back again and bury. COLONEL McSHANE: Thank you, ma'am.

Scott Stenter.

Mr. Senter, Colonel and distinguished panel, we appreciate you being in Abilene, Texas.

I am in the real estate business here locally. I was born and raised here in Abilene.

Texas and went off to go to school and think to move back because this is a town that loves the military. We appreciate what you folks do for our country. We want you to continue doing what you are doing so well.

I would like to support the idea of the second possible site on Dyess. That north end of Dyess looks like it may have some merit as opposed to the south end, and we would like that to be explored while the committee is doing that, and I would also like to suggest that we may have a lot more people down here to help eat that barbecue, and we need the Rail Garrison in Abilene, Texas.

I would like to send a letter into the record from John Leedom, Senator District 16 in Dallas, Texas.

It says, "The peace of our nation and its security is important to the people of Texas. Dyess Air Force Base is one of the ten sites in the country being considered for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Dyess is housing a portion of our nuclear forces and ready to add the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison."

The people of Abilene and the military community have a long history of cooperation and concern for each other. The base was established due to a community effort at the beginning. The people are proud of Dyess Air Force Base.
The people of Abilene have probably worked harder on base community relations than any other municipality similarly situated in the country. The Air Force has on several occasions brought civilians in from other locations to see what an excellent job Abilene has done in maintaining an atmosphere of respect and support for its military installation.

And on a personal note, just about 15 years ago, I came to Dyess Air Force Base and my family came to Abilene.

I came as an active duty Lieutenant Colonel Air Force chief of personnel at Dyess Air Force Base. Shortly after I arrived I was asked to serve on the judges panel of the United Way of Abilene.

Subsequently I was invited to become a member of the Civic Club. From that I became a member of the board of directors of Abilene Health and Daycare Center on the elderly.

From there I became a member of the Boys Club, served as president of that board and currently serve as the president of the Abilene Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

I mention these things only to underscore how readily, how quickly and how thoroughly Abilene assimilates the military into the community.

Thank you.

COLONEL MCCORMICK: Thank you, sir.

JOHN TURNER: Thank you, Colonel.

Distinguished panel, my name is John R. Turner. I live at 1817 Jackson.

I have been a resident of Abilene approximately 15 years. I helped dedicate Dyess Air Force Base when it became Dyess Air Force Base.

I am in the broadcasting business and have worked with the Air Force people at Dyess for many, many years on many projects, and we certainly are in favor of the Peacekeeper missile being based at Dyess Air Force Base.

The people of Abilene have for many years wanted Dyess Air Force Base and have through the years wanted a strong national defense.

We had the Atlas missile here many years ago, so let's move forward with the Peacekeeper.
consideration and support, Jim Mathis, Attorney General for the State of Texas."

Thank you.

COUNSEL McSHANE: Thank you.

James McShane.

MR. AUSEFF: Good evening, gentlemen.

My name is James Auseff.

I live at 2210 Curry Lane here in Abilene, and I come as a private citizen.

I would like to say that I support this project, and I think that many people and many of my friends in the community and the surrounding area support it likewise.

I would like to specifically say that for more than 50 years people in this community have supported the defense of our nation and have welcomed the military into our community.

My family has been here almost 100 years, and I can remember my grandparents telling me when Camp Barkeley was established and the soldiers came out here during World War II and would drive past our home that oftentimes they would come into the community, and there was a lot of support back then.

I didn't realize what they were doing.

support the United States.

I would also like to state that there are a number of heroes that live here in Abilene, men such as Keith Neill who spoke earlier was a commander who helped capture Fr. Jim.

John Conner who fought on - who flew on the first missions into France in World War II in the invasion of Normandy.

There are people like this who live here because they like Abilene, they like our community, and they like what we stand for, so we welcome you and hope that you will give us a lot of consideration.

Thank you.

COUNSEL McSHANE: Thank you, sir.

Bill Wright.

MR. AUSEFF: Thank you, Colonel McShane.

I am Bill Wright. I live at 1473 Woodland Trail here in Abilene.

I am a businessman and an ordained environmentalist, and I would like to address some comments to the Section 48-4.4.12 in the cultural section.

One of the statements says -- first of all, let me say that I concur with the findings of the report with regard to the environmental impacts in the Dyess area.

Certainly they are minimal and the statement that I would like to refer to goes as follows, "While data recovery is possible, avoidance of archeological sites that might be found, avoidance is preferred because technological advances in the discipline will permit future researchers to make more effective use of the resources."

Taking that statement just the way it sounds would indicate that if cultural remains were found in an investigation, an archeological investigation of Dyess that the capability of deciphering those resources would be better left to future generations, and I have here a letter from Bob Malood who is the Texas State Archeologist, and I would like to quote just a portion of that letter and then I will present it as evidence.

"The reference on page 34 having to do with avoidance of sites is a standard approach used in archeology these days. It simply means that when possible archeological sites should be..."
left alone rather than be unnecessarily impacted by construction.

"It does not mean that archeologists do not have the expertise currently to mitigate the impact of science due to construction projects."

I do point out that the cultural remains in this particular area are very dispersed.

Certainly we don't have a Chaco Canyon or a Matthew's Peak in this particular area, and we think that as a member of the Archeological Committee of the Texas Historical Foundation, I can tell you that in my opinion that we don't have a problem with archeological cultural remains.

I think that the remainder of the report speaks for itself. I concur with it, and a person a little earlier said where does it end, what is the point.

I would like to speak personally for a moment. Last year, a year ago, I had occasion to be in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and I was having a meeting with a Czech official in his office, and I asked him a question.

I was pleased that there seemed to be

---

Texas March 13, 1962 as a brand new lieutenant from Fort Benning, Georgia when I reported into Camp Beailey and since that time my wife and I have been either a part of the military or strongly supportive of it here in Abilene and though we stayed away for 17 years to New York when it came time to retire we headed back to Abilene because it is a great place to live.

The population probably has somewhere between 35 and 40 percent retired military or families of retired military because they find it a place that is congenial, amiable, patriotic and supportive of the things that are for the good of our nation.

We hope that Abilene will be the site of one of the trains or two of the trains that have the missile.

Thank you very much.

COLONEL McSHANE: Thank you, sir.

Tommy Harendt.

MR. HARENDT: Hi, I am Tommy Harendt, and I am reside at 3130 Broken Bough here in Abilene.

I am the current president of the Abilene Home Builders Association. The tradition of strong military support or the tradition that Texas, Texans and Abilenians have always supported the military has been mentioned many times tonight.

Another tradition that hasn't been mentioned is the tradition of home ownership, and the Abilene Home Builders Association and the Texas Association of Builders and the National Association of Builders all believe that it is still the dream of every American to own their own home in the home ownership tradition, and that dream is just an empty dream without a strong national defense, a strong national security and secure borders, so the Department of Defense has decided that the Ball Transition System is a necessary and vital part of our military defense and if that decision has been made by them we have confidence in thee that that is a proper decision and we certainly support that decision and encourage you to consider Byers as a home for the Ball Transition System.

Thank you.

COLONEL McSHANE: Thank you, Ms. Valasquez.

Ms. VALASQUEZ: Nobody. My name is
I had a very happy childhood and enjoyed being with those people at that time; however, I am here to talk to you tonight about not wearing the red, white, and blue but to talk about the EIS statement and some of my concerns about it.

For those of you who are following closely and attentively there may be specific numbers that you will want to have reference to, and I would be glad to provide that for you.

First of all, it is just an assumption that you can approach doing the EIS in this manner without considering some of the bigger pictures and bigger questions that we have to have received.

I would call to everyone’s attention the issue 1.9 decommissioning. It is difficult to predict how the Peacekeeper, and I find it difficult to say that word, would be decommissioned.

The relevant law and procedures may change substantively in the 20 or more years that the system would be in use.

Moreover techniques for handling the disposal of obsolete missile fuel and the

The Peacekeeper is a very expensive and controversial system which there is a great deal of reason to give much more than three or four paragraphs to the issue of national economic impacts.

I realize a, with the first issue that I raised you may consider it not your job and not your problem, but the fact of the matter is a very important second item in the aspects of economic of the Environmental Impact Statement is simply not addressed.

You do go and elaborate on this point over on page 61, so at least you are giving six paragraphs of credit to this issue of concern for this issue, but you certainly haven’t done any more to address the concerns that any reasonable and rational person would ask.

Are we getting anything in a cost benefit way for this system, and that in simply not addressed in this impact analysis.

Next I would refer you to Section 4.4 which is the specifics of the Dyess Air Force Base.

I appreciate the mayor pointing out that there are a number of minor technical
The document discusses the implementation of a weapons program in Abilene. The mayor emphasizes the importance of the program, which aims to enhance public safety and contribute to economic development. He mentions that the program involves the development of a weapon that is environmentally friendly, reducing the risk of mistakes and potential damage.

The document also addresses the role of the mayor's office in coordinating with other departments and ensuring the program's alignment with public interests. It highlights the need for clear communication and accountability to ensure the program's success and public trust.

The document concludes with a summary of the mayor's commitment to the program, emphasizing the need for continued monitoring and evaluation to ensure its effectiveness and relevance over time.

The discussion underscores the importance of transparent decision-making and stakeholder engagement in the implementation of such programs, ensuring that the benefits are realized without compromising public safety or the environment.
Those increases based on the C.O.5 will likely occur in the police, fire and public works departments.

Let me emphasize that over the last eight years, from 1983-81 to 1989-90 that the number of employees, net number of employees employed in those particular departments, are approximately the same while the population over that period of time in Abilene has increased from 101,000 to approximately 128,000. This increase in demand for service has been met through improved efficiency, productivity and the application of technology. I agree with the report that the program-related increase would come no adverse effect to the City's ability to provide quality public services to the citizens.

The City of Abilene has always looked forward and planned for the future particularly when that future required a major water resource. In 1965 the City of this community overwhelmingly approved by voting 96 percent in favor of the Peacekeeper Project, a project that will provide this community's water resource need to year 2033.

DOUGLAS MCDIARMID: Thank you. Our friend, the gentleman from Fort Worth, drove several hundred miles out of a busy day to spend time with us this evening to talk to us about the Water Project, the economy, the pervasive and pernicious effect of military preparations upon the citizens of Abilene.

I'm going to come at it from a little different perspective because I have the unique personal privilege of serving as a president of the Abilene Chamber of Commerce on June 27, 1983, when the Peacekeeper Project was approved by the City of Abilene, which it is equipped to go forward in that mission for the interest has continued.

I think we can be sure that the same level of preparedness and planning would be brought to bear for your Peacekeeper. I salute you, sir, for doing this.

Thank you very much.

DOUGLAS MCDIARMID: Thank you, Mr. Russell. Next call on John Russell, back Turkey and Russell Dresnoff.

MR. RUSSELL: I am John Russell of 3950 Stonecrop, Abilene, Texas. Colonel Rhame and Colonel Talich, I salute you and all of the members of your team for the fine work that you have done with this Environmental Impact Statement. I spent many years reviewing statements of this type both military and
end of your runway.

As a private citizen and a member of this community and based on your Environmental Impact Statement and the fact that this community is the finest supporter of the military and the United States of America I would like to say that you cannot go wrong by putting the rail decision at Dyess.

In fact, let's be smart about it. Let's do it right. Let's put it at Dyess.

I would like to read a letter from the Senator of the State of Texas, Carl A. Parker, who is the chairman of the education commission.

It is to the Secretary of Defense.

"Dear Mr. Secretary, in the many years I have been acquainted with Senator Grant Jones, I have been impressed not only by his dedication and hard work to the people of his community but also by his community's dedication to the economic development of military establishment both private and governmental.

"Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene has long been the home to the Strategic Air Command bombers from the B-47 to the new B-1.

"Abilene has always been quite proud..."
I could tell you of being a Rotarian as many of you wear many hats. I could tell you of being a Christian and a member of the First Methodist Church.

I could tell you a lot of things, but if I think it's proper to do it, I'll tell you about the main gate at Dyess AFB, which was put there with a great deal of pride and love by the citizens of Abilene and Big Country at a cost to the citizens here, but the government of almost a quarter of a million dollars.

It has been my pleasure since 1983 to be the honorary commander of one of the units at Dyess.

I am an independent business man, and I have customers in all 50 states and Puerto Rico and none of whom are government people.

We hope you decide to locate the Peacekeepers Hall of Record here in Abilene. I think it will be an excellent choice. One of the gentlemen who preceded me is from the Midwest.

Saul Jarembrook.

When I came here from Dallas last March of '82.

I would like to have the honor of introducing me, Mr. Boyd Davis, a former teacher, and the last on the panel. Let me introduce you for coming to Abilene and for being so patient. All of you are still awake and alert, and we apologize for the lateness of the hour.
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chance to comment and make statements, and you
certainly have the opportunity to make comments in
writing and submit them by the 31st of August, and
they will be included in the Final Environmental
Impact Statement that is done.

I apologize for the conclusion here.

This is the first time I have been to one of these
hearings, and I am told that normally ten o'clock
is the time to end the meetings, and I think that
we need to adhere to that practice, so thank
everyone for attending and participating in the
environmental impact process, and it is important
so that the process can be done, and with that the
meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

Hearing adjourned.
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don't get to make within three minutes, you may turn in your written comments after this meeting or send them to the address provided in the handout. I recognize that some people may wish to make statements on defense policy, nuclear weapons, arms control and fiscal policy at this meeting. However, each comment is best directed to your Congressman and Senator. We limit your comments to environmental issues. Please refrain from public demonstrations or for or against statements made herein. This merely submits from the time available for others to make statements or ask questions. Remember that each person should be given a respectful hearing even if he or her views differ from your own. Let's take a ten minute recess at this time and please try to be back here by about 6:30 minutes after the hour.

(COURT REPORTER'S NOTE: Off the record for short break.)

BY COLONEL MIKE McSHANE:

We will begin by having Colonel Walsh introduce the rest of the panel members.

BY COLONEL WALSH:

On my immediate right is Major Van Ness who will respond to questions on legal matters. He is assigned to the Air Force Regional Civil Engineers, the same organization that I belong to. On my far right is Lieutenant Colonel Emmons. He is from headquarters.
of you who have written statements that you want to have included in the record or written questions you want answered at a later time, you can just put them on the stage there next to the microphone. We'll start now with Mayor Joe Cody, and I hope I'm pronouncing that correctly, sir.

BY MAYOR JOE CODY:

It's a privilege to be here tonight. I am Joe Cody, Mayor of Blytheville, and I want to thank you for giving us the opportunity to hear the impact study and to make comments. My main concern for Blytheville, Arkansas and Eaker Air Force Base is the community and the military working together. We do that here in Blytheville. I would like for the EIS to show that community support is also a very important item when new missions are considered. We, often times, when we speak of the City of Blytheville and Eaker Air Force Base, we like to class ourselves as a large happy family, working together to improve this entire community and this is something that we're proud of. I pledge the support of the people and the citizens of Blytheville for the purposes of the Peacekeeper and Garrison Mission.

We also appreciate the cooperation of the Air Force during the study and I'm sure that it will continue to the successful completion of the selection process.

BY COLONEL MIKE MCBRANE:

Thank you, Joe. Mr. Cody, please. Judge Merry.

BY MR. JOE MERRY:

Thank you, ma'am. Joe Merry, please. Judge Merry.

It is believed that the proper and justified site will be Eaker Air Force Base. I thank you.

BY COLONEL MIKE MCBRANE:

Thank you, sir. I next call on Joyce Williams.

BY JOYCE WILLIAMS:

My name is Joyce Williams, I am employed by Congressman Bill Aker the District Office Manager of the First Congressional District. Because of the Congressional schedule prevents his attendance tonight, Congressman Aker directed me to represent him at this hearing and to present the following statement. Earlier this year, Congressman Aker participated in the scoping meeting held in Blytheville on the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program. At that time, he presented a statement supporting the efforts of people of Blytheville and Mississippi County in connection with the selection of Eaker Air Force Base as a site for a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Congressman Aker has instructed me to advise you that the views he expressed at that time are unchanged. Eaker Air Force Base would be an appropriate site as a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison site for the following reasons: the base is and has been for many years an important part of the nation's strategic defense network and of the Strategic Air Command. Geographically, the base is located in a

desired region of the nation in relation to strategic defense concerns. There is sufficient undeveloped land available at Eaker for use as a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. Urban development has not encroached on Eaker Air Force Base. The climate of the region is highly favorable to the strategic defense operations and by tradition and practice, the people of Blytheville, Mississippi County, and the region are strongly supportive of the national defense activities generally and Air Force Base activities specifically. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to appear at this meeting on behalf of Congressman Bill Alexander. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MIKE MCBRANE:

Thank you, Judge Merry. Please, Joe Merry.

BY MR. JOE MERRY:

Thank you, ma'am. Joe Merry, please. Judge Merry.

The Air Force and local area, these impacted areas of archaeological significance, roads and schools can be satisfactorily remedied. I direct your attention to the many impacted areas which are in place and are of sufficient size and quality to readily support the additional mission. A worthy note is the outstanding and overwhelming community support of Eaker Air Force Base and it's present operational mission and the readiness to continue this support in forthcoming missions. Mississippi County is proud to be the named county for Eaker Air Force Base and as we, as citizens, look forward to a very progressive future. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MIKE MCBRANE:

Thank you, Judge Merry. Please, Joe Merry.

BY MR. JOE MERRY:

Thank you, sir. I am Carl Ledbetter, Mayor of the City of Gosnell, which is located just right outside the base. I came here to tell you that I and the people of Gosnell feel that the location of the Rail Garrison at Eaker Air Force Base is important to us and if it is located here, we pledge to help in any way that we can to make it's coming here as smooth as possible. We also pledge to make the new people that would be assigned here to feel welcome and to become a part of our community.

BY MR. CARL LEDBETTER:

Thank you, sir. I am Carl Ledbetter, Mayor of the City of Gosnell, which is located just right outside the base. I came here to tell you that I and the people of Gosnell feel that the location of the Rail Garrison at Eaker Air Force Base is important to us and if it is located here, we pledge to help in any way that we can to make it's coming here as smooth as possible. We also pledge to make the new people that would be assigned here to feel welcome and to become a part of our community.
I've spoken throughout District 23, since the last reporting date that we met with you, there's been overwhelming support throughout the District. I'm happy to say that I have not received one correspondence with any negative feedback whatsoever. I'm very proud of that fact and the people in Gosnell and throughout District 23 are very proud of the support the Rail Garrison here. And like the other people have stated, with the past history of the base and the relationship of Blytheville and District 23, we will do everything possible to make the transition here a very smooth transition and one that we can be proud of in years to come. Thank you.

By Colonel McShane:

Thank you, Lou Maddox, please.

Thank you very much for the opportunity of appearing before this committee and since I have appeared on several committees, I will have empathy and make this brief. I represent the County Commissioners and the Mayors and the Legislators that I've talked to in Southeast Missouri. I've had absolutely no negative remarks and absolute commitment to do anything and everything we can to be of help. I want to assure you that if we can be of any service in any way, we will consider it a privilege to do so. Thank you very much.

By Wayne Wagner:

Good evening. I'm Wayne Wagner, State Representative for District 23 which includes the area surrounding Eaker Air Force Base, including the City of Gosnell.

Representative, thank you, Wayne Wagner, please.

Good evening. I'm Wayne Wagner, State Representative for District 23 which includes the area surrounding Eaker Air Force Base, including the City of Gosnell.
has provided in determining an alternative plan of action in locating the Rail Garrison as in your third proposal tonight. It is important that we citizens and the Department of Defense do everything possible to preserve such archaeological findings, especially the magnitude of this one. Hopefully, the alternative that you have presented to us can change the impact from significant to negligible. We are proud of the heritage of this area and also want to protect it. I think this has been accomplished with the mitigation measures you have presented to us tonight. The enthusiasm that you will see here tonight is not without basis.

BY COLONEL McSHANE:
Mr. Bell, time.

BY STEVE BELL:
I apologize for overstaying my allotted time. Unlike the Honorable Governor of our great state, I do not want to appear on the Johnny Carson show. Thank you.

BY COLONEL McSHANE:
Willie Hammond, please.

BY WILLIE HAMMOND:
Thank you. I am Willie Hammond, Alderman of Ward 3 for Blytheville. I would like to echo the response that you received here from all of the aldered officials and say that I’m not going to go over three minutes.

The economic and some of the environmental impact that it would have on our community and on Blytheville. I can see no adverse impact whatsoever. We have trains coming through our community very day that carry things that could be of danger but I see no added danger with the Rail Garrison System here. As a member of the Blytheville Base Community Council and Mayor of Osceola for some seventeen years, I’ve watched this base and it’s performance. This would be an ideal location for the Rail Garrison Missile and I certainly urge you give it every consideration. Thank you very much.

BY COLONEL McSHANE:
Thank you, Mayor Michael Wilson.

BY MICHAEL WILSON:
Colonel McShane, I’m Mike Wilson, Mayor of Wilson. After the scoping hearing, the City Council of Wilson passed a resolution. For the record, I’d like to read that to you to be entered into the record and I would also note that because the resolution was passed on May 4th, 1987, I will refer to Blytheville Air Force Base instead of Blytheville Air Force Base. The resolution made whereas the City Council of Wilson, Arkansas recognizes the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Concept as a clever addition to this nation’s defense system and they realize that the immunity of efficiency of America’s military in this country’s best assurance for peace and whereas the U.S. Air Force is considering a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System at Blytheville Air Force Base, and whereas Blytheville Air Force Base is the largest industry in the county and is vital to the economy of the county and this addition would bring more military personnel to the county and enhance the future of Blytheville Air Force Base, now therefore it be resolved that the City Council of the City of Wilson, Arkansas, that every effort be made to encourage members of the United States Congress to approve the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Concept and upon further the U.S. Air Force be urged to install the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System at Blytheville Air Force Base. This was passed unanimously. Thank you.

BY COLONEL McSHANE:
Thank you, Mike Gibson.

BY MIKE GIBSON:
I am Mike Gibson, Colonel McShane, of Osceola, Arkansas. As Mayor Pruitt said, we are a city of approximately nine thousand people, located fifteen miles south of Blytheville Air Force Base. I’m here before you tonight as an elected public official in my capacity as City Attorney. I also represent the citizens of south...
Mississippi County as their Prosecuting Attorney and I've been asked by the Mayor of the City of Joiner, located approximately thirty-five miles south of Eaker Air Force Base, and the town of Bassett which is about thirty miles south of Eaker Air Force Base, to speak on their behalf tonight. On reviewing the socioeconomic issues of the proposed Environmental Impact Statement, it is noted that the support and desire of the citizens of Mississippi County, for the location of the MX Rail Garrison System, is not fully expressed. The people of these communities have a largely rural, agricultural background and have a strong and proud commitment to the defense of this nation. The citizens of Osceola, Joiner, Bassett and other citizens in south Mississippi County sincerely want the MX Rail Garrison System at Eaker Air Force Base. I don't think you will find the adversity to the MX Rail Garrison System in Mississippi County, Arkansas that perhaps you have found when compared to other proposed locations. The citizens of south Mississippi County realize the value of this system, not only to the defense of this great country but also the great benefits that result and improve the social and economic conditions as a result of locating the MX Rail Garrison at Eaker Air Force Base.

Colonel McShane, we not only just want you to locate the MX Rail System at Eaker Air Force Base but with an unemployment rate in excess of fourteen percent, we, in fact, need you. It seems to me that two points, two additional points, perhaps, need to be addressed in your final Environmental Impact Statement. Number one, you should more fully express in that statement the desires of the citizens of this community, Mississippi County, that your system be located here at Eaker Air Force Base, that we want you and we need you. I would also ask that you give due consideration to the economic needs of the community in which you might locate this system. I dare say that no other community, when compared to ours, needs these jobs and dollars worth in their communities. It seems to me that this is an excellent opportunity for the military to not only keep the peace kept, Colonel McShane, but you can also help to ensure the domestic tranquility by spending dollars for defense in areas that are economically depressed such as Mississippi County and I think that should be given due consideration. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MCHANE:

Thank you. Now, the balance of these cards that I have are from private citizens, at least that's the indication we had that they were and I've shuffled them and they

including historical discoveries. I'm both appreciative and impressed by the interest and concern expressed by the Air Force in the archaeological discoveries and the persistent attention demonstrated by the Air Force in the protection and preservation of the site. The EIS does not that preliminary evaluations revealed that four of the six sites with the possibility of four others may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. At the conclusion of my statement, I would appreciate some elaboration on that, if you could. I am competent that you will find no community demonstrating a greater level of enthusiasm or support than is found for EAFB and it’s personnel by the citizens of our area. We are proud of what EAFB has done for us and we are equally proud of what we have done for EAFB. My compliments on the fairness and the consideration of the Environmental Impact Study. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MCHANE:

Colonel Walsh, do you have someone who could address Mr. Sullivan concerns.

BY COLONEL WALSH:

Yes, I would like Mr. Sullins to respond to your question, sir.

BY MR. RICKMAN:
We are currently in the process of preparing the final report of our studies on the archaeological site which is about seventy-four acres and is considered to be an excellent example of Mississippian prehistoric village. We expect that we will be preparing the papers for nomination for the National Register early this fall and that it would become part of the National Register perhaps by the end of the year. As a part of the National Register, once it is part of, actually becomes a historic place, the Air Force will be preparing a memorandum of agreement in conjunction with the State Historic Preservation Office in order to document what actions will be necessary to maintain all of the artifacts and to collect when necessary, the information necessary to preserve that data and the artifacts that are present there. This process, currently, will not actually require any activity on the site but rather will be in anticipation of any disturbance that might be required in the future. As Colonel Walsh said earlier, currently for the Peacekeeper Ball-Garrison Program, no disturbance at this site is primed.

BY COLONEL MCGANN:

Shirley Green.

BY SHIRLEY GREEN:

Colonel McGann, you really know how to wear us little to talk about developing up to one hundred when we don't even know what we're doing with the little handful we have now. And there are a couple of other questions that I believe were addressed before but I did not see answers in the study were I've lived in Memphis and the tri-state area all my life and we've always been under the impression that this area was on the New Madrid fault and I would like to know what study has been made, how that would affect something like this, and also the fact that we're in tornado alley here which is well known and if I don't expect an answer tonight, I would just like to see it in the report. So, if you'll excuse my voice again, and I thank you, and my nervousness too. I'm just used to hollering at kids. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MCGANN:

Thank you. Colonel Walsh, are you able to answer these concerns at this time?

BY COLONEL WALSH:

Yes, sir. With your respect to your question on the Peacekeeper missiles, on their adequacy, that's a very, very good question. We did have difficulties with Northrop, the producer of the missiles, in their maintaining the production schedule that was originally established for them and the problem did lie in the conversion from a research and development effort to a production line effort. In the seventeen tests that we've had of the Peacekeeper missile, they have performed well above our expectations but, nevertheless, Northrop did have difficulty transitioning from research and development to a production line. Because of that, the Air Force withheld progress payments and that got national attention and that's what Mr. Aspen was referring to. However, since that time, they have gotten their act together and are almost back on schedule with the production of the inertial measurement unit, there are thirty-three MMAs now deployed but only two-thirds have workable IMUs. So I really don't understand why we're spending all this money...
in recent legislation and that is that they have placed two hundred and fifty million dollars into both the
CBO program and into the Peacekeeper-MAX Garrison
program to continue the research and development through
the first part of the fiscal year, 1989. They have
also fenced an extra two hundred and fifty million
dollars that could be used for both programs or one
program or no program and it all depends on a decision
that Congress intends to make in conjunction with the
new Administration and they have established a date
of March of next year for making that decision. Thank
you very much.

BY COLONEL McSHANE:
Sir, did you have a statement or was it just a question?

BY MR. IMMAN:
Just a question.

BY COLONEL McSHANE:
Thank you, Terry Gabrielson.

BY TERRY GABRIELSON:
Colonel McShane, gentlemen, my name is Terry Gabrielson.
I'm a Blytheville resident. I was asked to speak this
evening by Mr. Frank Latter, Superintendent of
Blytheville Public Schools. The purpose of being here
to make the correct decision of adding the mission
here at Eaker Air Base. We have read
mission here at Eaker Air Force Base. We have read
carefully and studied the outstanding document you've
put before us and we concur with your conclusions and
your statistics put forth, namely in Blytheville, our
current student/staff member ratio is 16:1 and with
the addition of the new mission at the air base, it
would simply, we could comfortably assimilate the new
students who would join our school district. It would
raise the figures to about 16:4, a mere increase of
three tenths of one percent. We feel that we have an
excellent staff in place. We are in the process of
upgrading our facilities and adding new facilities.
It is not anticipated that any new facilities would
have to be constructed. If the need presented itself,
certainly, based on the school board's past performance,
we would add new staff if the need did present itself.
We think we have the kinds of programs in the Blytheville
Public School that will well serve a variety of
students representing a vast variety of needs. As
mentioned at the last hearing, we serve well and
effectively, we believe, youngsters ranging from very
very gifted to profoundly handicapped. We have those
types of programs in place. But a lot of other people
attend our school. Again, we would very much like to
see you make the correct decision of adding the mission
to the Eaker Air Force Base. We absolutely pledge to
support you in any and all possible ways. We commend
you for your report. Thank you.

BY COLONEL McSHANE:
Thank you, Jerry Bohannon.

BY JERRY BOHANNON:
Thank you, gentlemen. My Board of Directors have kept
me here in Blytheville where it's humid, my nose is
in pretty good shape. Welcome to Blytheville, gentlemen.
I'm Jerry Bohannon, Executive Vice President of the
BY COLONEL McSHANE: I must echo the comments of appreciation which preceded me on your being here to give our citizens the opportunity to respond to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The investigation team should be commended on the intensity and completeness of its investigation in the Blytheville-Goosell area. From this investigation and subsequent study has evolved an awareness on behalf of the impacted communities of the effort by the Air Force to work cooperatively toward a successful and amicable garrisoning of the MX missile system at Barksdale Air Force Base. Operations of the 97th Bombardment Wing have been an integral part of the way of life in this area for many years. The importance of the aircraft based here play an important part in our national defense is accepted and appreciated. Selection as a garrison site, therefore, follows, therefore, a very reasonable line of thinking. We've supported our country's military objectives and will continue to do so. In our knowledge of the cultural significance of findings on Barksdale Air Force Base, brought about by the Environmental Impact Study, we are pleased with the measures taken to ensure the proper accountability of these sites. Having been designated as a recipient of the Barksdale trophy for outstanding community support, the City of Blytheville has developed a relationship with Barksdale Air Force Base of exemplary cooperation. The record should note this support in the Air Force deliberations for selecting potential garrison sites. Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments.

BY BILL AKIN: Good evening. Since this is a public hearing, I thought it would be good to talk to the public. In looking at the MX missile, I think it is appropriate, even though our Environmental Impact Statement tries to limit it to a statement that should not consider the psychological, the national security or the moral. I think as far as looking at the MX missile, I think this is something that we should not even be trying to build the fifty we have much less trying to get fifty more. We hear about the talks about trying to reduce our nuclear arsenal by fifty percent and move towards a more peaceful world, working out our problems in other ways than by the number of missiles, planes, etcetera, that we have and yet the Plan Garriess Plan is trying to double the number of MX missiles we have which is seemingly the opposite of what we are trying to do on a national level. I think as far as looking at the MX Action Alternative of the MX is one of the most important alternatives, I'll speak for myself. I think it represents a good portion of the people in the country and even this area of the country if not in this city, that the money, ten to fifteen billion dollars and looking at the piece that this community will get and the jobs and the benefits... many people have spoken to and are highly in favor of, that we could distribute that same amount of money in this community and other communities are in need and it would go a lot further in terms of the employment of people and the productivity of the community. To address a few things about the DEIS statement itself, it seems to imply that deterrence is somewhat enhanced by this system whereas this is adding about five hundred warheads whereas to our arsenal that we say would be survivable because they'd be on the rails whereas Congress has already found that we would have more than enough, thirty-seven hundred warheads would sustain any Soviet attack and be able to deter or be able to respond back which I think is more than efficient deterrence. The statement is weak in terms of looking at what happens when these trains get out on the rail and the safety factors involved. They talk about objects hitting the train and at some relatively low speed but they don't talk about weapons and the trains being sabotaged, looking at the tracks and the vulnerability of having these tracks all over the place whereas one strategic explosion on the tracks would take care of the train going anywhere.

BY COLONEL McSHANE: Thank you for the time and, also, I hope that the statement did not really address all of our written and oral statements before that this final document would address these and other things that we have in written form. Thank you.

BY BILL AKIN: As indicated, the final document is required to address all these concerns. Colonel Walsh.

BY COLONEL McSHANE: I would like to respond to some of the issues that you raised. First of all, the National Environmental Policy Act requires that the proposed action only look at the physical effects of the system. It
does not require us to look at the psychological, social effects of the system. It has to be something that's a direct cause of the action as has been reported in the EIS. Also, the National Environmental Policy Act only requires us to look at alternatives to satisfy the underlying requirements. In this case, the underlying requirement is a more survivable ICBM system so it does not require us to look at alternate uses of the money. That is a subject for the Congress to consider in making their final decisions. Also, the EIS does not require us to, or the Congress has directed us just to look at the peacetime operation of the system so we do not have to consider the wartime use and in actual facts, the purpose of this system is through the mobility of the Peacekeeper that it becomes an untargetable target by the Soviets and knowing the Soviet Union, knowing that they cannot successfully attack it, will not attack in the first place. Thank you very much, sir.

BY COLONEL MCSHANE:

Phil Darnell, speaking as a private citizen, I think the new on base option pretty well answered my initial question. However, I'd like to ask one more. Is it:

The, as far as I know right now, that would probably be transported via aircraft into the base and set up with the other three stages of the missile at the operating base.

BY COLONEL WALSH:

If I can, I think his question concerns the, when the missile is taken back to P. E. Warren for maintenance, will the fourth stage be with it or not?

BY COLONEL MCSHANE:

No.

BY COLONEL WALSH:

Does that fairly answer your question?

BY PHIL DARNELL:

Yes, sir. And finally, I'd just like to say that I endorse all those who have spoken in favor of basing it here. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MCSHANE:

Thank you, Dewey Neely.

Colonel Neely, I'm Dewey Neely from Decola, Arkansas, fifteen miles south of Eaker Air Force Base. I'm a member of the Base Council and have been for a number of years. I would just like to echo most of what has been said in favor of the Peacekeeper rail Garrison missile being stationed here. If and when it's finally approved, it is pretty clear that the new on-base option will avoid the Cemetery? And, on other question, more of a technical nature, just out of curiosity, is the Stage 4 liquid propellant, well be carried along with, all four stages will be carried at once on the maintenance train?

BY COLONEL WALSH:

With respect to your question on the cemetery, we have made every attempt to avoid impact to that cemetery and at this time we still have avoided it. I would like to ask Lieutenant Colonel Evans to respond to your second question.

BY LIEUTENANT COLONEL GARY EOKEND:

In taking about the maintenance train, are you referring to the train that would be out on the rail practicing our operational concept or the transportation of the missile itself from the build up base?

BY PHIL DARNELL:

Well, whatever train would be, as well as I can gather from reading the EIS, that would be the train that goes back and forth to Warren. Whenever the stages, the missile itself, with the propellant stages are included. Not the operational train.

BY LIEUTENANT COLONEL GARY EOKEND:

Okay, I think I understand your question right now.

I think this is one thing that some are taking out of context. It has not been yet, I was explained earlier, but if and when it is, then the people that I've talked with in Decola and south Mississippi: County are certainly all for basing of a Peacekeeper rail Garrison missile at Eaker Air Force Base. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MCSHANE:

Thank you, James Deal.

BY JAMES DEAL:

I want to thank you, General, for the opportunity to present my views. Time does not permit to really present all the views that incorporate my interest in this and my studies up to date so I fully intend to send a written statement timely for this purpose. I'll state for the record, though, that I pretty much agree with Senator Dale Bumpers that the Missle may not be the best thing for this nation but I also want to include that if there is deployment of this missile system, I would be in favor of Blayeville, Arkansas being one of the ten. I want to bring to you some experience that I have, though, about transportation. During the last war in the 1940's, I was a conductor for Southern Pacific Railroad, working out of Indiana to Tuna and at that time we were training or we had a training base headed by General Patton for the Africa Corps.
I serve as Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Blytheville Chamber of Commerce and I'm delighted to have this opportunity to address the Board on the subject of the rail companies in our area, and therefore they would not attack in the first place. If we were working on an orderly movement in full coordination with our forces, we could dispose forces and we could fight more of the Soviet forces. They could not be successful in an attack.

We've heard it before in the last few days. We will rely on strategic warning to initiate a dispersal. The Soviet Union is known that because of the Air Force efforts, it's creativity and sensitivity have had a profound effect on our strategists. They will have adequate strategic warning and be prepared to give a full, effective response, if necessary. The Soviet command and control situation can be expected in the most adverse circumstances. We're not successful in an attack, but the damage would be enormous because we would have more than the time to get those missiles off of this base.

Yes, there are things we can do. But it's not a very good situation. It is almost impossible to have any indication of where the next attack would be. And therefore we must have enough forces deployed so they could hit the Soviet Union and inflict unacceptable damage. If the Soviet command and control would be hit, they would not attack in the first place. And therefore we would have ample time to get those missiles off of this base.
to avoid this significant cultural resource and collocate the garrison, thus saving millions of dollars. Baker Air Force Base should now be considered an even more viable, perhaps even the best candidate for the location of the Mt. Peasekeeper Rail Garrison System. Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments for the record.

BY COLONEL MUSSANE:

Thank you, Bo Huffman.

BY BO HUFFMAN:

Sir, I think he goes by Bo.

I'd like to ask Mr. Richman to respond to that question.

BY FREE RICHMAN:

Our research on the archaeological site at Baker Air Force Base began with a literature search of all the past studies that have been done and many sites had already been recorded. Once we had finished this search of information that was available in the State historic Preservation Office, we began a survey of the site itself. As I said earlier, it's about seventy-four acres. The initial findings were to look at about one half of one percent of that area using a pedestrian survey which is essentially random; individual archaeologists walking about twenty meters apart. During that pedestrian survey, we found approximately ten thousand artifacts, projectile points, shards of pottery, jewelry and other artifacts which clearly tie into a prehistoric period. Following that pedestrian study, we did magnitometry studies which is essentially using a proton magnetometer, a device similar to a metal detector, which can locate areas that have been disturbed deep in the earth, approximately down to one meter. Using this instrument, we were able to find some locations that were clearly the sites of previous village houses as well as a palisade or a wall around such a village. We did some excavation at a few sites, approximately thirty-four meters in total, to document that there were various foundations and house floors in that area.

This is all the tests that have been done at this time.

This will be the basis of the report we prepare for the Air Force and for the SHPO and we'll this will be the basis of the eventual plan for any recovery that would be established.

BY COLONEL WALSH:

By SHPO, we are referring to the State History Preservation Officer.

BY COLONEL MUSSANE:

Lajean Brown.

BY LAJEAN BROWN:

Colonel McShane, I'm Lajean Brown. I've been involved in the Farmer's Bank and Trust Gonsnell Branch across from the main gate of the base and I'd like to say that I am in support of the Rail Garrison Mission because if ever it would be a strong defense and I believe the Rail Garrison Mission would help make all of this possible. I am very proud to have this mission based here at the Baker Air Force Base. I live in Gonsnell just next to the base and I'm proud to have Baker Air Force Base as a part of the community. Thank you.

BY FREE RICHMAN:

Thank you, Carol Glidewell.

BY CAROL GLIDEWELL:

Colonel McShane, my name is Carol Glidewell. I am here in capacity as President of Baker Air Force Base Base Community Council. I'm the President of that organization. We have approximately two hundred and fifty members, both military and civilians in our organization and we are told that it's somewhat unique in all of the Air Force in that we are the organization directly responsible for good relationships between the community and the base. The organization was the one that was directly involved in winning the Barkdale trophy for being the best for community support in all the strategic air command. So, from this standpoint, we certainly welcome the Rail Garrison Mission to Gonsnell and hope it will be here. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MUSSANE:

Thank you, Douglas Mason.

BY DOUGLAS MASON:

I'm representing the Delta Greensboro Regional Political Organization here and first, I would like to ask that any of my questions be answered in the Final RIF rather than tonight and taking up any more of the precious little time that's left. I'd like to say that I did read the safety section in the geological section of the DEIS and, frankly, I was a bit disappointed in the minor coverage afforded the earthquake threat therein. The main premise seems to be that since the 1811-12 quake was a magnitude that only occurs once
every five to seven hundred years and only one hundred and seventy-five years have past, thus far the threat is minimal. In fact, an understanding of rudimentary statistics would make it clear that this prediction refers to independent events which only follow that trend in a broad sense. Can you tell me, for example, when the last quake occurred of an 8.3 magnitude on the Richter scale? Was it in 1915 or 1916? I sincerely doubt that it was five to seven hundred years. It may have been a thousand years ago. You can only examine the deformation of the apparent material to determine that bus just like the odds of head and tails are fifty/fifty, it's still possible that you might get five heads in a row because each toss of the coin is an independent event. Similarly, the next major quake could occur tomorrow, not in the year 2522. But what about lesser magnitude quakes? In my comment sheet which wasn't addressed and I did send it registered mail. I refer to the prediction by Dr. ... Johnson, Head of Tennessee Earthquake Information Center at Memphis State University, that this area has a forty to sixty-three percent chance of having a tremor measuring 6.0 on the Richter scale by the year 2000. I would like to know what are the expected effects of this less dramatic event. Referring back to the 1811 quake, I read John James Audubon was walking the banks of the Ohio River near Indias when that quake occurred and he documented this in his book Episodes of Western Life and he was literally tossed twelve feet in the air by the jolt of a quake many miles distant. So, even if there is no risk of detonation and, by the way, I remind you, Colonel Walsh, that they said they couldn't sink the Titanic and the space shuttle would never explode either, but what effect would just radioactive material stream across the landscape have? Would this material be washed into the river or what would be the effect on nonthreatened wildlife and people? In your summary of Environmental Effects, you note under the section on geology and soil, only the hush significant impacts of erosion during construction and I would like to ask what about the destruction after construction in regards to the New Madrid fault? Also, in your audiovisual presentation, you talked about comparison of bases and for Baker you only considered the cultural impacts to be significant. I'm just thinking, ironically, that perhaps future archaeologists, if any of our species survive all of this nuclear madness, will one day find the earthquake damaged remains of Eaker Air Force Base in Blytheville and consider these somewhat analogous
to Pompey or some of the other archaeological finds of our day. But finally, I would like to ask the audience if they were as disappointed as I was in the renaming of Eaker Air Force Base. I hope everyone has read Mutiny on the Bounty or at least seen one of the movies remake because I think Captain Blythe is alive and well in Blytheville. Thank you.

BY COLONEL MCMURDO:
That was all the cards I have. I ask any of the folks, did any more come in? Apparently not. Ladies and gentlemen, we can conclude the meeting at this time. Please remember that you have until 31 August to submit written materials to be included in the transcript of the hearing. Once again, oral and written statements or comments will be afforded equal weight. Officials of the Air Force appreciate your efforts to come out tonight and to contribute your views to this public hearing. We thank you for your courteous attention. Please be assured that Air Force decision makers will carefully consider each viewpoint raised here tonight when deciding the ultimate course of action on this proposal. Thank you and this public hearing is adjourned at 9:17 p.m.
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affiliation or address, and then ask your question or make your statement.

I have quite a few people who have indicated a desire to speak tonight, so, I will begin by letting you know when the three minute time limit is up. George Avery, please.

MR. SACHER: Thank you, Col. Walsh.

We have carefully reviewed the RIK and after that review, we have concluded that there is no significant impact on the City of Medical Lake that we anticipate from the Garrison of the missile at Fairchild.

As a result, however, we would hope that we would be consulted if there are to be any changes, alterations made to State Highway 902, since it does provide the primary arterial into the City of Medical Lake.

On behalf of the city council and myself, we would like to go on record as endorsing the housing of the Ball Garrison Missile at Fairchild Air Force Base.

MR. SACHER: Thank you. That takes care of all of the public officials who have indicated a desire to speak tonight. The balance of these

...
that this classified annex be made publicly available before the end of the DEIS comment period.

On page 3-1 in the section covering national economic impacts, the DEIS is deficient. The Air Force has failed to include in its analysis any section of how many more people will be hungry or homeless or unemployed because of the Wall Garrison proposal.

I would also note that the Catholic bishops of the United States have condemned the MX system because of its negative socioeconomic impact.

On page 4-6-1, Spokane is listed as the host community. Why was this hearing not held in the host community?

On page 4-8-24, the DEIS addresses measures which would mitigate the harmful impacts on the habitat of the endangered species. However, these measures lack adequate detail and do not represent a sufficient commitment on the part of the Air Force to protect the environment.

On page 5-2, the safety considerations are not specific to each of the proposed bases and thereby do not provide enough information for an intelligent assessment. An example of this is that there is no information as to the nearest emergency response crew which would handle an accident at Fairchild involving a nuclear weapon and/or missile motor.

On page 5-10, the DEIS states an MX's third stage contains 2600 pounds of nitroglycerin. I wonder how many residents of Eastern Washington realized this fact or would approve more than two tons of nitroglycerin as it's passing through their field and homes.

Overall, my assessment of the proposed DEIS on the Wall Garrison would support the no action alternative, and this is my recommendation to the Air Force. Thank you.

MR. MCKAY: Thank you, Frances Stacey.

COL. WALSH: May I make a comment on the previous gentleman's statement?

MR. MCKAY: Briefly.

COL. WALSH: With respect to the substantial change in the design of the system, we will be required to have a supplemental draft DEIS. The existing DEIS would not be adequate, so we would have to come up with a supplemental draft that will be made to the public. Thank you, sir.

WALSH: I'm speaking tonight as just an ordinary citizen. I'm a Sister of Providence. My concerns are basically economical, you relay several of the points in your presentation tonight. A main concern for me is the wetland, the effect on the wetland habitat and the potential shortage of wildlife that would be affected, including the great blue heron.

As I've just mentioned, there's not a whole lot of detail about how that would be taken care of, how the wetlands in the area, the destruction of the wetlands is a major ecological concern for me.

You mentioned 574 acres of land, almost half of which are considered prime farmland, would be used for this project, and I don't know that the value of that project is equal to the use of land.

You also include that the solid waste plant that's on the docket now has significant environmental and health concerns that need to be addressed. So, I would ask that you move the solid waste disposal up a little higher in your priorities of why it wouldn't be good here in Spokane.

Finally, you mentioned that there would be a potential shortage of low and moderate income housing in Medical Lake. I'm not a part of the Medical Lake community, but I am concerned about those who have low and moderate incomes and any kind of effect on those that would be negative would be a concern for me.

Finally, the report mentioned the nearby Spokane/Colville tribes having concerns. And then both in your report tonight, Col. Walsh -- and in the report, it seemed like those concerns, they weren't described and they didn't seem to have much significance to anybody, and I would be interested in knowing more about their concerns and that that would be addressed more specifically.

Finally, I would say that I see that nuclear weapons are really shiny, we cannot use these and must not use them for obvious
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Finally, you mentioned that there would be a potential shortage of low and moderate income housing in Medical Lake. I'm not a part of the Medical Lake community, but I am concerned about those who have low and moderate incomes and any kind of effect on those that would be negative would be a concern for me.

Finally, the report mentioned the nearby Spokane/Colville tribes having concerns. And then both in your report tonight, Col. Walsh -- and in the report, it seemed like those concerns, they weren't described and they didn't seem to have much significance to anybody, and I would be interested in knowing more about their concerns and that that would be addressed more specifically.

Finally, I would say that I see that nuclear weapons are really shiny, we cannot use these and must not use them for obvious
environmental and health hazard reasons. So, I would ask that the NE selection not be placed here in Spokane, thank you.

MR. MCNAIR: I got a card from Mr. James Reinbold. First question I'd ask, are you an elected official, sir?

MR. REINBOLD: I'm representing Mayor Alden.

MR. MCNAIR: Are you an official?

MR. REINBOLD: No.

COL. WALSH: There were several issues I'd like to respond to. First of all, the more specific any work to the handling of the wetland that is covered under section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and we would have to work with the Corps of Engineers to develop a more detailed approach on how we would mitigate the impacts on those wetlands. It could be by building additional wetlands to compensate for those that have been removed. But that would occur after the decision has been made.

SISTER STACEY: And you did say that it would not. It's likely it would not compensate for the loss -- especially for the wildlife because of the fact that the wetland would be in different spots.

COL. WALSH: As you noted in the leading, we were not specific and we did not make any commitments, so therefore, we make the worst case conclusion. As to the impacts, we would not take any benefits in the analysis of these mitigations until they had been committed to after they had been reviewed with the Corps of Engineers.

Sister Stacey, we're looking at the worst case impacts.

The next thing we had been consulting with various Indian tribes that have historical ties to the area, but at this time in the analysis, they haven't indicated the presence of any sacred sites on the base that we would interfere with.

SISTER STACEY: So their concerns are environmental.

COL. WALSH: No, no important sites, burial sites, or sites of that -- are important for prayer, ancestors.

SISTER STACEY: I'm wondering, will you be responding to each speaker, Lt. Col. Walsh?

COL. WALSH: If they ask me a question, yes, ma'am. If they do not ask me a question, I will not respond, but if they ask me a question.

SISTER STACEY: So you'll respond to a direct question then?

COL. WALSH: Yes.

SISTER STACEY: Thank you.

MR. MCNAIR: George Beltmater? I hope I didn't pronounce that too badly.

MR. BELTMATER: I've been called worse.

My name is George Beltmater, I'm president of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane. I have 2140 members, our address is 1,802 Riverside, Spokane, Washington.

We're heavily involved in the activities of Fairchild Air Force Base. Some of our board service committees are here tonight and say or may not testify depending upon the need.

Based upon the information, which we have received like everyone else, in looking over the complete report, we find nothing to be concerned with, we do not feel that there are any specific questions dealing with the environmental phase.

We would like of course, not to have the habitat disturbed, but if that is the only promise that we have involved, we're totally in support of the facility as it is reported in the environmental impact statement. Thank you.

MR. MCNAIR: Thank you, Lauren Gaylord, please?

MS. GAYLORD: My name is Lauren Gaylord.

I'm speaking on behalf of myself. I would like to go on record as pointing out that I am opposed to NE and also opposed to the Wall Barracks Project.

I think there are significant flaws in the draft EIS in particular, the mitigation measures, more specifically, in terms of the wetlands.

The last 25 years of development have meant huge destruction of wetlands and reservoirs from these which don't work. The result has been destruction of numerous wildlife and their habitats, and this is not discussed in sufficient detail in the draft EIS.

I think it must be provided detail analysis of the impacts and the mitigation impacts if they're going to place now and where so that they will be taken care of.

I'm also concerned about the mitigation...
of rail problems, there are frequent rail
accidents in the valley as well as in the United
States, and these rail accidents present potential
for a new type of accident with enormous threat to
the safety of the entire region. There must be a
greater analysis of this end of the mitigation
measures that can be developed to prevent those
dangerous impacts.

I also think that the section on
alternatives is extremely weak and there needs to
be greater consideration of other alternatives. I
think just in general, the mitigation measures
appear as if they're an afterthought, they're
extremely general, they are not incorporated as an
essential of the RIA, this program presents an
incredible number of adverse impacts and they are
not mitigated sufficiently in your report. Thank
you.

Mr. McHare: Thank you, folks, as I
indicated, if you clap every time after that, 1'll just
wait until you're done and you're going
to take away from the speaking time.

Richard J. Salz 3-1-2-1-2A

Mr. Hoff: Colonel, my name is Richard
J. Salz, I'm a participant in the local superior of

you as well as the people here.

Mr. WEALE: Stand on the ear, please.

Mr. WEALE: Surely, my name is Bill
Greene, I live in Spokane, Washington. I represent
the ARI, the Physicians for Social Responsibility,
which is also the representative for the IPPNW
which got the Nobel Peace Prize in 1985.

It is the position of our group that any
significant exchange of nuclear weapons would lead
to a nuclear winter and the destruction of all
humanity. This has not been addressed in the impact
statement, the environmental assessment very well
for consideration for nuclear weapons, the warfare
risk was not addressed, small details such as the
2 percent increase in flow traffic on roads was
discussed, but no Air Force was safe of the
increase and risk of nuclear exchange.

Where would all this take place?

It seems like the most important issue to be
addressed. I recognize that this kind of
political issue is not supposed to be discussed
that is, to me, an environmental issue.

Different from what you said, Colonel, these
hearings have had a -- served in a free society
for the people to express their view both pro and

against these issues.

And in previous NE hearings in Utah,
Nevada, Boston, these types of hearings have had a
major impact on the deployment of these weapons,
as political statements as well as trying to meet
these NE requirements.

I shall leave it there and ask that the
impact include a statement about the increased
risk of nuclear weapon exchange by having these
additional NE weapons deployed.

Mr. McHare: Thank you. Colonel, could I have
our microphone be turned on? And future speakers,
it was set up so everybody
could talk and everybody could hear.

SPECTATOR: Col. Walsh, Col. Walsh has
reported the opportunity for addressing the
audience, we should be afforded the same
opportunity.

Mr. McHare: Marion, please?

Mr. WEALE: I'm Marion WEALE, I live at 1346
West 14th in the City of Spokane. I'm speaking
for myself as a citizen of Spokane, and before us,
I have brought and distributed to the public here,
the letter from the City Council of Spokane to Lt.
Col. Peter Walsh of the Air Force recording the
I am addressing that the, the City Council in an -- in writing these remarks for the city made a unilateral -- without any input or any input from the citizens of Spokane. The City Council unilaterally arrived at its decision without seeking any direction of the citizens of Spokane, no advisory opinions were sought in evaluating the EIS and the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. No public hearings have been held, the United States Air Force needs to know, no consensus is presented in their remarks to the U.S. Air Force in the determination that the City Council has arrived upon.

The City Council did not publicly address to the citizens its decision in the content of this letter, and that -- this and that indeed that it would even be in the City Council agenda August 1, 1988. The City Council, as elected officials, chose, in isolation, to make this decision with its staff and therefore, the public needs to address this to you that we are not using a democratic process in any of the Draft environmental impact statements, the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison, June 1988, and there are my remarks.
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away from its natural, predetermined environment?

Of the migrating water fowl and all creatures
great and small? Even little children can
understand that the elimination of birds would
leave an environment before it of protection from
the insects which, in turn, are responsible for
recreating the soil from the decaying, aging and
decaying vegetation. Of course, this does not
happen overnight like the rise and fall of the
stock market.

Few people know that the blue heron is now
on its threatened list. We’re destined to require
a certain -- insects that live only in its natural
run field, for the survival life -- for survival.

And water fowl must have sarcoïd and asthenotes and
I could go on and on. When I was a child, blue
birds were abundant, each of their former habitat
has been sacrificed for the development. You
seems one anywhere in the City of Spokane.

It is a highly developed suburban -- it’s
a highly suburban area. An oil spill in Courv
alone a couple of years ago decreased the eagle
population because such of the spawning fish
population was killed. All the economists thought
about was the finances lost, human carelessness

transuranic waste from the Hanford Reservation to
the repository in New Mexico, the U.S. Department
of Energy has rejected the option for rail trans-
port of waste on grounds that the nation’s rail
system is considered unsafe for the shipment of
nuclear waste materials and I’d like to know how
that is the Air Force assessment of safety for the
very same rail system has produced such different
conclusions. That’s all.

BRIDGE: Did you want an answer to
that question tonight?

BRIDGE: If we have one tonight.

COL. WALKER: I would make it as brief as
possible. But for the maneuvers that are related
to the initial deployment and maintenance, we have
initialized the start times for the dispersed
mavericks which will be nationwide.

We do see nationwide start times, but what
you point out is perhaps a deficiency in the present
in which we need in to work explicitly on how we
have used these start times on you will understand
how we did do that and most of this analysis was
from the Sandia laboratories that did much of the case work
for the Department of Energy on a movement of the
hazardous waste, thank you very much, sir.

and if anything has caused any problems such as
this.

MG. MCMANUS: I understand. If you have
further comments and you wanted to submit them in
writing, you may do so.

MG. MARGARET HARDIN: Okay.

MG. MCMANUS: Douglas Ray, please?

MG. RAY: My name is Douglas Ray. I’m from
La Grande, Oregon, which is incidentally on the
tracks that the KE is projected to be transported
on.

I’m -- I have comments regarding the
the calculations of accident fatality risks attached
to the deployment of the Rail Garrison. I feel
that the PRA is defunct in this area. Its
projections in the area are general and based on
figures for the entire nation. I object to that
because I think it’s an error that the rail
system in the western United States has been in
worse, far condition than that of the east part of
the country and I think it’s Wyoming, which is, I
hear, is the worst.

I would like to, in support of that, I’d
like to point out that at a meeting last month, or
a hearing that is, regarding the transport of

MG. BARKER: It’s William Barker.

MG. BARKER: I’m William Barker. I’m a
clinical psychologist and my office is at West
104, 4th Avenue in Spokane and I’d like to also
comment on the -- or follow the comment that was
made earlier about the statement. I think there’s
22 lack in its assertion on the social impact and
adequate treatment of the emotional psychological
effect of this progress on our children.

What are we going to say to the 2-year
old and the 3-year old child about this progress,
that there’s -- that the railroad around Spokane
are set up for nuclear warheads and to have these
embled and have these ready to go, that we’re
one of the headquarters for nuclear missiles to be
available and that -- and what are we going to say
to them about their safety, you know, what is this
going to say about their feelings about themselves
and their own sense of wellbeing?

And I suggest that the important statement
is lacking in that area and I support the idea
that that expertise in that area has not been
well-used.

And in the meantime, I support the
recommendation of an alternative

3-79
simultaneous explosion of the two missiles, that it would be too late to save human life. That was not
safely related to the program, that's why the reason for the safety zone, thank you, sir.

MR. MCKNIGHT: John Eavesnag, please.

MR. EAVENAGH: My name is John Eavesnag; I live in Spokane. I'd like to address the
environmental issues that weren't addressed in the BIR and that being the failure rate of the
36 2.1 test firing series of a few months back see a
24 2.1 two missiles out of the three didn't work as
12 2.1 they were supposed to. And my concern is that the
14 2.1 American people are putting their money into a
20 2.1 system that's not going to work as it's supposed
to. That's about all.

MR. MCKNIGHT: Thank you, Col. Malarit.

COL. MALARIT: Sir, there have been 17
19 2.1 successful launches of the Peacemaker Missile and
19 2.1 all it launches have performed beyond our
19 2.1 expectations, and it is a highly accurate
dleil.
22 2.1 What you have heard been used has been
25 2.1 the Air Force's concern of the ability of the
24 2.1 developer of the initial regiment only to transfer
23 2.1 from a research and development effort to a
25 2.1 production effort, so the Northrup Corporation was
26 2.1 unable to deliver the guidance systems in a timely
26 2.1 manner to meet our needs, that's what was asking
26 2.1 the news.
26 2.1 We were withholding progress payments
26 2.1 from the contractor, but recently has got back on
26 2.1 schedule and he's almost got all his progress
26 2.1 payments back and we are now going to meet full
26 2.1 operating capability on schedule at P.E. Warren.
26 2.1 Thank you very much, sir.

MR. MCKNIGHT: Jerry and Nancy Nines, one
person going to speak.

MR. NINES: My name is Jerry Nines, my
wife and I live at 9th North LePage. I would like
to say that both my wife and I favor the proposal
of the Rail Garrison being placed as proposed site
17 2.1 on Fairfield.

We raised our children in this community and I can't think of one evening in which we had
to console our children having lived near it, a
21 2.1 strategic air command, Fairfield Air Force,
because my children learned what it represented
22 2.1 and they're content.

We have grandchildren that live in this
24 2.1 community and I'm sure as they are educated they
24 2.1
force that is on duty, this would provide coverage in the existing strategic weapons but also in the rail garrison.

MR. WIGGEMEYER: How do you plan on protecting the miles and miles of rails that the trains carrying the HE missiles will travel on?

COL. WALKER: We do not propose any extraordinary action on those rails. What we would suggest to you is that we would be able to move randomly on those rails and it would be very difficult for a adversary to know precisely where we would be moving so could do no ill to those rails.

If he were to do an ill to those rails, it would be unambiguously and an indication to us that some ill intent was intended and that we would take the necessary precautions with other experts of our train to put them on alert.

MR. WIGGEMEYER: I understand that the State of Washington at this time presently is the number three nuclear power in the world. Do you feel that the children of this area will be harmed psychologically knowing that Spokane and the State of Washington will be the number one target of any enemy contemplating warfare?
COL. WALK: Again, sir, you’re asking me
to speculate on the intents of people. All I can
suggest to you is that other locations where there
have been deployments of the nuclear missiles,
there has been plenty of unrest capital to go to
those areas, to go immigrate into that area. So I
can only speculate what has happened elsewhere
and assume the same thing would happen here.

MR. GORMLEY: Thank you. Again, I
would just like to go on record against the
placement of MX missiles here. I thank you.

MR. BERNARD: Jan Bernard.

MR. GORMLEY: My name is Seneca Desherry. I
live in Spokane, I’m here as a private citizen.
I’d like to first address the cost effectiveness
issues that were raised by the slide presentation
this evening as well as being addressed by the
city officials in the area.

According to like, even 1980 statistics,
as far as what happens really when you put for
every $1 million that goes into a military program
such as the MX program, there is a ton of jobs,
like public housing within a five-year period and
were that money to go into the private
sector, there would be an additional 50,000 jobs
here.

I think that there is a further concern
regarding the fact that there just be a limited
addition of tracks to connect the NE with
Burlington Northern.

However, it doesn’t take much imagination
to see how many ways in which someone could cheaply
use dynamite or any other type of device to cause
havoc along the rail lines. I think that it doesn’t
take much imagination or having read parent papers
on railroads there are several reached, once
recently, in Iowa, I believe, one train on the
track shouldn’t have even started for 16 minutes.
It is enough — since the train is only
going to be deployed during a time of
international crises, this would even be expected.
and that there be further chance of high risk of
looking at the situation such as in Iran where
you’re looking at the airliner bombing of a
civilian flight.

Other things that were not addressed: one
is the solid and hazardous waste site you have on
44 -- 45, wherever it is.

MR. MCKNIGHT: Tom, any, Mary Singer?

MR. SINGER: My name is Mary Singer, I
live at South 45th Melrose in Spokane, and I’m

In a five-year period.

So, in effect, all the documents, it
seems to me, even though I don’t have the
statistical research in terms of the MX, I have the
chance sense to know that the figures that were
given by this panel show, that should have shown
there would be a few jobs in Spokane as well
as throughout the country with the deployment of
the MX here.

I would also like to address the B17.
region of influence, particularly as related to
your progress, related to community. It didn’t
mention in your document specifically, you
identified the B17 as Spokane County and Kootenai
County, Idaho. That would be in conflict for me
with another document or series of documents
that have come out in the Spokane area regarding
what the citizens do in the event of a nuclear
attack as far as fallout shelters, the older are
in the -- at Medical Lake and Cheney. They have
been updated in recent years in newer documents.

As far as if you’re talking about the
neighboring counties in Rex, Pierce,
Banner, Pend Oreille, Klickitat, Yakima, and again
in Washington, Whitman and Stevens, but this is
not addressed in any part of your statement.

Here as a private citizen and a student of Eastern
Washington University majoring in psychology.

Col. Walsh, in his statements, gave us
much statistical information, even down in the
fact that there would be a high of a person
fatality, perhaps I’m reading that wrong but
that’s what it sounded like.

I will meet Col. Walsh, in my written
comments, some other statistics, the number one
fear of children in adolescents in a nuclear war
and that’s certainly pertinent to our
psychological involvement, and I will send you
these statistics, etc.

Number two, in the slide presentation
another base was not considered for deployment of
nuclear bases on railroad tracks because of an
underground water supply situation. I do not
really know where the Spokane aquifers run but any
attack on Spokane would certainly disrupt the
aquifers and all life forms within it, and all
necessary water supplies to this area because it
is not only source of fresh drinking water

Number three, you mentioned there would
be periodic drug testing of individuals driving
the trains, maybe when I’m done you could tell me
whether it would be civilians or military driving these trains, and what exactly you seen by periodic drug testing. It has not worked very well in the past couple years. We have had many instances of people seeking treatment and involved in terrible crashes and loss of life.

Second, with regard to the mitigating measures as well.

Second, Spokane has already been on Fairchild on a toxic waste cleanup list, again, I ask you, how will this affect the toxic waste; will it just add to it and this whole cleanup will be pushed back another number of years? That's all I have to say, thank you.

Mr. McNALLY: Col. Walsh, I think you can answer a couple of those questions.

COL. WALSH: Yes, as you see, the two issues I wish to address; one is to -- of the hazards under consideration, none have been eliminated. We have identified significant impacts at an Air Force Base with the potential of contamination of the wells throughout the aquifer as well as impacts on wetland as well as impacts on an economic.

Just as we identified significant impacts at Fairchild as land use and in our biological

easy, easy, years, and in our opinion, we were both pridedful and fearful of the fact that each Fairchild, Fairchild's new, was obviously a desired target for an address for workers.

Because, over the transpolar cap as you look to the map presented tonight, we can hit them in the shortest, quickest ties, and therefore, Fairchild Air Force Base is probably number one in hazard.

Also, too, in the same connection, the fact that now there is talk of being a Peacekeeper rail head here, which is obviously a second point of desire attack, it gives a Spokane resident a double feeling of trepidation, fear, stress, stress, hopelessness, all those things are now preceding on us. We have in Spokane just discerned from Belford, thatGrave out the many Belford falsehoods, melodies that they put secretly into the atmosphere, the coverage, just what we start to correlate and reduce that a bit, we find one, another even more treacherous thing sitting over our area in the form of a Peacekeeper rail head Darrians.

I would like to emphasize that we in the profession of medicine, people under tension.

resource and that information would be made available to the decision maker before he makes his final decision of where to deploy the systems.

And in response to your question, on the who will be driving the train? It will be military personal who can be subject to periodic testing since they are handling strategic weapons. However, they will have with them certified drivers from the local rail companies to act as guides as we go through various segments of their privately owned rail system, thank you.

MR. WILSON: My name is Dr. David Wilson. I'm a Spokane physician. I live at 1308 Baldoo Road. I'm speaking tonight as an individual as a Spokane physician over 40 years at the same Spokane hospital, 40 years ago.

I do have the privilege of being a member of PAM, the Physicians for Social Responsibility, it's a real privilege to be with that organization, it's done internationally as well as nationally.

One of my keynote thoughts for tonight is that for many decades, Spokane has always had Fairchild Air Force Base as its number one top notch competitor in Spokane. They were the outstanding and each (phonetic) for rapidity for
and by their dispersal, we assure the survivability, because it would be impossible for the Soviet targets to know precisely where they are. Though, whereas if this were on the rail net and they knew they would survive and still be able to launch attack on him, that would cause unacceptable damage. So, knowing that, he would never attack in the first place and we have deterrence, and that's why we're confident there will be no impact upon the people living here.

MR. WILSON: An impact upon the people living here by having these extra targets in our either or knowing --

MR. WILSON: There's a limousine answer.

COL. WALKER: Let me answer no. Let me move on to the second question. Now, the second question was -- actually, you had two parts, why is it necessary and what evidence do we have that there is ill intent on the Soviet Union.

MR. WILSON: I didn't say Soviet. I said anybody.

COL. WALKER: Anybody. Well, first of all, the present force that we have of missiles is between 20 and 30 years old, it's an aging force using the technology of the 1960s, so we need a new credible weapon to replace that aging weapon. We also need a weapon that provides increased survivability as the Soviet Union has improved its strategic strike force.

Now, you ask what evidence do we have they have increased their weapons. They are in the process of deploying a road weapon system, they're in the process of deploying a rail while weapon system, they are building up their submarine forces so that they can launch a credible attack, they're also in the process of hardening all their sites to make them less vulnerable to our existing force of intercontinental missiles. So that is the evidence that we have that we need to take counter actions in those actions of the Soviet Union, thank you, sir.

MR. WILSON: How do you know that they aren't just doing this to counteract ours? There again doesn't begin to answer my question.

COL. WALKER: We have not deployed in the last 20 years they have deployed three to four new systems.

MR. MCNAMEE: Thank you, Al.
DOCUMENT 504

MR. HANSBERRY: First, I would like to apologize to the audience for having my back towards them, second, any response to my concern, please make in final report statement.

 Environmental impacts -- The DSRs either lacks or has insufficient information regarding the environmental impacts of one, the weapons and transportation of uranium and other radioactive raw materials for NE reactor vehicles. The transportation of nuclear materials such as uranium hexafluoride imported from South Africa.

 Three, the manufacturing process. The manufacturing process involves the production of plutonium, vitrius, and other radioactive components of NE reactors specifically in third process, transports, the air borne and soil borne contamination.

 Four, the money and manufacturing processes of nonradioactive explosives such as the 2200 pounds of nitroglycerin compounds used in the area, three times here.

 Five, the present toxic waste sites of Fairchild upon the Rail Garrison Progress.

 Six, positive control measures to control and dispose the toxic substance generated by the program.
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Fairchild Air Force Base is already on the list for the Super Fund for clean-up because of toxic waste and we cannot subject our area or any part of her to more contamination, particularly from weapons which are not needed.

Although the contamination from tests firing into the Pacific is not directly affecting their aircraft, the planet is a definite part of the total picture of the NE and should be addressed in this environmental impact statement.

John which would supposedly have been generated have been endorsed and political entities, however, the projected rate of employment would be questioned.

We citizens need to have precise information in the final statement on the indicators and assumption used to generate the employment figures in the draft statement. The draft statement fails to consider and make comparisons with jobs which would be in a like amount.

DOCUMENT 504

We need additional and precise information on the amount and type of toxic waste that would be brought into our area by having NE missiles based here.

Fairchild Air Force Base is already on the list for the Super Fund for clean-up because of toxic waste and we cannot subject our area or any part of our worth to more contamination, particularly from weapons which are not needed.

Although the contamination from tests firing into the Pacific is not directly affecting their aircraft, the planet is a definite part of the total picture of the NE and should be addressed in this environmental impact statement.

John which would supposedly have been generated have been endorsed and political entities, however, the projected rate of employment would be questioned.

We citizens need to have precise information in the final statement on the indicators and assumption used to generate the employment figures in the draft statement. The draft statement fails to consider and make comparisons with jobs which would be in a like amount.
Research conducted by the employment
research associates and coordinated by the U.S.
Labor Department indicates that increases in
the military budget have actually reduced
employment opportunities. If those funds were
available for investment in the private sector,
they would create more jobs in areas where they
are most needed. Research on salaries, investment
in state and local government, non-military create
more jobs than this does. We need jobs which
generate life and productivity in our area and in
our nation.

MR. MERRIAM: Thank you, Mary Ann. I'm
sorry, is that Pleasant Mary Ann, 1206 N. Avenue?

MR. MANN: That's me, D-L-R-2-R-2, M.
I'm sorry. I know you must be getting ready for
these hearings, on just relax. I am
representing Region R, which is a state-wide organization and I am from the largest

Citizens of Oregon have participated
freely in recognizing the Trident Train that have
come through our communities and the way rail

Our government
This increases risk of civil strife in
our communities. The large numbers of security
personnel deployed in protecting weapons and speak
opposite force create a police state. This
police state is supposed to what we are objecting
to in the first place. We must be very careful to
protect the rights of open opposition in the
citizens.

I thank you very much for hearing us, I
know you probably didn't have to, but it would
also be nice if you could come to some rural areas
along the route of the trains in the rest of the
part of the country. And my recommendation is for
no action. Thank you.

MR. MERRIAM: Thank you, Marilyn.

MR. MANN: My name is Marilyn.

MR. MERRIAM: My name is Marilyn.

Citizens, I'm from Spokane and I'm a private
citizen. First of all, the NE is a first strike
weapon, and the same missile experimental, and yet
in the Peacekeeper is offensive to be and early
firearms.

In your presentation you said the NE
would help determine whether the Wall

Life are proposed to carry low the NE through our
communities. We don't. We would not have known
about this had Physicians for Social
Responsibility not sent us a notice. So thank you,
you, again.

I hope that the citizens of Northeast
Oregon are able to network better with the
citizens here in the Spokane area, we've about a
four-hour drive, and that's difficult to do,
but we have a consultant to that alone materials
between Debra and Spokane come through our
little rural area.

Speaking personally, I am deeply offended
by the President's choice of Peacekeeper as the
base for a first strike weapon. And the notion of
playing hide and seek with life and death is absolutely
indiscriminate. Environmentally, concerns have not
been addressed concerning where these weapons will
be used, then there's a 100 percent chance
of death to all life on the planet.

The doctrine before use of these weapons
can greatly increase our risk. What about Brian
Milano? Will these trains come over us if we pray
in their path? People of conscience, communities
of people of conscience will not be complicit with

System should be deployed, and a decision of that
magnitude should not be influenced by job
creation, and yet you present this having made in
your opening talk by stating it will produce X
number of jobs. However, it has been well
documented that the same amount of money will
produce very few jobs in the private sector, this
should be addressed if you are addressing it as a
job producer.

Also, this system will have negative
effect on the poor and that should be addressed.

The NE is a first strike weapon. Again, like I
mentioned, therefore, it makes it a prize target.
All movement of the trains, whether training,
maintenance or operational, could make Spokane in
a large area of the county in fact subject to
massive attack. Something as dangerous as the NE
should not be located anywhere near a populated
area, or an agriculture area. These areas should
not be made targets of first strike weapons.

Also, I feel that the Wall Garrison
method would be very subject to sabotage and
therefore, ineffective. My recommendation is in
action.

MR. MERRIAM: Thank you, Kathleen.

MR. MANN: My name is Marilyn.
MS. DUNNAGE: My name is Kathleen Dunnage. I
live at 422 East Birch in Colville, Washington,
which is probably on the rail line.

Most everything that I was going to say
has already been said. I do want to point out
from experience living in Colville that these rail
lines are probably not in any kind of shape that
you're talking about in your general statistics.

Otherwise, continually up there.

I want to point out that I feel like it's
judicious to discuss the environmental impact of a
nuclear system without discussing that they are
nuclear weapons and what that entails, but I will
try to play your game at least a little bit here.

I think that the MX Missile System is
another fix for a reality that is in addition to
nuclear weapons as much as you want to deny that
the financial and jobs are in a reason to have these
here. I think that the City Council and the
Chamber of Commerce fails for that. I don't think
they really are whether we need better missiles
or not, better nuclear systems, and I wanted to
say to the folks that are saying that the -- that
it's -- it's a false assumption that military
spending is going to be good for the economy of

our community or for our country. Statistics
continually show that it's not.

And I would like to see addressed,
perhaps another alternative, that there be an
MX Missile System and what would be the economic
impact if money were invested productively instead
of squandered on weapons we don't need?

A couple of reasons: One, I think it
would be interesting to have an environmental
impact statement on the cumulative effect on
nuclear weapon systems and other military impacts
on our community instead of doing this
incremental, like drugs, there's probably some
cumulative effect on all this.

And picking up on the idea that there may
be people of conscience, in fact, there will be
people of conscience who, if the MX Missile System
goes through, will feel called to stop it however
we can. And that leads from whatever chance that
may create, it's also a financial burden to the
county to whatever the -- whether it's the City of
Medical Lake or Spokane, if areas are made,
and just one last request that I -- I
don't really know what do with it, but it strikes
us sitting here all singing, that I'm facing a
panel of men, all men, and I -- and it's nothing
personal folks, but I'm just wondering, if
something, if that has something to do with why
nor only options we're looking at are these
missiles, thank you.

MR. MUIRHEAD: Thank you, Randy Geyhord
still here, I think he left. Randy Cooper.

MR. COOPER: I also live in Colville, which
is about an hour and a half north of Spokane.
This will be -- some of this will be restoration,
but I want to say it again.

First of all, I am somewhat resentful of
the fact that 1/3 of our time as a public forum,
our input has been taken up by this panel.

I would like to see discussed in the RIS,
the vulnerability of track damage and derailment.
I'd like you to assess the possibility of
 derailment using existing info currently available.

I would like you to assess the disruption
and expense of dealing with activists, people of
conscience who will be occupying the tracks. You
should have no doubt that the tracks will be
occupied in all of the locations that these
campaigns are deployed.
And I'd like you to share with us who is going to incur the expenses, is it going in the local, is it going to be federal? Exactly how many weapons do we need for deterrents? And those are your words, not mine.

I'd like you to assess the impact of those propellant explosions in rural areas as well as urban areas, the Spokane City Council apparently feels explosions in rural areas are acceptable, the council suggested that routing trains carrying MSE through rural areas around Spokane, not through Spokane.

I'd like you to determine the probability of an unfortunate act or unfortunate accident, those are Reagan's words, between appropriately armed security personnel, those are your words, and instances where data currently being obtained from the recent unfortunate accident between a B-52 warship - a B-52 warship and a civilian airliner.

In summary, I feel that those yearnings are purely taken because you don't consider within the scope of the hearings in the FAA such regret as addictive efforts of the explosion of MSE, impact on area control and negotiations, psychological

remaining in the United States. We had no warships, in the street alone, 140 in 200,000 people watching that parade, and then on television supposedly the number's about twice that. Now those figures can be verified by looking at hard issues of the local newspapers.

In addition, we have an all-city civic lunch where 600 people attend downtown during this Labor Day to honor our military seamen and what they do for our community. There's an awful lot of support around here.

Well, why do we have that support? Let me tell you a little bit about the folks, we had a young street that saved his life to save another, that doesn't happen too often. We didn't seek publicity, just saved his life to save another could survive.

In addition, we have always not here that give their time, give of their dollars to the Red Cross, to Guaranteed Security, to all the volunteer agencies. This community would be far less if we didn't have those folks here. Enough about the good feeling that we have here.

Just one final point I'd like to ask, and if you wouldn't mind responding, Col. Walsh, is on the 26 1/2 acres of displaced wetland. How many of these areas will be displaced by the relocation of the airport school and the airport school is going to be relocated anyway, I think that should be taken into account in the draft RIA.

Again, thank you very much, myself and my family support this, and I think that a lot of other people who are not here tonight would support it also, thank you.

MR. MCRAE: Thank you, Col. Walsh, do you know the answer to the question?

COL. WALSH: I do not have the answer specifically to that question, sir. On will answer that later.

MR. McRAE: Youlanda? 4-4-9-0-9-7. He left. George Malden?

PROCTOR: We left also.

MR. MCRAE: James Reinhold.

MR. MCRAE: Thank you very much. I am here representing -- my name's James Reinhold. I'm an administrator for the City of Cheney. I'm representing Al Ogden (phonetic), who is the mayor of Cheney and also the chairman of the Westline Coalition of Cities, whose members include Medical Lake, Airway Heights, Spokane and Cheney, with
Mr. McNamara: Thank you. Steven Blakey?

Mr. Blakey: My name is Steven Blakey. I live at 110 North Broad, Medical Lake.

I was a graduate of the first class for nineteen three missiles in 1974, I have covered the book.

Mr. McNamara: Thank you. Peter Eirwin.

Eirwin:
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We're not peacekeepers. We're against Peacekeepers.

Eirwin: My name is Peter Eirwin.

East 521 Roe in Spokane. The EIS is not complete by the very nature it doesn't even follow the definition that you defined in Webster: environment, that being that all the conditions, circumstances and influences surrounding and affecting the development of an organism or group of organisms and so there are several very important components that have been left out, that I don't believe exist.

Also, my job to inform the politicians, because now I've seen of the collaborative efforts between the armed forces and the politicians. There seems to be a bit lacking there, also, I'm also personally offended that we look at peacekeeping as a deterrent when it really comes down to an army of force, people keep peace, missiles don't do anything but instill fear. And when you set up an atmosphere that is not conducive to peacekeeping, or peacekeeping, then what do you set up and who is to be responsible for that?

It would be far more truthful as we pledge truth and justice in the pledge to say these are not peacekeepers but peacekeepers.

Mr. McNamara: Thank you. Phil Brilean.

Brilean: Thank you. Donald Ruthford.

Conducted for a couple weeks, we still don't see our sanctions tested.

Okay, you say that these -- that the ballistic missiles are deadly accurate, so are the B-52s, or I say that, or what could just one do in a day? So isn't it better to just talk peace, and this -- it's morally impossible to consider nuclear weapons, it's just -- it isn't, but then it is not the issue. It's not? It's the environmental and your people are doing your job, it's your turn to do what you're told to do.

I'm also at the hesitant volunteers, they're constantly being drafted in the country, ecology is slowly going down here, we are ruining our own environment by our waste, products that we have produced and nuclear weapons. Sometimes I think the nuclear industry has been a terrible thing in the first place, because it's caused such waste that we don't even know where to put it and we're ruining our own earth.

So I just want to go on record as that I'm against the MX Missile in Spokane, thank you.

Mr. McNamara: Thank you. Phil Brilean.

Brilean: Thank you. Donald Ruthford.
MR. ROTHENBERG: I'm Donald Rothenberg. I live in Spokane, North Hill. I represent myself with my wife's permission here.

I would like to make mine in the form of a request really. I see many others deeply concerned about the environmental impact upon fields, the wetlands, and all that dwell there with the possible exception of the inhabitants, but I'm most concerned about the inhabitants that are human.

The installation of the NE Missiles here on these railroad beds make us a first strike target as many have already realized us. So, in a sense, the essay holds us in hostage with their missiles saying don't you dare move or you've got to.

I don't like being held hostage.

I'd like a good psychological study of just what does it do to our children who must live in this deadly bull's eye if we put this - if we house this kind of missile in our midst. What happens to our children psychologically when they live with the constant knowledge that there is destruction, their deaths in at least, only minutes away and in the hands of other people over whom they have no control and to whom they -- with whom they have no communication?

I'd like a real study and a statement of that kind of psychological impact. I would also like a study on the spiritual impact of what it does to us who hold those in hostage with these missiles that we men, saying to them, don't use your weapons or you had it from us. I don't like being a hostage and I don't like being a hostage holder.

I think the question boils down to one where we've got to consider the question of what kind of people we are and what kind of people do we want to become.

So I would suggest that in avoid prejudicial evaluation, a study of these psychological and spiritual concerns that affect our human lives here contrasted to non-civilian agency, some agency that has expertise in the area of psychological and spiritual studies and can make an unprejudicial report on the psychological, the spiritual. These human effects these missiles will have upon our community. Thank you.

MR. McRRARRY: Thank you. David Carroll?


I can see by your testimony that you have fought wars and none of you wouldn't want to go to war again. I do thank you for what you have done to aid in our security in the preservation of a nuclear war, but I think you really are on the wrong track with regard to this Hill Garrison Program.

I think that progress is about as well thought out as the Susan B. Anthony dollar was.

Evidence on the avenues that you talked about, a lot of that comes from satellite and a lot of our security is based on early warning of missiles. I'd like to see more spent on that rather than this system which does not enhance our security.

I have five questions and I'll expand on some of these as time allows. Are you going to address the potential for rail accidents and the likelihood if that potential will increase during times of national emergency or national need?

There'll be increased rail traffic, everyone will be assumes, including train crews, not unlike the experiences by our airmen in the Persian Gulf.

Are you going to clarify the terms plutonium oxide and are you going to detail the procedures used for decontamination and clean-up of plutonium contamination?

There are you going to survey rail routes for accidental occurring alpha seepage (betaic) and accidents?

And fifth, will civilian plants or trained personnel be drug tested and randomly like military personnel are?

In sections 31 and 40, it's stated that radiation material dispersed in an unlikely as considered the negligible risk and that produce -- or into results in contamination and does not result in biological harm. I believe that is wrong. I think it should read it will amount likely results in plutonium being labeled and ingested if you're contaminated.

I've worked in plutonium laboratories before where just a few milligrams of plutonium dust, disclose dust were put in a corner of an auditorium, within an hour, we could detect it
I'd like to hear from both gentlemen, Mr. Nicholls and Dr. Grauer, as to how they see Terra Tech and its potential to contribute to the national effort. As for myself, I have been in contact with both gentlemen and have been impressed with their ideas and proposals. I believe that they have a clear understanding of the technical and operational requirements for such a project.

Mr. Nicholls: I think it is important to stress the importance of the national effort. This is a major undertaking, and we must approach it with great care and attention. We have to ensure that we have the best people working on this project.

Dr. Grauer: I agree. We must also consider the financial implications of this project. It is crucial that we have a clear understanding of the costs and benefits of this project.

Mr. Nicholls: I think it is also important to stress the importance of the national effort. This is a major undertaking, and we must approach it with great care and attention. We have to ensure that we have the best people working on this project.

Dr. Grauer: I agree. We must also consider the financial implications of this project. It is crucial that we have a clear understanding of the costs and benefits of this project.

Mr. Nicholls: I think it is also important to stress the importance of the national effort. This is a major undertaking, and we must approach it with great care and attention. We have to ensure that we have the best people working on this project.

Dr. Grauer: I agree. We must also consider the financial implications of this project. It is crucial that we have a clear understanding of the costs and benefits of this project.

Mr. Nicholls: I think it is also important to stress the importance of the national effort. This is a major undertaking, and we must approach it with great care and attention. We have to ensure that we have the best people working on this project.

Dr. Grauer: I agree. We must also consider the financial implications of this project. It is crucial that we have a clear understanding of the costs and benefits of this project.
an advisor to the Air Force but not to control the throttle. Thank you very much, sir.

MS. WEREH: We will conclude the proceedings at this time, please remember that you have until 31 August to submit written materials to be included in the transcript of this hearing.

Please be assured that Air Force decision-makers will carefully consider each viewpoint raised here tonight when deciding the ultimate action in your proposal. Thank you. This public hearing is adjourned at 10 p.m.

(Whereupon proceedings were concluded)

STATE OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF SPOKANE

T. Joyce Strohman, a notary public in and for the State of Washington;

Do hereby certify:

That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes as taken of the public hearing, on the date and at the time and place as shown on page one hereof;

Witness my hand and seal this 16th day of August, 1956.

[Signature]

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing in Spokane
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questions on safety and legal matters.

On my far right is Colonel Branch. He comes from Headquarters Strategic Air Command. And he will respond to questions on the operation concepts.

On my immediate left is Mr. Michman. He works for Tetra Tech Corporation. This company was hired by the Air Force to prepare the EIS. Mr. Michman will respond to questions dealing with the affects on the human resources.

And on my far left is Dr. Kramer. He also works for Tetra Tech Corporation. And he will respond to questions on the physical resources. Thank you.

Colonel Branch: Thank you Colonel Walsh. We now turn to the question and answer period of the Public Hearing. This time was set aside to allow you to ask questions about the content of the briefing and the Draft and Environmental Impact Statement and to make statements about the proposal. As I indicated before we are going to start out with those who're elected officials. We will start with ray Holmberg, please, a State Senator.

Mr. Holmberg: Thank you very much. I support the location of the Peacekeeper Rail System in Grand Forks. I have to commend the Air Force for having this hearing. I am not personally convinced that the sequence is perfect putting communities sometimes through a wringer through a wringer kind of situation which can polarize the comments without any assurance that the system itself will be built anywhere. So that is not my idea of how the government should conduct it's business, but that is the system you are operating under.

And I know it is not the system you particularly set up. There are many who are fretting the debate over this question on the value of the system itself. And I applaud those and yes they should question that system. But we as mentioned earlier their comments and concern should be addressed to the members of Congress and the President of the United States.

The real issue here is not whether there should be a MD Rail System, but if there is one where should it be located. On the basis of the cost which is of course as we all understand taxpayers money, the Grand Forks site is one of the least expensive sites for the location of this particular project. Also the Grand Forks site was already mentioned tonight some of the least significant impacts to the local community. In the case of the question is, if built should the construction jobs and economic activity be at Grand Forks or should these jobs, at least, go to Fairchild. Little Rock, or other places. I personally support the Grand Forks site. And we hope that that measure will get through. Thank you very much.

Colonel Walsh: Next call on Grant Shaft, State Representative.
It looks like we are going to spend a lot of time with folks traversing back and forth, so as I call one speaker I will also call the next name. And there is a seat right next to the podium, so you can come up as the other speaker talks.

That would be Tom Richter. Just come on up and have a seat next to the podium while this speaker speaks.

**MR. BRAINT: Thank you, Colonel. For the record my name is Grant Shaft. I am a member of the North Dakota House of Representatives. I represent Districts 17, 18, located in Grand Forks. My District represents the eastern portions of the City of Grand Forks, the largest residential district in the city, and also includes the downtown business district of the City of Grand Forks, and the Grand Forks Air Force Base.

I am also a business person in the City of Grand Forks in the capacity of an attorney. And I am a lifelong resident of Grand Forks and plan on residing in the City of Grand Forks and raising my family here.

Briefly I would like to state my whole-hearted support for establishing the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System in the City of Grand Forks. Thank you.

**COLONEL McMAHAN: You are next. Next speaker will be James Richter.

**MR. RICHTER: I am Tom Richter. I represent part of Grand Forks and the North Dakota House of Representatives. Thank you.

**VALLEY REPORTER SERVICES
VALLEY CITY, NORTH DAKOTA - (701) 645-5444
FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA - (701) 293-6623

I am not an expert on the Peacekeeper. I am a long-time advocate of the rail base concept of employment. In terms of the environmental impact I reviewed some of the documents and I am satisfied that the conclusions showing the EIS that the negative impacts of the installation of the garrison system here would be negligible if any. I am not sure that I agree that the positive or beneficial impacts are as small as the study indicates. I believe they might be considerably greater than the study indicates. On a broader basis I think that one of the major concerns of any environmental study is safety. And I am concerned in the past we have sometimes have waited too long to develop a system new weapon system before the old ones or the existing ones became obsolete or obsolete. And I am pleased that there is this opportunity to urge that the EIS be accepted and valid. That the beneficial and positive aspects of this project were emphasized or given greater significance. And I hope we will see the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System installed here at Grand Forks Air Force Base.

**COLONEL McMAHAN: James Richter. Followed by James Earl.

**MR. RICHTER: Thank you, Colonel. My name is James Richter. I am a resident of East Grand Forks, Minnesota. I am here tonight representing the Polk County Board of Commissioners. And I have a resolution of support. And I

**VALLEY REPORTER SERVICES
VALLEY CITY, NORTH DAKOTA - (701) 645-5444
FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA - (701) 293-6623

will read that. "WHEREAS the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System will support rural peace and WHEREAS the Grand Forks Air Force Base has and will propose Peacekeeper R..."

**MR. RUTLEDGE: I am Ken Rutledge, Mayor of the City of East Grand Forks. I too have a resolution that was passed by our Council. And in part it says "Be it resolved that..."

**COLONEL McMAHAN: After Ray Trosen will be Richard Christiansen.

**MR. TROSEN: Thank you, Colonel. My name is Ray Trosen. And I live at 710 Booth, Laramie, North Dakota. Which is about 12 miles west of the Air Force Base. And I am the mayor of the City of Laramie. And we retired of the resolution. Now therefore it is hereby resolved that the City Council hereby supports..."

**COLONEL McMAHAN: After Richard Christiansen will be Frank Or.
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Mr. Chairman: Colonel McHaffie, my name is Richard Christiansen. I am the Mayor of Emerado, North Dakota. First of all I would like to say I support the MX missile program. However, I am also here to voice my concerns about the liquid fuel used in the four stages of the MX missile. The Air Garrison complex will be located on the southwestern portion of the base. That location is a prevailing windmill area. I ask that you consider the location of the base. That location is a prevailing windmill area. The Air Garrison complex will be located on the southwestern portion of the base. That location is a prevailing windmill area.

According to estimates 300 of the residents could die and I am sure the rest of the people would be harmed in some way.

My questions are, how many accidents have occurred in the last years, five years, 15 years concerning missiles in DOD that use these fuels? Also, what can be done to contain such a fire? And what is the effect of the toxic flames generated by the fire? Thank you.

Colonel McHaffie: Colonel Miles, can you answer those questions tonight?

Colonel Miles: Major Van Ness will answer those questions.

Major Van Ness: Sir, I am not aware of any accidents involving the kind of liquid fuel that are involved in the four stages of the Peacekeeper Missiles. My question is, how many accidents have occurred in the last years, five years, 15 years concerning missiles in DOD that use these fuels? Also, what can be done to contain such a fire? And what is the effect of the toxic flames generated by the fire? Thank you.
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The question before us -- that is not to say we didn't analyse them in our document. We assumed the worst approach to the MX missile program. However, I am also here to voice my concerns about the liquid fuel used in the four stages of the MX missile. The Air Garrison complex will be located on the southwestern portion of the base. That location is a prevailing windmill area. The Air Garrison complex will be located on the southwestern portion of the base. That location is a prevailing windmill area.

According to estimates 300 of the residents could die and I am sure the rest of the people would be harmed in some way.

My questions are, how many accidents have occurred in the last years, five years, 15 years concerning missiles in DOD that use these fuels? Also, what can be done to contain such a fire? And what is the effect of the toxic flames generated by the fire? Thank you.

Colonel McHaffie: Colonel Miles, can you answer those questions tonight?

Colonel Miles: Major Van Ness will answer those questions.

Major Van Ness: Sir, I am not aware of any accidents involving the kind of liquid fuel that are involved in the four stages of the Peacekeeper Missiles. With "..."
As this in our city auditorium to represent the views of a project such as this. It has been done very professionally. And I hope we learn from your experience and we can conduct meetings such as this in the future to all citizens can be heard. And this is a bipartisan type of crowd you have seen. There are Democrats and Republicans here. And there are non-political people here. And I am sure you will hear from all of them. And so far we have heard the support of Rand Garrison. And I believe that the future of Grand Forks is in your hands. And we thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Montoya: My name is Richard Montoya. I am a student in UND. And I am adamantly opposed to the MX missile. I would like to defer my testimony to Dr. Scott Strelley.

Colonel Rasmussen: Okay. If any other folks are going to defer testimony just stand up and hail to the right. And it would save the transition time.

Mr. Strelley: My name is Scott Strelley. Last * * * *
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This page contains information about the implementation of a program that helps to preserve the right. The Air Force has been a very good neighbor in Grand Forks over the years. My colleague, Mr. Coo, has already pointed this out. And I won't repeat his words. Lastly, I do appreciate the fact we live in a country where everyone can speak up as we are tonight. And that there is the right to dissent. And although this is perhaps somewhat of a political statement, it is believed to be right that we stand up and dissent that we join in supporting this program which helps to preserve that right. Thank you.

Colonel Rasmussen: Colonel Walsh?

Colonel Walsh: Sir, I need to make a correction on a statement please.

Colonel Rasmussen: Go ahead.

Colonel Walsh: Sir, I would like to state that the Congress and President have approved this program at this time. Right now the Congress has approved $50 million for the program to continue research and development and directed that the Air Force present the EIS so that if a decision was made to proceed with the program we could develop a system in the early 1980's. And what Congress has done this year has

* * * *
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County after the project stable phase begins in 1993. This
is due to the fact that about 1.1 dependents will come in
with each job. This will increase labor supply in the county
and raise the unemployment rate again for the duration of the
project, 1993, '93 and on.

There is also the potential hidden cost should this
progress be in any way modified or eliminated during its
lifetime or should this, the implementation of this progres
at this Air Force Base lead to the reduction of my other
activities at the Air Force Base. This costs of this are
not really dealt with by this Environmental Impact Statement.
But should be duly noted by the community. We might be left
with a housing plan, we may be left with tax-keepers, and public
employees, and no means of supporting them except from the
existing population bases. Thank you.

COLONEL McBride: Thank you, Steven Finney. Next
up will be Dale West.

MR. FINNEY: My name is Steve Finney, I am a
resident of Grand Forks. I was and live in greater
Grand Forks. I have never been active in either the military
or the peace movement, but because I work in retail and I
deal on a day-to-day basis with people from the Grand Forks
Air Force Base, I recognize the huge contribution the Grand
Forus Air Force Base makes to our economy. I also deal with
people from the so-called peace community. And by impression
*
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1. of them is almost all of these people are just regular people
2. like you and me trying to do their jobs and make a living
3. while at the same time maintaining some measure of dignity
4. and self-respect in their jobs and meaning to their lives.
5. Also because I am a business person I can't help
6. thinking that to a non-business person listening to the
7. statements of local business representatives only logical
8. conclusion is that business people are only interested
9. bringing more jobs to town whatever the cost. And I am here
10. to tell you that that isn't the case. And although we
11. business people care intensely about the local economy, we
12. care about more than just that. And we won't compromise the
13. safety and integrity of our community for any number of new
14. jobs. There are business people who think for themselves and
15. support wholeheartedly economic development. But we do not
16. support the Rex Rail Garrison Plan. Not because they are soft
17. on defense, but because the cost is too great. Because it is
18. an idea that is strategically and morally bankrupt. The
19. Department of Defense insists us by thinking all it has to do
20. is dangle some new jobs in front of the community and
21. business people will flock unquestionably to their aid.
22. Strategically this KH plan offers no more deterrence than is
23. already provided by the US Submarine, which are even less
24. vulnerable to attacks than the proposed plan, and missiles
25. and their trains, and which carry enough nuclear firepower
*
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* * * * 

1. to destroy every large and medium size city in the Soviet
2. Union.
3. Why are we considering this plan? The answer to
4. this also has to do with business. Defense industries like
5. all other industries must introduce and sell new products to
6. survive. And after a period of record profits the influence
7. they yield on our politicians, all of whom have local
8. economies like ours to think about it enormous. That is why
9. this plan averts rather than adds to our safety as being
10. promoted now. To those business people here tonight who
11. support this plan I ask only this, have you considered the
12. possibility that this plan may be a waste of money that can
13. be used on a more direct and sensible and humane kind of
14. economic development. That it doesn't make anyone safer.
15. How much time have you spent thinking about the implications
16. other than those on the local economy. If you have done this
17. and as a result of these considerations you support this plan
18. I respect you. Sincerely I do. And I thank you for coming
19. here tonight and getting involved, even though I disagree.
20. If you came here only because somebody talked you or because
21. you hate or fear the so-called peace if you were it to
22. yourself and your families and your community to question
23. this program and to talk to some of the peacekeepers. You
24. may find they are more reason and open-minded and think more
25. like you than some of the authorities that are telling you
*
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1. what a good idea this plan is. Our safety is a part of our
2. environment, perhaps the most important part. Thank you.
3. MR. WEST: My name is Dale West. I am from 90s
4. Sunset Drive, Grand Forks. And I represent North Rural
5. Electric headquartered here in Grand Forks. We serve 11,000
6. customers with electricity in seven counties. Our board of
7. directors are made up of individuals elected by our members
8. throughout this seven county area. I am passed the following
9. resolutions: "WHEREAS the United States Congress in the 1986
10. Department of Defense Authorization Act request that the
11. President propose a more survivable missile for 50
12. Peacekeeper Missiles and that deployment in Montana. We
13. have been and continue the rail Garrison Garrison for the deployment
14. of Peacekeeper Missiles has been completed to comply with
15. this request, and WHEREAS the Grand Forks Air Force Base has
16. been considered as one of up to ten sites for the Rail
17. Garrison installation with minimal additional land
18. requirements and no anticipated adverse environmental
19. impacts, and with a positive economic impact on the area
20. through the creation of additional jobs, be it therefore
21. resolved that the board of directors of North Rural Electric
22. Co-operative Incorporated hereby supports the installation of
23. one of the rail Garrison facilities at the Grand Forks Air
25. COLONEL McBride: Two things I would like to point
*
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I support the Rail Garrison concept and its deployment with the Grand Forks Air Force Base. I would like to address the issue of safety. It has been argued that we will be vulnerable because the system would encourage a provocative nuclear first-strike policy. I recognize that nuclear war is probably the ultimate environmental threat. And I support the arguments of those who oppose this proposal on the basis of its destabilizing affect on international relations. Far from being a peacekeeper the manner given to the system in the proposal, the Rail Garrison System would encourage a strategy based on pre-emptive first strikes and thus increase the danger of nuclear war. I would leave the development of this argument to others however and concentrate on remarks on one of the major shortcomings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Draft EIS falls to address the issue of decommissioning adequately. It misleadingly suggests that reasonably foreseeable consequences are considered. Decommissioning is dismissed with a terse seven line paragraph, identified as 1.9 on page 1-18 on the Draft EIS which reads as follows: "It is difficult to predict how the Peacemaker Rail Garrison System would be decommissioned."

-

MR. PHILIPS: My name is Victor Phillips. I live at 640 6th Avenue South. And I am speaking on behalf of myself. I support the Rail Garrison concept and its deployment with the Grand Forks Air Force Base. I would like to address the issue of safety. It has been argued that we will be vulnerable because the system would encourage a provocative nuclear first-strike policy. I recognize that nuclear war is probably the ultimate environmental threat. And I support the arguments of those who oppose this proposal on the basis of its destabilizing affect on international relations. Far from being a peacekeeper the manner given to the system in the proposal, the Rail Garrison System would encourage a strategy based on pre-emptive first strikes and thus increase the danger of nuclear war. I would leave the development of this argument to others however and concentrate on remarks on one of the major shortcomings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The United States Air Force because the assessment of environmental effects as presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate and misleading. As Chair of the Agassiz Basin Group I offer this testimony in opposition to the proposed deployment and scope consideration of alternative defense strategies which do not depend on missiles with multiple nuclear warheads.

I recognize that nuclear war is probably the ultimate environmental threat. And I support the arguments of those who oppose this proposal on the basis of its destabilizing affect on international relations. Far from being a peacekeeper the manner given to the system in the proposal, the Rail Garrison System would encourage a strategy based on pre-emptive first strikes and thus increase the danger of nuclear war. I would leave the development of this argument to others however and concentrate on remarks on one of the major shortcomings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Draft EIS fails to address the issue of decommissioning adequately. It misleadingly suggests that reasonably foreseeable consequences are considered. Decommissioning is dismissed with a terse seven line paragraph, identified as 1.9 on page 1-18 on the Draft EIS which reads as follows: "It is difficult to predict how the Peacemaker Rail Garrison System would be decommissioned."
the city's plans to accommodate this and other proposed growth and not to take a stand for or against the projects. Only one of those four units of government, at least until tonight had taken a stand, to my knowledge. And it appears that now all four units have. We will probably be safe to say my position as well is in favor of that particular proposal.

Another staff member, if he is permitted to speak this evening will also address the environmental impact statement.

What I would like to do is tell you that City of Grand Forks has developed through this planning process ongoing capital improvement program. It is a program that takes comprehensive view of implementing the city's long range comprehensive plan. I brought a copy of the city's five year capital improvement program. And I ask that it become a part of the record of this hearing. The city is in a position as a result of recent action on the part of the City Council to spend over $6 million a year in federal, state, local monies to improve the city's infrastructure. Six year capital improvement program in the City of Grand Forks calls for the completion of a waste water force main through fire station. It's establishments funds that we feel are essential in the rehabilitation of our city streets, our city's storm water system and our sanitary storm systems.

Mike Phillips.

Bruce Gjovig. Am I pronouncing that correctly?

MR. GJOVIG: My apologies for being late. Bruce Gjovig. I stand for the Air Force Garrison System. I believe this country is served well by a strong defense. Each one of us must believe that at this defense is a good defense. I am very proud of what has happened the last eight years. We are standing taller nationwide. We are much closer to peace because of a strong defense. It also can be said that the Grand Forks Air Force Base has been an outstanding neighbor for over 30 years. There has been lots of that tactics have been used over the years for new missions for this Air Force Base. All those space launch for nothing. It has been shown and proves that the Air Force Garrison Base is an outstanding neighbor in our backyard. And although I as an expert in defense systems I think through history and performance again we can rest assured that our interest will be carried out if the Garrison was located in Grand Forks.

It should also be stated that I think why Grand Forks. Certainly their defense dollars will be spent. I think they should be spent wisely, therefore they should be spent where there is the best bargain possible. And I would also favor a Grand Forks and a Minot location. And certainly something that has not been stated particularly before is that North Dakota was the beneficiary of the Garrison Garrison.
our railroad transportation system in North Dakota would undoubtedly be improved by the maintenance of the railroad than serving all interests of North Dakota. Because North Dakota is dependent upon transporting goods in and out of the state. And much is done by rail. And we would benefit. That is a citizen in agriculture and energy would benefit, which is of no small portion.

To in conclusion I think there is economical transportation, social, and long history of reasons why we support the Garrison System in Grand Forks Air Force Base.

COLONEL NICHARDS: Mike Phillips. Next will be Walter Scott.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mike Phillips. Grand Forks, I would like to speak primarily on the environmental impact. I feel Grand Forks is an ideal location for Peacekeeper Rail Garrison. First, because the minimum amount of additional land acquisition that is needed. As I review the draft system I think it was the lowest land acquisition of any of the site locations. It has the minimal environmental impact both during construction and during operational phase.

Also, I take it that you reviewed the trading system of the U.S. Hail, you will find that Grand Forks is an ideally located North-South and East-West tracking and much more so than our neighbor to the west. You might keep that in mind also. And Rail Garrison I feel is also a much more...

--------
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means exhaustive. For many were discovered in spite lack of any surface clues that prehistoric materials lay just below the surface, and then in lead such burial stites perhaps just the area six to eight sites surrounding the area. These sites document centuries of sacred places to a significant portion of our people. And are invaluable historical resource for us all.

The investigative portion of the report stated that the area of the Garrison facilities would be in areas not adjacent to where any archeology digs have identified prehistoric sites. But it also located the north-much railroad spur which will connect the storage areas to the Burlington Northern Railroad. We being near in or in the very area where some of the burial sites have been discovered. And it describes a possible alternative rail spur north of the base as passing directly through identified sites.

It took nearly one half page of the ISD document to describe these prehistoric sites. It took just one sentence on the next page to discuss the relevance of any of this to the Rail Garrison construction.

I submit that a Nation which chooses to build new potentially first strike weapons and put them on rails with each rail car having a kilo-tonnage of 180 Hiroshima's and yet belligerently's risk off of the destruction of this significant element of our common human history stands on...

--------
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exceeding shaky morale ground. I love my country. But I am saddened and angered when my country takes tragic insensitive action such as this in my name.

COLONEL NICHARDS: Thank you, Carole Bordenkircher, followed by Martin Eilly.

MR. BOOY: My name is Walter Scott. I live in Crookston, Minnesota. I am a retired member of the Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce. I am the owner of two small businesses in Crookston, Minnesota. And I also am employed by the State of North Dakota as the Principal Director for the Small Business Development Centers.

The Grand Forks community supports the Air Force Base. And since the location of Rail Garrison here will not significantly affect or change our environment. I support Rail Garrison, because continued freedom in our country will allow the entrepreneur system to thrive and grow. Thank you.

COLONEL NICHARDS: Martin Eilly. Next will be Mark Hail.

MR. HAIL: I think I am making history here, because I am probably the first Canadian to appear before this Commission. So I thank you for that.

The political boundary separating Canada from the United States, he said 49th Parallel, is virtually meaningless in the nuclear age. That especially holds true...

--------
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Let's work together to prevent the ultimate threat to our environment nuclear war. No war.

Thank you. And I would like to present this to you. (Refer to Report #1)

Colonel McBride: Mark Hall. And next will be John Omahen.

Mr. Hall: I am Mark Hall of Grand Forks, North Dakota. As a lifelong resident of this city and county I am in favor of rail Garrison. Grand Forks has been good for the United States Air Force. The United States Air Force has been good for Grand Forks. I look for rail Garrison to strengthen those bonds, which have been created over the years for the strength and support of this nation. Thank you.

Colonel McBride: Thank you, John Omahen.

Mr. Omahen: I refer to Ronnie Rosenberg.

Mr. Rosenberg: Good evening. My name is Ronnie Rosenberg. Diane Rosenberg. 420 Jackson Avenue, Crookston, Minnesota.

I am an attorney with a law office in Fargo, North Dakota. I hereby object to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the MX Rail Garrison Project and to the Hearing on the proposal. The Notice for this Hearing fails to conform to Air Force DOD regulation section 100.15(b) subsection B, subpart 1. The Notice provided to

Identified interested individuals fails to include the name and phone number of a person to contact for more information; the request that applicants submit these intentions to take part; any limitation on the length of oral statements; the suggestion that statements of considerable length be submitted in writing; and the offices where the Draft EIS and appendices are available. By not providing this information it is required to do by its own rules, the Air Force has made organizing opposition to this project more difficult.

The DEIS is not widely available. For example, the Crookston Public Library and the Fargo Public Library do not have copies.

The Public hearings are not using rules at a sufficient number of locations. Thirty-two code of Federal Regulations section 212 provides that the amount of public participation is to be determined in pertinent part by the magnitude of the proposal. At the very least, Hearings should be held at towns and cities along the rail lines which will be subjected to missile trains if this project is implemented.

I received my copy of the DEIS on July 20, 1980. The time is not sufficient from the distribution of the DEIS to this Hearing to prepare an adequate critique. It is no solution that additional testimony can be submitted in writing because part of the process is to inform and
### DOCUMENT 505

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 55</th>
<th>Page 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the extent to which the proposed project is controversial. At page 3-2 of the DEIS, it is stated that controversy was not considered. Thus the Air Force has failed to do that which it is charged to do by Federal Law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a recent meeting at the Grand Forks Builders and Traders Exchange. And at a recent meeting at the Board of directors unanimously went on record. They felt that all of our members or at least a great majority of our 75 members would also be in favor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you. My name is Marc Olson. I have been a resident of Grand Forks for eight years. I have never been to a meeting as a former rated officer of the United States Air Force in the 1970s. I believe in the importance of a strong deterrent military force to preserve peace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<td>For a long time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel recycle: Katrynn Draper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>REMEMBER - Hands on your chest.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing the Fargo-Moorhead Peaceworkers, the North Dakota Peace Coalition, and Pax Christi USA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our position in the 1970s and the 1980s was to be a strong voice for the United States Catholic bishops in 1983 to 1989. The challenge of peace. The bishops stated that we do not know of any situations in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear weapons, no matter how restricted a scale, can be morally justified. In commenting on the weapons systems, the bishops stated they oppose the addition of weapons that are likely to be vulnerable to attack and yet also possess some. A prompt war target will indicate the system's capability to ensure the destruction of the other side's retaliatory forces vulnerable unoccupied. These weapons are strategic in nature and were expected in 1985. They stated that is what the ND is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td><strong>Daily in our Congress and state legislatures over much larger amount for the homeless, the hungry and the helpless here and abroad.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Impact Statement.</strong> I support what is the concept of peace. I am a resident of Grand Forks. And I am a freelance writer working and living in this area. <strong>I believe it is very important to consider the fact that the Grand Forks Air Force Base is being built on a former naval weapons storage site.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Colonel recycle: Katrynn Draper.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>REMEMBER - Hands on your chest.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing the Fargo-Moorhead Peaceworkers, the North Dakota Peace Coalition, and Pax Christi USA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our position in the 1970s and the 1980s was to be a strong voice for the United States Catholic bishops in 1983 to 1989. The challenge of peace. The bishops stated that we do not know of any situations in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear weapons, no matter how restricted a scale, can be morally justified. In commenting on the weapons systems, the bishops stated they oppose the addition of weapons that are likely to be vulnerable to attack and yet also possess some. A prompt war target will indicate the system's capability to ensure the destruction of the other side's retaliatory forces vulnerable unoccupied. These weapons are strategic in nature and were expected in 1985. They stated that is what the ND is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 3-103
Also although I am a former Air Force officer by expertise certainly does not run to these systems. Nor from that standpoint would I speak other than through history. The Grand Forks Air Force Base obviously was opposed and place here because of its strategic location. And I believe that the rail garrison project will enhance what is already in our immediate vicinity.

Also we must realize that somebody must have thought that it was important by this geographical location to consider the only other ABM site that was once operational or at least put into the area for operation in this very vicinity.

Also the Air Force Base is the just has been a strategic demand base. I would assume that therefore we should, although the arguments have been given and will continue to be given as to the logic of placing this system here, whether it is wise from a military standpoint or economically, I think that although such has been made about the economic impact of what it will do to develop Grand Forks I do believe that the real interest of most people of this community is that we have a strong defense in this country. And that we have our bases properly located so that indeed we can have a city that will be defended to the point there will be an economy to defend.

COLONEL McHANE: Ray Davis.

* * *

First, although a substantia number of jobs will be created by rail garrison willing; research has shown that it produces fewer jobs than other kinds of government and non-government spending. The Council on Environmental Priorities analyzed the number of jobs created by the rail systems compared to alternative uses of the same resources. If we can assume that the Council’s national multipliers applied to the Grand Forks region, we would find that if $1 million were spent on these uses we would create more jobs than the 1,000 jobs estimated in the DEIS. For instance, the same amount of funding would produce 530 more jobs in real estate, 216 more jobs in public utility construction, 315 more jobs in housing construction, and 209 more jobs in solar energy or energy conservation than it would in the rail garrison.

From these comparisons we may conclude that as a job creation strategy, the NS Rail Garrison Project is relatively ineffective. For eight years we have used military construction as an industrial policy. Consequently, money that could have been used to rebuild our declining infrastructure, to develop human resources through education, to provide jobs for the most disadvantaged, to clean up our environment to develop alternative energy sources, to promote energy conservation, to build mass transit systems to reinvest in domestic industry and to save our family farms.
Colonel McNamara: Time, Doctor.

Dr. Poole: I have more I would like to submit in written testimony. (Refer to Report B)

Colonel McNamara: Would you also spell your name, please?

Dr. Poole: D-T-O-D-P-E-S-A-N-H-N.

Lt. Colonel Walker: Excuse me, sir, may I make a comment, please?

Colonel McNamara: Briefly.

Lt. Colonel Walker: In response to your statement, Dr. Poole, the National Environmental Policy Act requires that the proposer of the action look at alternative measures or actions to satisfy the underlying need. In this case the underlying need is a more survivable ICBM System. And so the EIS considers alternative to that as specified by Congress. It is not the intent of NEPA that we should look at alternative uses of the funds. That is the responsibility of Congress to consider that in the deliberation on the budgets. Thank you.

Dr. Poole: May I reply?

Colonel McNamara: A couple of seconds.

Dr. Poole: It was my opinion that NEPA legislation required a look at alternative enhancement systems. I am afraid that the NEPA system does not provide the long-term enhancement or sustainability.

Thank you.

* * * * *
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... hungry, the rights of the homeless, and the unemployed to work, the rights of those coal miners with the government to publicly express their view, and the rights of the people to choose a leader who represents their views regardless of his or her race, sex, class or political affiliations.

We need democracy in the home and the work place, and the schools, and in this auditorium. There is currently in the Soviet Union under the direction of Gorbachev an inexorable discourse which addresses the real problem of society and a necessity and the right of the Third World for independence.

A brief comparison is in order. For 14 months the Soviet Union stopped nuclear testing. During this period the US accelerated its testing program in an effort to achieve superiority. The US has already adopted this policy for non-first-use nuclear weapons. The recent Democratic convention refused to put such a plank in its platform. The Soviet Union is callously withdrawing from Afghanistan and it reducing its conventional forces in Europe. While the US continues its semi-occupation with Philippines, Honduras, and South Korea, and plans to build up forces in Europe. The USSR is currently implementing plans to force back a manager, university administrator, and public officials, to submit to the will of the people through their actions. The US FOB on the other hand is complacent despite with troublesome...

* * * * *
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in his behalf. There is no reason to be critical of the Grand Forks Air Force Base. There is no question that this base has been an important part of our national wealth to date. I feel that we should not have peace today if we did not have peace today. I feel that Rail Garrison will only add to that.

Grande Prairie terminal base has been a good neighbor. There has not been an event that has jeopardized the safety of the people of this area. Thank you.

**Mr. Peterson**: Thank you, Richard Frank. And next will be George Schubert.

**Mr. Frank**: I am Richard Frank, a 60 year resident of Grand Forks. By no means am I an expert in military affairs. Not are certainly the majority of you fellow citizens here assembled. But we are all here to hear and discuss this great national issue as it's president, General Eisenhower, who would say that he was a military expert. And it's no secret what we want to do is to have his legacy to our country. "Bravado of the Military industrial complex." That's what he said. And he repeated it many times. "Bravado of the military industrial complex."
MR. RUSCITTY: I refer to Ronnie Rosenberg.

MR. RUSCITTY: I refer to Ronnie Rosenberg.

To Jim Delglish.

COLONEL NORMAN: Thank you. After this speaker will be Tom O'Neill.

MR. DELGELSH: My name is James Delglish, 3445 9th Avenue North in Grand Forks. And as a vice-chairman of the Greater North Dakota Association of the North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, I appear before you today in support of the Peacekeeper Ballistic Missile Defense System. The Greater North Dakota Association is a non-profit organization with nearly 2,000 members throughout the state. We are committed to strengthening North Dakota's economy.

In addition to that, however, I feel that a strong defense system is consistent with GMAD's objectives of supporting freedom, freedom of transit as well as individual freedom.

North Dakota is an ideal location for the deployment of this system. Our rail network is sufficient to support the system requirements and can easily be upgraded if needed. The Draft Environmental Impact Report states that "Grand Forks will have no significant risk associated with this system." This Greater North Dakota Association urges the Air Force to retain Peacekeeper Ballistic Missile Defense System to North Dakota. And we urge that priority be given to North Dakota as a first selection. Thank you.

COLONEL NORMAN: Dan Schacter.

MR. SCHACTER: Thank you. And as from the Rural East Grand Forks, I am opposed to the proposed weapons system. And as far as the weapons system is concerned, I oppose it for several reasons. One is morality and question about its strategic feasibility and what will happen strategically if it is deployed.

I realize these lines are outside of the scope of this Environmental Impact Statement, and so I will direct my attention towards some of the discussions of safety, public safety issues.

Before I do that I do want to make one comment. To make this comment, because those of us who express opposition to foreign policy in this country often have our motives questioned publicly. And I just want to say my major motivation for being here is that I cannot reconcile the continued production and deployment of nuclear weapons with what I read in the Gospel.

How with regards to safety. First question I have is regarding the possibility of detonation of nuclear wastes during the time of disposal. There exist lines of this kind.

A little while ago Colonel Walsh said I think I am quoting him as "That is absolutely no possibility of detonation of these weapons." On page 86-46 of the report, the Impact Statement, I have a quote here "There is virtually no possibility of an inadvertent detonation." And...
my first question is: it seems to me that we could easily determine the cause of death...
MR. CARTER: My name is Rick Clayburgh. I am a Legislative candidate here in Grand Forks. I am also a life-long resident of the community and look forward to the future raising my family in this community. Along with the tremendous economic impact on our community I support world peace and I wholeheartedly support the MX Rail Garrison.

Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER: Joe Landers. And then Jeanette Shaw-Lynch.

MR. LANDERS: Thank you, gentlemen. My name is Joe Landers. I am a life-long resident of Grand Forks. And I would like to say I am here mostly as a father of three boys, five, three, and one. And I guess I feel that the MX, that this program is something that is positive and will keep us out of war. I hope to never have to send my boys to war.

And I am in favor of this program. Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER: Jeanette Shaw-Lynch.

Ms. Lynch: I will defer to Mr. Prownek.

Mr. Prownek: I am a resident of Grand Forks. I am also the secretary of the Red River Valley Peace Worriers and also vice-president of the North Dakota Peace Coalition.

And first off, I would like to state that I find it hard to accept that, you know, Orwellian utopia. That this system could ever end. That leaves a nation and a community particularly Grand Forks or North Dakota to pick up the pieces when the Air Force does not perform its duty. The Air Force is there to defend the nation as a whole. And if it benefits the community that is okay, but once they leave it is not the Air Force's commitment to come in and fix the damage that is done.

By reducing personnel, reducing the Air Force wing. It is up to the community and the state government, North Dakota, as a small state, 50,000 people. And it does not have the resources to change its economy if this system comes in and it is all of a sudden phased out very quickly.

Another thing is that I believe that the economy of Grand Forks and the state of North Dakota is important. I am a fourth generation North Dakotan. My people have been here ever since we came from the Old Country. And I think that I am going to stay in this community, I live it here.

And the other thing at the Peace Worriers and the North Dakota Peace Coalition if they use this kind of money on national issues should be spent on job creation, this money should be spent for education. It should be spent for repairing roads. It should be spent in revitalizing housing.

In the state of North Dakota there is an estimate that 89% of all bridges are unsafe in some degree, from very unsafe to mildly unsafe. By spending this kind of money to rebuild bridges, rebuild homes, who would put money into this community that people would be more or buy homes and returning that dollar in the community. And it would be much better spent, you know. I think that these kind of things build a nation. A nation itself is not based on only its economic -- on only its military strength. It is based on its economic and also its, you know, moral strength. There is great nations of Athens which had cultural education, and then there was Sparta who lost it.

COUNCIL MEMBER: Meet up with Bart Carroll, followed by Stenerson.

MR. CARTER: Being in opposition to the deployment of the MX missile I wish to offer my testimony to Al Prownek. Mr. Prownek: I am Al Prownek from Crookston, which is in the expanded ground zero if the MX is employed. I would also like to begin by pointing out that Nato tech was not exactly an impartial unbiased organization, since it was part of Honeywell. And we are Minnesota understand Honeywell's relation to the weapons of death.

Now the US is to develop what the missiles is and what it is designed to do. It weighs 100 tons. It has ten independently target warheads. Each warhead equates to 300,000 tons of TNT equivalent three mega-tones. That equals all of the bombs in the Second World War, the Pacific, Europe, Africa, and including Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That is the most -- three million mega-tones.

The range is over 5,000 miles and it is accurate within 300 feet. Now the only reason we have to be as accurate as 300 feet after 500 miles is if we are shooting at a hardened military site like a silo, it doesn't make much sense to shoot at empty silos, therefore the MX must be part of the United States first strike nuclear war playing...
strategy.

In addition to being a first strike weapon, it is also inherently destabilizing due to its multiple warheads. The deployment of the MX in any basing mode will therefore decrease national security because the deployment increases the likelihood of a nuclear exchange.

Now, the Air Force implies that deployment will enhance deterrence. But the Congressional Budget Office in November of '87 states that approximately 3,700 nuclear warheads would survive a Soviet surprise attack and over 8,000 would survive a short warning time alert system.

Strategic forces. Considering the fact of launching only a small fraction of those remaining missiles would obliterate the Soviet Union undoubtedly initiate a nuclear winter, contaminate the entire earth to an uninhabitable state.

I ask what is sufficient military strength. And to point out what we have today. I as going to drop some BS in this can. Each MX represents the Second World War or one MX as the Second World War. Let's do it again. All right. Now I am going to drop in the equivalent of what we have in nuclear weapons alone, not counting conventional weapons. This is nuclear weapons existing today. And you gentlemen want more. And I am just going to demonstrate what we have today. These are Second World War. Remember. What is sufficiency. When are we going to have enough.

* * * *
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You have stated that no conceivable way would a warhead be detonated by accident. Did the Air Force conceive that its B-1 bomber could be doomed by a bird? It happened. And people were killed.

We keep hearing of our border, even the use of international tension. No hearings have been consulted or have been held.

Minute Man missiles were placed within a five minute drive from the border of our province, Manitoba, which is a nuclear weapons free-zone. We have not been consulted about the MX Rail Garrison program, even though this program allows the easy movement of MX missiles arbitrarily close to our border, even across the border conceivably during the time of international tension.

We have a membership of about 212 people and contacts in 74 congregations throughout the city.

A little over 200 years ago a small country revolted from the oppression of a powerful empire, charging the empire with forcing burdens upon it that it did not agree to. One of the protests was against taxation without representation. I am here today as a Canadian to protest to our present to us during the time of nuclear war.

We have a membership of about 212 people and contacts in 74 congregations throughout the city.

A little over 200 years ago a small country revolted from the oppression of a powerful empire, charging the empire with forcing burdens upon it that it did not agree to. One of the protests was against taxation without representation. I am here today as a Canadian to protest to our present to us during the time of nuclear war.

We have a membership of about 212 people and contacts in 74 congregations throughout the city.

A little over 200 years ago a small country revolted from the oppression of a powerful empire, charging the empire with forcing burdens upon it that it did not agree to. One of the protests was against taxation without representation. I am here today as a Canadian to protest to our present to us during the time of nuclear war.

We have a membership of about 212 people and contacts in 74 congregations throughout the city.
there is no reason to jeopardize our future. I feel this Rail Garrison would be too destabilizing and dangerous. It also would be a greater risk from false attack and accidents that would be devastating to any community or base. That is not just Grand Forks, any community or base.

I ask that more research be put into another system, such as a submarine system or some other proposal that will not cause any community to become such a primary target for future deterrence through accident or attempt. In closing, if we do not have a choice, if we have no choice and it is going to be built anyway, then certainly let us put it in Grand Forks, as we must be as responsible as any other community for the national defense system as well as economic impact. However, I want to emphasize let us not jeopardize our future generations by building it. Let us go for a safer system. We not only owe this to ourselves, but our kids, our grandchildren, our future. Thank you.

COLONEL MCGRANAH: We are going to conclude the proceedings at this time. Please remember that you have until 11 August to submit written material to be included in the transcript of the hearing. Once again, oral, hand written statements or comments will be afforded equal weight. Please be assured that Air Force decision makers will carefully consider each viewpoint raised here tonight when deciding the alternate course of action on the proposal.

Thank you. This Public hearing is adjourned at 10:05 p.m.
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Christian and student of the Scriptures I cannot in good conscience at all support the Rail Garrison system. (Refer to Report #12)

MR. FINNEY: I am Maury Finney from East Grand Forks. WA-A-U-N-Y. I am a business man in greater Grand Forks, and enjoy a good business from the entire community which includes not only East Grand Forks, but Grand Forks, and Grand Forks Air Force Base, and forming community as well as the small towns communities.

After some research on the Rail Garrison plan to have several nuclear weapons stored in the railroad garrison in one place seems very unsafe and destabilizing proposal. I feel that considering that we have had enough railroad accidents, one only last week, which injured 100 people, this is not the most intelligent approach to a future defensive attempt.

First of all, doesn't this grouping of missiles in trains make us an easy first rate target. Will our potential enemy know when we wheel up these trains whether it is a practice session or is it the real thing.

Don't take us wrong, I am for very -- I am very supportive of economic development in our great community. That includes all of us, some of us in agriculture, and retail, industrial, labor, education, and military. We are all in this together. The list goes on and on. However,
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there is no reason to jeopardize our future. I feel this Rail Garrison would be too destabilizing and dangerous. It also would be a greater risk from false attack and accidents that would be devastating to any community or base. That is not just Grand Forks, any community or base.

I ask that more research be put into another system, such as a submarine system or some other proposal that will not cause any community to become such a primary target for future deterrence through accident or attempt. In closing, if we do not have a choice, if we have no choice and it is going to be built anyway, then certainly let us put it in Grand Forks, as we must be as responsible as any other community for the national defense system as well as economic impact. However, I want to emphasize let us not jeopardize our future generations by building it. Let us go for a safer system. We not only owe this to ourselves, but our kids, our grandchildren, our future. Thank you.

COLONEL MCGRANAH: We are going to conclude the proceedings at this time. Please remember that you have until 11 August to submit written material to be included in the transcript of the hearing. Once again, oral, hand written statements or comments will be afforded equal weight. Please be assured that Air Force decision makers will carefully consider each viewpoint raised here tonight when deciding the alternate course of action on the proposal.

Thank you. This Public hearing is adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

* * * * *
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PROCEDURES

HEARING OFFICER McHARRY: Good evening.

It looks like just about everybody's back, so we'll start with -- I'd like to have Colonel Walsh introduce the other members of the panel, please.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALSH: On my immediate right is Major Van Ness. He is a lawyer for the Air Force and he will address issues pertaining to planned acquisition and safety.

On my far right is Lieutenant Colonel Emmons from Headquarters, Strategic Air Command, and he will answer questions pertaining to the operation of the system.

On my immediate left is Mr. Richard of Tetra Tech Corporation (sic), Tetra Tech is a company that the Air Force has hired to prepare this draft statement. He will address issues pertaining to the human resources.

On my far left is Mr. Kramer, also of Tetra Tech Corporation, and he will respond to questions relating to the (physical) resources.

Thank you, sir.

HEARING OFFICER McHARRY: Thank you, Colonel Walsh.

We now turn to the question-and-answer period of this public hearing. This time is set aside to allow you to ask questions about the content of the briefing and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Once recognized by me, please step up to the
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I thought the study was inadequate on the transportation impact, and I would ask if there was some way we could have it added specifically. There was no evaluation made of the national rail system accessed by each of the candidate bases.

We have tried to listen carefully to what you have presented. We have also taken its points into account and will be incorporating them into the decision process. This document that we have before us today only identifies the environmental impact associated with deployment. There are many issues that will be used in the final decision on whether or not to deploy at a particular location. These issues -- or these other considerations -- will also be taken into account. The number of personnel required to man a particular location. In this case, Little Rock has a slightly higher base than the other bases because it doesn't have the Strategic Air Command Control structure already in place, so it is a little bit more expensive as far as manpower is concerned. It also takes into account some of the considerations that you presented: adjacency to a major rail hub and geographical position within the United States.

All of these considerations and others will be incorporated into a document which will be entitled the "Area Selection Report" that will accompany the Record of Decision that will be produced after this environmental impact statement is filed and it will explain how those other considerations contributed to the final decision by the President and the Secretary of Defense.

Thank you, sir. 

HEARING OFFICER WILSON: Nick Wilson.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Gentlemen, my name is Nick Wilson. I'm a lawyer here in Jacksonville; I'm a member of the Legislature; I was born here some forty-six years ago; I've lived here all my life. I intend to spend all the rest of my life here.

I, too, represent the north Pulaski County legislative district that comprises some 65,000 or so people in the north and south of the county, except the City of North Little Rock.

I have tried to listen carefully to what I hear on the streets, talk about, in the coffee shops, and elsewhere.

I express you on behalf of the people that I represent.
that it was very, very intense in its findings. Some areas in the -- considering Jacksonville, I felt that we had a little more points than was shown, but that's debatable.

We have in Jacksonville 29,306 residents, and as mayor of this city I participated in our last program that you had here at this same school some months ago.

I'd like to say that since we had that meeting I read a letter that was addressed to the Secretary of the Air Force, and at the chance of being repetitive I want to bore you with it again, sir. Because you were not here at that time, and I'd like it in the record.

This was dated April 21, 1988, to the Secretary of the Air Force at the Pentagon.

"Dear Sir: Twenty-five years ago Little Rock Air Force Base in north central Arkansas was selected as a primary location for the Titan II missile.

"We accepted and welcomed these missiles into our community as a deterrent to nuclear war. The relationship between the missiles and the citizens developed into one of strong friendship and cooperation (phonetic).

"The community adopted a positive attitude about having these new citizens in our community and efforts were made to provide adequate housing, recreational facilities, and community centers to accommodate our new neighbors' every need.

"In 1987, after 25 years of faithful service, the Titan II missiles were removed from this area.

"Now we have an opportunity to replace them with the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and this community feels proud to be a part of our country's efforts to protect our country and citizens from the aggressiveness of our enemies.

"I feel very strongly that we can provide adequate housing, facilities and a favorable environment for the personnel that would accompany the Peacekeeper mission. I therefore request that Little Rock Air Force Base be selected as the location for this mission."

I also have a few other comments. I'd like to say that after I read this letter at the previous meeting not one person at that meeting lived in the city of Jacksonville spoke against the Air Force Base. Since that meeting I've not had one person call me, write me, or come to my office and tell me that they did not want the rail Garrison in this area.

I also realize that we're not the only ones that will be impacted by this, but --

HEARING OFFICER RGBHANE: Mayor, as I indicated, we're going to have to go with a three-minute time limit, and your time is up.

MAJOR SMITH: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your indulgence.

HEARING OFFICER RGBHANE: If you have further comments that you want to add to the record, you may do that, of course.

MAJOR SMITH: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER RGBHANE: Keith Vaughan?

A VOICE: He had to leave.

HEARING OFFICER RGBHANE: All right. Thank you very much.

For the record, Keith Vaughan is the elected City Attorney from Jacksonville and he had to leave.

Aldereman Marshall D. Smith.

ALDERMAN MARSHALL D. SMITH: Thank you, sir.

I'm Marshall Smith, I, myself, and nine other aldermen represent the citizens of Jacksonville.

This is a very important mission that we would like to have in Jacksonville.

I feel we can handle the cost criteria that has already been mentioned at this meeting was more in detail at the previous meeting, such as installation, facilities outlet, and the size of the base that we have here, makes it a plus for Arkansas in the central area.

Arkansas is centrally located in the United States and Little Rock Air Force Base is centrally located in the state of Arkansas, accessible from all sides as far transportation.
We feel like it would be a very plus [sic] to have this rail garrison here. I feel like with the jobs, some 300-plus jobs, and the millions of dollars promoted in the local area will stimulate the economy and at the same time bring safety and, as the sign says up here -- the slide -- the peace that we need here in our nation.

I feel like you are to be complemented on the study that you've made.

I think the bottom line here is, as far as the environmental impact, that there is a very little significant impact that would happen if this came here to Jacksonville.

We're all for it.

Thank you.

Hearing Officer McShane: Thank you.

Lula Leonard.

Ms. Leonard, I'm Lula Leonard, City Clerk-Treasurer for the City of Jacksonville.

I have lived in this city for 30 years, during which time I have seen the impact that the Little Rock Air Force Base has had on our community.

Placement of the military installation in our community has not only benefited us with protection from enemy aggression, but with residential, business and industrial growth. It has presented us with the challenge of being a
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to come to the Little Rock Air Force Base.

I am also part owner of a company here in Jacksonville called Lomence, which if you -- the rail spur that you're going to be using goes between the parking lot of our facility and the main building, and we would see no problem having you -- it being a problem.

You're more than welcome to use the train as much as you like.

Applause.

Hearing Officer McShane: Palpate, as I indicated, applause and other things are just going to detract from the atmosphere, so if you would, please abstain.

I next call on Gene Farrell. -- Farrell, Gene.

Have you got your last name first or --

Gene Farrell.

Mr. Farrell: DEQ officials and fellow citizens, my name is Gene Farrell. I live at 801 North Monroe, Little Rock.

I have lived here for six years. I'm a student at UALR, and a representative member of the Coalition for Peace and Justice, and also a nurse at St. Vincent's Infirmary in Little Rock.

I want to make a brief statement in opposition to a further buildup of the MX missile in general, in particular to having them based here in Arkansas.

I believe the production and deployment of the MX missile is a step backward in recent advances towards nuclear disarmament which came about when President Reagan and
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Secretary Gortechef signed the INF treaty.

There is an astounding and undeniable scientific documentation which attests to the fact that the MX is basically an obsolete weapon system, that its only purpose is to pad the pockets of the military contractors which are now finally under serious investigation regarding their procurement practices, or to have the chosen basing site as a more vulnerable target in the event of a nuclear weapons exchange.

I have reviewed the lengthy Draft Environmental Impact Statement as well prepared with obvious conflict of interests by the US -- I seem to believe, by the US Air Force and I remain unconvinced intellectually and ethically that this so-called peacekeeper will actually be safe based on callous on our shaky tracks or will serve to promote peace, being in fact an offensive weapon in the militaristic scenario.

I feel the sincere desire by the government and local officials to base this system here in Jacksonville, Arkansas. I am politically motivated to try to bring an economic boost to this area which is suffering from serious environmental hazards from former ill-advised military investments.

Money and profitability should not be a priority here, and having the MX in Jacksonville does not promote a safe, healthy, nor peaceful community for the residents.

I am about to become a father at Christmas. God
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willing, and I do not want to raise my children in a state where missiles to annihilate life are stationed and rationalized as instruments of peace. I don't know how I would explain that contradiction to my child and I don't believe I could.

I'd also, further, like to ask a question. What is the environmental impact of not deploying the MX? What is the environmental impact of alternative deployment methods, such as, but not limited to, the 30-plus basing modes examined over the past 25 years? What would be the environmental impact to this community and to the state? What will be the impact on tourism in this state?

And what will be the impact of the measures necessary to handle increased traffic on roadways and railroads in this community and throughout this state?

What is the environmental impact of building an antiballistic missile system in order to protect the MX rail-based garrison?

What security measures will be implemented to protect the MX? And what security measures on railway properties are to be under military command? If not the military, who will control the railway security network? What will be the MX's impact on local police authorities? And what powers will the local military security commander have? Will any security commander subordinate have the power to
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automatically detain and search persons --

HEARING OFFICER MCGRANE: Mr. Farrell, time.

Mr. Farrell: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER MCGRANE: Colonel Walsh, do you have answers to those questions?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALSH: I have attempted to write down as many as I could. I think I can answer most of those.

First of all, the environmental consequences --

MR. MURPHY: Point of order --

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALSH: -- of not deploying this system are identified within the document under the title of "Existing and Future Baselines," so it is already available to you.

Second, the Congress has specifically asked the President to propose a small survival basing mode and, further, directing that we prepare an EIS on that basing mode, so the Air Force has no requirement to compare the impacts of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison with any of the other 30 basing modes that were considered.

As far as the transportation effects, I think they have been fully explained under Transportation Resources. Your question with respect to the antiballistic missile, I should point out to you that this system mode [phonetic] needs no such protection. In fact it ensures its
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also a past president of the Chamber of Commerce, past president of the Arkana counties, and past president of the Sherwood Bank.

I say that because I come in contact with a great number of people and I live the mayor of Jacksonville, have found no one who opposes the basing of this rail garrison Peacekeeper missile here.

I think it's simply named. I want you to build it here not just because it's good for the economy, but because it's good for peace and it's good for America.

You know, what price do we have to pay for freedom?

And I think this is a rhetorical environmental question.

Students of history would do well to look back to Neville Chamberlain, back right prior to World War II. A good student of history will remember -- and they may have seen pictures of when Neville Chamberlain got back from his meeting with Adolf Hitler. He told the world that at that time that "We have peace, peace in our time." And he had signed a treaty with Hitler that England would not build additional weapons and, of course, France was well-involved in the same thing. Everyone knows what happened there. We had the most devastating war we've ever had.

I think that is an environmental concern because I would a lot more like to see a system built that would keep someone from doing an act than I would to have to see what
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happens when we're not adequately prepared.

Certainly the jobs are important to us here in central Arkansas. Certainly they are secondary to the overall goal of making peace a lifetime thing, and I think people who oppose it are very sincere in that endeavor, but I think somewhat naïve. And if they would study history a little bit they would know that only through an adequate system of good defense will our children and our grandchildren be able to enjoy those lives -- the life we have had for the last few years.

I thank you very much.

WILLIAM W. STEAD

DR. STEAD: I'm Dr. William Steed from Little Rock.

I live at 7101 Westpark Drive.

The question I would like to pose is: How does deploying 10 more MX missiles fit in with the President's efforts to pull back -- begin to pull back from this suicidal arms race?

And the second is: How can the missiles possibly be safe on a rail system that is fraught with safety problems all of the time, with major accidents, multiple people killed, where there is adequate documentation of use of drugs by the railroad personnel.

W. STEAD
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safe on the rail system or not. first of all we acknowledge in our analyses that there is a chance for accidents, and we acknowledge that just due to just normal rail operations there could be between -- about three fatalities and up to 16 incapacitations.

We also identified some of the actions that the Air Force has been taking to continue that number was kept as low as possible. We felt that the numbers would actually be lower than that which was reported in the EIS.

We also feel that the limited movement of the missile or of the missile case on the rail track will minimize their exposure to the general public, that they will only be moved on the national rail network when there is a crisis or a time of national need, so the time of exposure is very limited.

But, even so, the EIS did acknowledge that there is a possibility that during that brief time of exposure there could be an accident, and there is a very remote possibility that there could be an accident where you could have ignition or explosion of the missile.

And in our analyses we have identified what the potential consequences of such an accident might be so the decisionmaker would be fully aware of that.

We also emphasize in our analyses that there could be -- could be no possibility of release of plutonium because of the makeup of the country vehicle. So, even though we may have an accident, even though we may have an ignition of the missile propellant, that we would have no danger from the release of plutonium.

But, on the other hand, in the EIS itself we also identify what the impacts could be if there was such a release, as we have not tried to whitewash the safety aspects of the operation. We have tried to lay them out, as required by law, so that the decisionmaker is fully aware of what the potential consequences could be of the operation of the system on the national railroad.
support and report the Jacksonville community has with the existing Little Rock Air Force Base and its missions. All of the Air Force personnel that I have talked to have indicated that the relationship between the base and the community is among the best that they have been exposed to in their careers.

The Jacksonville area has recently lost several key industries reducing our employment by between 500 and 1000 people. The Peacekeeper Garrison will partially alleviate the economic problems in the community resulting from the loss of these jobs. However, jobs are not the important issue here. The issue is the need for the Peacekeeper Garrison to help strengthen our national defense.

To those opposed to the Peacekeeper I would ask one question: If it's the wrong buying mode, why are the Soviets deploying a similar system? I appreciate the thoroughness that the Air Force has gone through in the development of the Environmental Impact Statement and I want to state for the record my personal support for the Peacekeeper mission. I hope that you will select the Little Rock Air Force Base as a finalist for the basing of the Peacekeeper.

I have one major concern that I would like to add, and I would hope that the rail bed themselves would be fully evaluated, and improved, and tested to make sure that everyone in the community is comfortable with your efforts in this area.

Thank you.

JAMES REDMOND

MR. REDMOND: Colonel McNamee and gentlemen, I am a businessman in the local community here. I've been here 30 years, and I really speak for nobody except myself.

We have a community here that has got -- this local community generally supports this program.

First, I'd like to express my thanks to our system of government and you gentlemen in particular for allowing the citizens of this country to comment, both pro and con, on this.

We have opponents to this system. The complete Kremlin is opposed to this system, and we have opponents to our country to this system, but I'd like you to answer the question, if you have an answer to it, how much public input did Gorbachev give the Russian citizens to whether he was going to have a system like this to wage war against us?

We need the system. We'll live in Jacksonville without any additional money from any of you people anywhere. We're going to survive quite well, we're a sturdy people, and we'll make it. But we need this system, and if you don't put it in Jacksonville and you think there's enough of us in

Jacksonville that don't want it, for God's sake take it and put it somewhere. Our children, our grandchildren need this protection.

Whether our opponents to the system, from the Kremlin all the way back to us, believe we need the system or not, we need it.

Any nation that has totally disarmed itself has turned into a nation of slaves. There has never been a nation that has been conquered by communism, and there are 43 of them since the second World War, with one exception -- there's only one country that has come back and has any form of freedom left in it.

If our opponents want this bad enough, and we're scared enough of this system, for God's sake take it out of our community, but put it somewhere.

Don't do anything. Don't sit on your behind and not protect the country. We need the protection, even though we have people among us that they probably are doing it in good faith, but ignorance is really no excuse when it turns into slavery.

Gentlemen, I thank you for hearing my side of it.

HEARING OFFICER MCNAMEE: Thank you.

JERRY RANDLE: I'm Jerry Randle, Director of

MR. RANDLE: I'm Jerry Randle, Director of
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time to address, or comment, or give rah-rah speeches for the

Mr. or tell why the Russians are at the negotiating table.

According to the National Environmental Protection

Act, the purpose of this hearing is to elicit public comment on

the deficiencies of this Statement and for no other purpose.

I'm here to list a few deficiencies of this

statement.

I would appreciate it if Lieutenant Colonel Walsh
does not take up any more public time.

HEARING OFFICER: He has been answering

questions.

MR. NOORT: We have also --

HEARING OFFICER: Proceed.

MR. NOORT: The record will reflect what he has

done.

I'm going to proceed with a checklist of issues that

were either ignored in the Draft Environmental Impact

Statement or were not adequately addressed, giving glib

responses.

Will any security commander or subordinate have the

power to automatically detain or search persons found on

the railroad right-of-ways as may be done on military

reservations? Will homes and properties immediately adjacent

to the right-of-ways be subject to unannounced searches and/or

systematic observation?
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many jobs, on the average, would be created if money remained
in the civilian economy rather than being taxed for use by the
military?

The Reagan administration was known to have had at
least four MX basing modes under active consideration prior to
selecting the rail Garrison mode in December of 1986. Why
haven't any of these other alternatives been included in the
DEIS?

Why not a No MX Alternative? In other words,
include an alternative for getting rid of, dismantling, the 50
self-based MX currently deployed in an option. Such an option
might make sense as part of the deep reductions being pursued
in the President's START negotiations.

Descriptions of the Proposed Action fails to specify
whether its 50 MX missiles would be the ones currently
deployed in silos at F.E. Warren Air Force Base --

HEARING OFFICER: Time, Mr. Noort.

Colonel Walsh, apparently Mr. Noort does not want
answer to those questions. I took his statement to mean is
that correct, at this time?

MR. NOORT: Right. They properly belong in the
Final Environmental Impact Statement.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Walsh, apparently Mr. Noort indicated
I and as I indicated, those questions must be addressed in the
Final Statement, and they will be addressed there.
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Will plainclothed or secret agents be stationed in
towns, villages, or at other intervals along MX rail lines for
security purposes?

Will persons living near the MX routes be advised
that their activities are subject to systematic monitoring?

Will deployment of the MX result in the establishment of a network of secret police across the
dispersal area? Where will the Congressional oversight of this security network be in view of the recent FBI disorders for
civil liberties, is it reasonable to ask citizens to allow the
formation and widespread

deployment of another secret security organization? To what
uses, other than the MX railway security, will the security
network be utilized? What additional security measures will
be taken to prevent sabotage or acts of terrorism? What is
the environmental impact of these safeguards on the affected
areas? These issues were neglected in the Draft Environmental
Impact Statement.

The No Action Alternative has been properly
considered within the DEIS in terms of nationwide economic
impact, for instance Section 4.1.1. The Job creation
potential of the two rail Garrison actions is discussed
ignoring that no action would also create a certain number of
jobs. How many jobs would be created if $8 billion to $15
billion was spent on education instead of the military. Now

MR. NOORT: Thank you.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALSH: Sir, there may be other
people in the audience that might like to hear the answers to
some of the questions that have raised.

MR. NOORT: In response to that, let me ask their
own questions, take up their own three minutes.

I want the responses to my questions in the Final
Environmental Impact Statement, not now.

HEARING OFFICER: Did you provide a copy of
that to the court reporter?

MR. NOORT: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Walsh, shall I answer him, sir?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALSH: No, sir, we'll go on.

And if any of those questions did raise similar
concerns of folks who do want them answered, they can ask
the question later.

SUSAN BORNER

SUSAN BORNER: My name is Susan Borner, and I'm a
member of the North Arkansas Central Greens committee.

A couple of things, while I'm opposed to MX of any
form or any kind of nuclear weapons, because as far as I'm
concerned there is really no good alternative to -- if the
nuclear weapon is to blow up, we are all going to die.
A couple of things that you mentioned that I would like addressed possibly later on. The first... if you talked about Damascus, Arkansas and the Titan that blew up and the fact that the warhead did not blow up, people have won suits against the government for the propellants that were emitted.

There were people that were harmed by the propellants.

I live in an area that's a very high karst area and the ground goes up so that if that happened up where I live, that we get these propellants in our water system. Most of us are on well water, and I was just kind of wondering what is your effects or what are your plans if that happened up there in north Arkansas?

Some of the other issues that were concerning me, the descriptions of the Proposed Action fail to specify whether the 50 MX missiles would be the ones currently deployed in silos at F.E. Warren Air Force Base or whether these would be 50 new missiles. If new missiles are involved, why aren't these costs included in the table listing Rail Garrison Expenditures? If missiles are to be taken from the silo, why isn't the impact of this included under what is discussing Warren Air Force Base, including the site operations band lost?

Thank you.

READER OFFICER READER: Colonel Waler?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALL: In the 1980s we do refer to

Action for F.E. Warren we did in fact consider the removal of the missiles from the silo, the environmental consequences of that action.

Thank you very much, we'm.

READER OFFICER READER: Six Bess.

SIX BASE

MS. BASS: Good afternoon.

I'm very pleased to be here, to be a public voice as a taxpayer and as a proud American.

My theme tonight is: Stop and think. The railroads within the United States has developed over a period of time. They unite people; they transport supplies, services, goods, and people; they are the network and the backbone of our industrial nation. This transportation system aids in our development as a nation.

We feel safe and secure with our railroad system. Let's not make it a toy of the military. I say take the toys away from the boys.

Take the toys away from the boys.

It reminds me of a child playing with a little train in the backyard. Oh, yes, they want to travel and carry little bombs across our transportation system, and I as a person within the United States say no. I say no to the military.

It's a poor idea. I find it outrageous and quite

the Damascus incident. I should point out to you that the Damascus incident was due to the explosion of the now obsolete missile, that there was no release of plutonium, and that's the only reason that we cited that incident.

We did not cite that incident to suggest that there would be no toxic fumes released. And we have acknowledged that in the possibility of an accident where there was an ignition of propellant that there could be toxic fumes released that could be harmful to people in the immediate vicinity.

However, I should point out that with the solid propellant if there was an explosion, it would remain in chunks. It would not go down into the groundwater table. It could be merely picked up.

I should also point out that the Air Force would be responsible for any damage incurred and would have to pay compensation to those people impacted.

With respect to your question on Proposed Action, perhaps it's a deficiency in our document that we did not specify where these missiles were coming from. The answer is that on the Proposed Action the 50 missiles are in fact new missiles. On the Alternative proposal, they will have 50 new missiles and 50 missiles that would be removed from the silos at F.E. Warren.

I should emphasize to you that in the Alternative

RIDICULOUS.

I say stop and think. Think about what we are doing. I'd also like to address a few questions.

Descriptions of the Proposed Action fail to specify whether it's 50 MX missiles would be the ones currently deployed in silo at F.E. Warren Air Force Base, or whether these would be 50 new missiles. If new missiles are involved, why aren't these costs included in the table listing Rail Garrison Expenditures? If missiles are taken away from silos, why isn't this impact included under when discussing the Warren Air Force Base?

Similarly, the Alternative Action fails to discuss the impact of closing down the silos at Warren Air Force Base. Under the heading "Purpose and Need," the Air Force implies its proposed actions will enhance deterrence. Deterrence is defined as "having sufficient military strength and the perceived willingness to use that strength after an enemy attack to inflict unacceptable damage to the enemy, thus inhibiting them from striking in the first place."

According to the data from the Congressional Budget Office, November of 1987, approximately 3,700 K-88 nuclear weapons would endure even a Soviet "bolt from the blue" surprise attack, while roughly 8,200 other nuclear weapons would remain if there was enough warning time to alert our strategic forces. Doesn't this constitute "sufficient military
It seems that while the MX trains might be completely tested before they are deployed, the missiles they carry will not.

The DEIS indicates that rail garrison basing is needed for "complicating the enemy's targeting task." A spokesman for the US Air Force's Ballistic Missile Office was quoted in a March 1986 newspaper article as saying, "A missile would not have to use up more weapons to try to destroy an MX train."

HEARING OFFICER RIEB: That's correct.

RAY JOHNSON: Lieutenant Colonel Walsh: What are some questions that were asked by the lady. In response to them, there is an attempt to disguise the train. We acknowledge that there was a discrepancy in the lengths of the train from those that you normally see.

However, we should point out to you that even if someone were to identify the train and go into operational mode, by the time that information was made available to anyone in the Soviet Union so that he could use that information to target their missiles, the train would no longer be in that location. So it relies on its mobility for its survivability.
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is very little difference now between launching it out of a silo and launching it from a missile carriage. In fact, we already have the technology for building missile carriages, so there isn't that much that has to be done in the research and development area before we can deploy the system.

Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER MCRANE: Ray Johnson.

RAY JOHNSON: My name is Ray Johnson, and I live in Sherwood. I am president of the Homebuilders' Association of Greater Little Rock. We have 514 members, and we want to go on record as supporting the missile system coming to Little Rock Air Force Base.

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER MCRANE: Thank you. Bill O'Neal? I hope I got that right.

BILL CONWAY: Thank you, Colonel. For being here tonight and giving us the opportunity to express our views on the Peacekeeper missile and the prospect of it being deployed at the Little Rock Air Force Base.

Without a strong defense, our country could not enjoy the many freedoms that we have, one of which we are exercising tonight.
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by their impact they make while living here and the lasting impression they leave behind.

I would welcome any additional military personnel into our community anytime regardless of their mission.

The Peacekeeper, if deployed at the Little Rock Air Force Base, would be right here in the heart of Jacksonville.

I live here and encourage the decision officials to choose the Little Rock Air Force Base.

There is an able and willing workforce able to construct any buildings necessary; our utilities can handle the additional personnel; our highway system can handle any additional personnel; and our rail system is nearby and available.

In Jacksonville and in central Arkansas there is considerable affordable housing to accommodate additional troops. Jacksonville is willing and able to assist the United States government.

Knowing that there is no significant impact at the Little Rock Air Force Base, I have one question: When will the decision be final, and what steps can Jacksonville take to be prepared to help the United States Air Force deploy the Peacekeeper at the Little Rock Air Force Base?

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER MCRANE: Colonel Walsh, can you answer that?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALSH: The Congress is in the process of passing a bill in which they would put $500 million into the Peacekeeper Ballistic Missile program for research and development next year, and $250 million into the Small ICBM program. They have also foresaw an additional $250 million.

It is the intent of Congress that in conjunction or in coordination with the new administration they will make a decision on which missile system to proceed with, and that decision will be made next March. At that time the system that they will select would get that extra $250 million that we foresaw, so that Congress has targeted next March as the final decision time for this -- which being mode or which missile system they are going to proceed with.

Thank you, sir.

HEARING OFFICER MCRANE: Dub Myers.

MR. MYERS: Good evening, Colonel. Good evening, gentlemen.

I just happen to be a local citizen here. Also I'm president of the Chamber of Commerce, and we have over 800 members.

I'd like to say any unkind thing about the MX missile being located in the Jacksonville area.

I'm like Bill Clinton, you know. I don't hear very
many people standing up here and saying, "I own property in Jacksonville," or, "I own a house in Jacksonville," or, "I raise my children here."

And my grandson just happen to be here now visiting me, and, you know, it's a damn good place to live. And I don't know how a lot of other people don't move on out here and join us, rather than saying something that might be derogatory to us.

The other thing, we're talking about a train, and we're talking about accidents, and everything and, sir, I hate to admit that I drove out here tonight, I sure as hell didn't walk. Many people are killed every minute in automobiles, and you talk about the risks -- people are killed in everything they do. They're killed in airplanes, and everything, and there is a certain amount of risking that you have to here.

There's a risk in war. I don't know if anybody else around here did it or not, but I served in the Korean War. I had a daughter that was 21 days old before I ever knew I was a father. She was eight months old before I ever saw her. I'm damn glad that I defended my country by serving my country in a foreign country. I'm proud to be a veteran. I'm also proud to be the president of the Chamber of Commerce.

The other thing I'd like to say is that deterrent, I've always heard, is the greatest thing we need to protect ourselves so we don't go on having any more wars. I believe
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if we spend billions of dollars and we save 10 lives, no telling how much money we've saved in the long run because those people might make a better place to live.

Thank you very much.

Your impact statements is wonderful.

Just come on down to Jacksonville and we'll give you a bunch, and we're glad to have the MX Missile and all the trains you want to bring by.

Thank you, sir.

HEARING OFFICER McSHANE: Fred Deveaux.

FRED DEVEAUX
Mr. Deveaux: My name is Fred Deveaux, and I live at
1603 Green Mountain Drive in Little Rock.

I'd like to say that I am opposed to the MX Rail
Garrison system.

And, I'd also like to state here, after listening to some
of these statements, that I am a veteran. I have served over
eight years in the United States Navy. I was assigned to a
nuclear powered guided missile cruiser that was capable of

22 carrying nuclear weapons. I also maintained the Trident
submarines that housed 24 nuclear-tipped missiles.

23 I think that more than enough deterrents,
24 although personally, I feel that we shouldn't have anything
25 at all. It's just such a waste, really. It's just a waste.
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Isn't this just another way of saying that towns and cities along MX train routes could expect to become targets in a nuclear war?

It is claimed that all train movement "whether training, maintenance, or operational would be contained [sic] with appropriate call company personnel to ensure safe and efficient movement." In addition, it is claimed that the MX training trains "should operate in the same manner as the existing commercial traffic." A March 21, 1988, House Armed Services Committee report raised a number of questions about this claim which the DEIS fails to answer.

If civilian dispatchers know the precise location of MX trains, why couldn't Soviet intelligence gain access to this information, thereby defeating the whole purpose of the busing idea?

At one point, the DEIS apparently contradicts itself about the normality of MX train movement by claiming that the trains would "randomly move throughout the United States." Isn't it likely that MX trains will indeed be granted special right-of-way privileges or other extraordinary powers that would increase the possibility of collision and other accidents?

Hearing Officers Morgulis: Ties, Mr. Devau.

Colonel Walsh, I think there were a couple of questions there at the front end that --
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The other issues that you raised is that we will be causing a barrage of the system. We have identified over 120,000 miles of track that would be accessible by the Peacekeeper train system. That is track that we have physically inspected to make sure that it is suitable to carry a train of the size, configuration, and weight of the Peacekeeper train.

The Soviet Union does not have enough weapons to launch a successful barrage attack over such track. And even if they tried to barrage as much as they could, they would be allowing other portions of the train to go unsanitized and thereby be available to launch an unacceptably -- or to inflict unacceptable damage on them.

So because of its mobility, it ensures its survivability and, therefore, becomes a very effective deterrent against initial Soviet attack.

Thank you very much, sir.

Hearing Officers Morgulis: John Ball.

John Ball

Mr. Ball: Hello, my name is John Ball, and I'm a student of international relations at Hendrix College, and I represent no one but myself.

As a student of international relations, I am quite aware that the Soviet Union is not Mr. Nice Guy in world politics. I remember Hungary in '56, Czechoslovakia in '68, and certainly Afghanistan in '79. However, there are a good number of people who what to take a moderate route towards this decision between the Ball Garrison MX and the Small ICBM.

I'd like to read briefly from the Scoercoff Commission Report, quote, "The Commission has concluded that the preferred approach for modernizing our ICBM force seems to have three components: Initiating engineering design of a single warhead Small ICBM to produce target value and permit flexibility in basing for better long-term survivability, seeking arms control agreements designed to enhance strategic stability, and deploying MX missiles in existing silos now to satisfy the immediate needs of our ICBM force and to aid in that transition."

A follow-up letter from General Scoercoff to Senator Sam Nunn on the Congressional Record of December 11, 1987, reeds, quote, "We would stress once again that it is vital for the nation's security that we have, quote, 'underway a program for long-term ICBM survivability to hedge against long-term vulnerability for the rest of our forces.'"

"While there are several possible approaches to the fulfillment of this compelling need, the Small ICBM is currently the most promising. In that respect, the Ball Garrison basing for the MX missile, while possessing attractive features, is not a substitute for the Small mobile ICBM inasmuch as it requires significant warming time to
To go with the deployment of the Small ICs is to go with the deployment of the Small ICBMs. That means the Small ICs are a viable option for our country, and that is a very important decision. However, we must consider the financial constraints that the nation faces. It is important that our country remain strong. However, people are concerned that the Small ICs are not as survivable as the Small ICBMs. In fact, the Small ICs are in the early stages of development and are not yet in production. Therefore, it is important to have a clear understanding of the Small ICs and their potential as a strategic weapon.

To ensure that the Small ICs are effective, it is important to compare the two systems and determine which one is the best option for our country. It is critical to consider the reliability and survivability of the Small ICs. It is also important to consider the financial implications of deploying the Small ICs.

In conclusion, it is important to carefully consider the decision to deploy the Small ICs. It is crucial to ensure that the Small ICs are effective and survivable, and that they are within our financial constraints. It is also important to compare the two systems and determine which one is the best option for our country. Thank you.

COLONEL MALP, Deputy Director, Office of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense

---

**30th Air Force Statement**

The 30th Air Force Statement is a detailed analysis of the Small ICs and their potential as a strategic weapon. It includes information on the development of the Small ICs, their reliability, and their survivability. It also includes information on the financial implications of deploying the Small ICs.

The 30th Air Force Statement is an important resource for decision-makers who are considering the deployment of the Small ICs. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the Small ICs and their potential as a strategic weapon. It is important for decision-makers to carefully consider the information provided in the 30th Air Force Statement before making a decision on the deployment of the Small ICs.

---

**30th Air Force Report**

The 30th Air Force Report is a comprehensive analysis of the Small ICs and their potential as a strategic weapon. It includes information on the development of the Small ICs, their reliability, and their survivability. It also includes information on the financial implications of deploying the Small ICs.

The 30th Air Force Report is an important resource for decision-makers who are considering the deployment of the Small ICs. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the Small ICs and their potential as a strategic weapon. It is important for decision-makers to carefully consider the information provided in the 30th Air Force Report before making a decision on the deployment of the Small ICs.

---

**30th Air Force Briefing**

The 30th Air Force Briefing is a detailed analysis of the Small ICs and their potential as a strategic weapon. It includes information on the development of the Small ICs, their reliability, and their survivability. It also includes information on the financial implications of deploying the Small ICs.

The 30th Air Force Briefing is an important resource for decision-makers who are considering the deployment of the Small ICs. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the Small ICs and their potential as a strategic weapon. It is important for decision-makers to carefully consider the information provided in the 30th Air Force Briefing before making a decision on the deployment of the Small ICs.
My name is Randy Groce and I'm from Conway.
I'd like to say that I have worked in this area --
in the Jacksonville area and even on the Little Rock Air Force
Base, and have spent money in your community, if that matters,
although I don't think that anyone's opinion should be
at a loss due to where they live.
I think it's fair to ask what the environmental
impact of this weapon is if used. How much destruction can
the 10 warheads cause? How many people will be
killed outright by the blast, even if the MX is targeted at Soviet
hardened sites? How much radioactive dust and debris will be
released into the atmosphere, and how many more people will
die from this fallout?
The MX missile will obviously be a target for the
Soviet Missiles. How many people in the Jacksonville area
will die outright if the Soviets attempt a first strike with
the MX still in the garrison and drop two bombs on the Little
Rock Air Force Base? How many more Arkansans would die
horrible, painful deaths from radiation sickness and burns?
The international peace movement is not the lunatic
fringe, as some like to claim. It is not lunacy to oppose the
overreaching probability of accidental nuclear war. It is
not lunacy to work for an end to the arms race when children
die all over the world are starving to death.
Jesus Christ, Mahatma Gandhi, and Martin Luther King
not crazies, but they were not lunatics.
The lunatics are the people who think that the
30,000 nuclear bombs that we have now are not enough. The
lunatics are the people who think we can start a nuclear war
and win. The lunatics are the people who want to spend
billions of dollars on weapons that can never be used.
Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER MCBRANE: Liz Deveau.

ELIZABETH DEVIO
MRS. DEVIO: My name is Elizabeth Deveau. I live
in Little Rock. I am with the Arkansas Center.

I would prefer that my statements be addressed in
the environmental statement to be -- to come out in the future.

Railroad accidents are a fact of life, not only
those at railroad crossings, but accidents involving extremely
flammable materials. One of the worst is LP gas which, if
involved in an accident, can cause what is known as a boiling
liquid expanding vapor explosion, an accident that can
literally level city blocks.

Should an accident of this type occur with one of
the MX trains nearby, could the missile cars withstand the
force of the LP explosion and resulting fire? Could the heat
from such a fire cause the rocket's solid or liquid fuel to
ignite?

What would be the environmental impacts of such a
combined disaster? How could firefighters cope with such a
problem of that magnitude?
Will you place LP gas tankcars or any other type of
railcars carrying hazardous materials on an MX train to make
it look real?
Even though you plan on preventative maintenance of the
garrison's railcars, will that set maintenance be
prepared on the other railcars you may plan on using?
Recent news reports have disclosed that Air Force
pilots have been allowed to use drugs, specifically barbiturates
and second, to help them stay alert on certain flights and
then help them asleep afterwards. Will the garrison train
crews also be allowed to take drugs during the dispalrful runs
since they are of a long duration? During heightened tensions
will you allow the use of these drugs to keep the missile and
train crews alert?
How often will the crews be relieved? How will this
be accomplished when the garrison is dispalred?

HEARING OFFICER MCBRANE: Thank you.
She didn't want an answer, so I will not ask for one.

Art Brennan.

ART BRENNA
MR. BRENNA: Colonel Brennan, I'm Art Brennan. I
live here in Jacksonville. I'm president of the David B.
Terry Chapter of the Air Force Association here in central
Arkansas. We are 1,550 strong. We are definitely behind the
rail garrison.

I'd like to read just a little bit out of the Soviet
Military Power, 1988, An Assessment of the Threat. A clear
picture of the strategic balance does not rest merely on
counting the number of systems each side has. A more
appropriate way of assessing the strategic balance may be
through evaluating compensating responses. Depending on
specific circumstances, one side can compensate for an
opponent's destabilizing offensive deployments with
deployments of its own -- offensive, defensive, or some
combination of the two.

"For example, the Soviets gained the initiative in
the 1970's with their massive and continuing buildup of
nuclear forces, and the US Strategic Modernization Program and
Strategic Defense Initiative are responses to the challenge.
"Accordingly, it is appropriate to address the
program's responses to Soviet initiatives designed to erode
the US nuclear deterrent. This approach provides a more
realistic assessment of the contributions of strategic
modernization toward restoring and maintaining a strategic
balance.

Examples of current and projected US responses
include the following:
"The improved time-urgent, hard-target kill
potential of US missile forces in response to Soviet
advantages by the increased accuracy and penetrating ability
of US air-breathing systems, specifically the B-1B ACPW’s and
ACP’s. These improvements provide redundant backup
capabilities that will ensure an effective retaliatory against
Soviet sólo under any conditions of war initiation or
technological breakthrough.

"The Soviet leadership places significant emphasis
on ICBM’s for achieving their strategic nuclear objectives.

Failure to maintain a credible retaliatory threat against
those systems could undermine the US deterrent and increase
the Soviet leadership’s confidence in being able to achieve
its objectives.

"The Soviets are attempting to ensure a ICBM
survivability by deploying road-mobile SS-25’s and the
rail-based, multi-warhead SS-26.

US plans for compensating responses include
improved sensors and retargeting capabilities to locate and
attach mobile Soviet targets. The B-2 ATB and other systems
under deployment are expected to play a prominent role in
this mission.

"The Soviet SSBN fleet is being enhanced by
deployment of long-range, more accurate SS-N-26 and SS-N-23
SSM’s, as well as more advanced, quieter Delta IV- and
TYPHOON-class submarines. An improved version of the SS-N-20
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is estimated to be under development. The long-range SS-N-23
SSM has also become operational and the Soviets are testing
another new long-range cruise missile, the SS-N-24."

HEARING OFFICER MCMANUS: Time, Mr. Bramen.

MR. BRAMEN: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER MCMANUS: Would you provide that to
the court reporter?

MR. BRAMEN: Sure.

HEARING OFFICER MCMANUS: Ralph Desmarais.

RALPH DESMARAS

MR. DESMARAS: My name is Ralph Desmarais. I’m a
veteran, and I’ve worked at Jacksonville Air Force Base, and
I’ve also worked right here in this school.

First of all, I also have worked and am working --
and it is part of my work to give public hearings. And I’d like
to be on record to object that I’ve never been to a public hearing
conducted so unanimously to prevent citizens from giving their
-- getting their time.

I left last time because I had to sit through an
hour of Air Force BS and then, on top of that, I had to listen
to local politicians holding forth for another three quarters
of an hour. I know of no other agency that would ever get
away with conducting public hearings in such shameful manner.

In addition to that, tonight -- I didn’t know this
was going on last time, but Colonel Walsh is guilty of
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filibustering and I think he should be reprimanded.

(Applause.)

HEARING OFFICER MCMANUS: Mr. Desmarais, your time
is running.

MR. DESMARAS: I’m only going to make two points,
both dealing with this book which I think is woefully
inadequate. I don’t know who does your geology, but you ought
to fire him and get somebody else. He apparently thinks that
the Little Rock Air Force Base sits on a Mississippi
alluvium. It does not. I will leave it to you to find out
where it does sit.

Also, what is woefully neglected in here is any
discussion of groundwater quality or even water quality
in general. There is some mention of it -- there is one
sentence on surface water; nothing that deals with groundwater
in any depth.

As you probably know, the degradation of surface and
groundwater on the Little Rock Air Force Base is one of the
most significant problems in the state. I have just gotten
within the past week the publication of the US Geological
Survey -- USGS wrote it for the Little Rock Air Force Base on
which they designate 18 sites, 18 sites, nine of which I can
tell you right underneath the place where you’re going to
place this proposed missile complex. Now, none of this is in
the Environmental Impact Statement and certainly, I would
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think, it would disqualify Little Rock Air Force Base from
ever being considered because I know of no site where you can
clean up such extravagant environmental damage within the time
period listed within the framework you people propose. I
was surprised you even held a public hearing after
reading that document. I would say that you need to do that -- you need to
study that document put out by USGS and then I would think you
would even eliminate Little Rock Air Force Base from
consideration.

HEARING OFFICER MCMANUS: Time.

As Colonel Walsh indicated, that, of course, must be
addressed since you brought it up, and it will be addressed
in the final report.

TRUSTEE HOLDER

MR. HOLDER: Colonel, I gave your court reporter a
page and a half statement. I’ll just be very brief.

My name is Trustee Holder and Little Rock has been
my home for all of my 75 years. Conservation, especially
wildlife conservation, has been my lifelong profession and my
lifelong enjoyment.

I, too, received a copy of this brief Environmental
Impact Statement and I want to compliment those who prepared
it. It is an excellent statement and proved beyond a shadow
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to put it bluntly, if our nation
But
Thank you.

If our nation goes forward with this missile system
-- and I hope it does -- it would be very, very unfortunate if
Little Rock doesn't get one of these units garrisoned at the
Little Rock Air Force Base. To put it bluntly, if our nation
is going to spend all of that money anywhere anyhow, then let
some of that money be spent here in this area where our people
will get some of the benefits.

It appears that our government, is quite of anything
that the objectors can do, is going to go ahead and deploy
this rail-mounted system. If so, let's try to get a unit of
this system garrisoned at the Little Rock Air Force Base.

Thank you.

MR. BELL: My name is Ruth Bell and I'm representing
the League of Women Voters of Pulaski County and, yes, I do
live in Little Rock.

As one of the other people said, a lot of the water
here is -- the source by pumping. As a matter of fact, the
City of Jacksonville, in their own statement, use six City
wells to supplement the water they buy from Little Rock.
We also have some worries about surface water
pollution in case of accident or sabotage. This is a --
surface water that could be polluted includes Bayou Rare,
which is already pretty polluted, and eventually the Arkansas
River with impact on both the wildlife, and also my life, and
the life of other people in the area.

We do thank you for the opportunity to share our
concerns and we would like to receive a copy of the Final
Impact Statement and notification of any future hearings on
that.

Thank you.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALSH: Yes.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WALSH: Yes. Yes, many of those issues that you have raised
pertain to the impacts of -- various substances, including
diesel and propellants, are included in Chapter 5 of the
document. Starting on page 5-37 it deals with diesel fuel.
But what I would like you to do is review that for its
adequacy and if you would let me know how you consider that,

Department of the Army

In light of the recent request by the Arkansas Department of
Business, Community, and Consumer Services for the
Department of Labor and Employment to conduct a
review of the impact of the proposed rail-mounted
system on the local economy, the Department of Labor and
Employment has initiated a process to review the
impact of the proposed rail-mounted system on the local
economy.

Any questions you may have about this process or
the review of the proposed rail-mounted system on the local
economy should be directed to the Department of Labor and
Employment.

I do want to compliment you all on how this hearing
is being conducted tonight. It is vastly different than it
was in April.

The Army has given us some concerns we'd like to have
you all include or address in the final draft of the
Environmental Impact Statement.

We feel that there is a high probability that we
here in Pulaski County could have an earthquake registering
6.5 on the Richter scale by the year 2000. And we would like
to have the Final Impact Statement address how a possible
earthquake of that magnitude or greater, since we are part of
the New Madrid Fault area, would impact on the missile --
the rail garrison.

We also continue to have deep concerns about air and
water pollution in case of accident or sabotage to the rail
garrison. We'd like the Final Impact Statement to discuss
the probability. We know all there is a high probability to
have an accident, but 'almost' isn't totally impossible.

We'd like to have the Final Impact Statement discuss
probabilities of accidental or enemy-action damage to the rail
garrison and address the types of air and water pollution that
could result from such damage.

We're thinking of things as simple as a massive
diesel fuel spill, for example, that could have considerable
impact on the water aquifer.
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the means in your everyday decisions, the small one and the large one.

And then I would like to ask these questions, and I don't need any answers to them. I would like for them to be in the final draft.

According to the DEIS, "certain personnel who are assigned to nuclear weapons duties... must meet certain "requirements" which include "security clearance, random drug testing, and medical and psychological screening." Will these measures be imposed on the civil dispatchers when the DEIS claims will control the movements of the train?

In a crisis such as that which would trigger deployment of the MB tank, these measures would be taken to compel civil dispatchers to show up for work rather than to stay at their homes with their families?

Table 4.1.1 includes statistics representing the Air Force's claims that this is the case. I want to know if the Air Force's claims for the national impact on employment (direct, indirect, induced) of rail garrisons and employment projections amount to a claim of over 52,000 jobs (man-years) per billion dollar transaction. Such a claim is, to be sure, a claim that is completely outside the range of all reputable studies on this kind of spending (too high by at least 50 to 100 percent).

What indicators and assumptions were used to generate these employment figures?

Another indication that the employment estimates in Table 4.1.1 is in error is the lack of fluctuation in the jobs per billion ratio obtained by dividing the employment by the actual dollars spent.

The table indicates that in Fiscal Year 1999 nearly all the money from the program will go towards research and development, while by Fiscal Year 1997 nearly all rail garrison money will go towards operations. These very different types of spending would not generate similar jobs per billion ratio in a well done economic analysis.

HEARING OFFICER VIEW: Time, Mr. Morton.

MR. MORTON: May I finish this?

[No response.]

MR. MORTON: Again, what indicators and assumptions were used to generate these employment figures?

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER VIEW: Jo Stewart.

JO STEVENS:

MR. STEWART: I am opposed to all nuclear weapons.

I feel sometimes that I'm living in a very nightmarish situation. We live in a world in which thousands of children are dying every year; we have a hole in the ozone layer which is spreading; we have millions of acres of the rainforest being cut down every year; we have an AIDS epidemic that is spreading globally; and we spend -- rather than spend the money to solve these problems: Problems of pollution; problems of health; problems of giving adequate food and medical attention to people around the world, rather than sitting down and talking to one another about our problems, we spend billions of dollars to build weapons which we say we will never use.

We are spending these billions of dollars to support a military/industrial complex which is, as one of my colleagues said earlier, lunacy.

If one of my neighbors came to me and said -- and this is entirely likely that this could happen, "I am in terrible debt. I have 10 credit cards; I owe everybody money," which is similar to what is happening with the United States. We are now a debtor nation. "My kid is sick; my wife doesn't have money to go to the grocery store; I don't have the money to pay my mortgage," would I tell him to go out and buy a gun?

The only reason that I might tell him to is if I were selling guns, and if I might make some money off of that.

I am opposed to this appalling situation that we find ourselves in and I just categorically -- sometimes I just get speechless with the outrageousness of what is happening here.

This country -- when I was a kid, I thought that, you know, we is this country stood for a high morality and it's very sickening to me, in my advancing age, to discover that this is not true.

I would like us to return to being a moral people who will sit down and talk with each other rather than spending billions of dollars on something that we say we're never going to use, first of all, and, secondly, which has such a chance of causing such great damage.

HEARING OFFICER VIEW: Time. Thank you.

Sharon Colgan.

SHARON COGLAN:

MR. COGLAN: My name is Sharon Colgan and I'm from Jacksonville, Arkansas, and I'm opposed to the MX missile.

I hope Mayor Swan is still here because I went to know that there are more of us in Jacksonville who are opposed to this MX missile than they're not real estate agents, they're not car dealers, they don't belong to the Chamber of Commerce, they're not bankers; they work hard for a living.

We work hard roofing, constructing out here at the base, some of them.

They come into my shop every day. Everyone person that walks by my door or the record shop I ask them how they feel about the MX missile. I know two people in this whole town that are for it that walk into my shop.

I've got a list of 35 names of my regular customers that we're fitting to send to Tommy Robinson, who's not here tonight, and these people are opposed, and the other 50
I too have alternatives for protecting this country. They do not, however, include explosives.

I would like these questions addressed, please.

Exactly what is peaceful? What sort of threat will become no longer peaceable?

What is national need? How many miles away will it be before it is a direct threat to us, at home?

I believe we do not have -- excuse me, if we do not have war, it does not mean we have peace. And I do not feel comforted by the MX missile revealing around my state.

I would also like to know what the chances of explosion were for the Titan.

The DIA forecasts that jobs created by the program would go from nearly 4,000 in FY 19 -- Fiscal Year 1989 to nearly 5,000,000 in 1991, and then decline sharply to 3,500 by 1993 and just under 1,000 in 1994 and beyond. This indicates that the MX missile program would have an extreme boom/bust effect on the economy. While, as noted above, the employment figures are highly suspect, this basic boom/bust pattern is likely to be correct. Will such short-term jobs really have any net positive effect on local communities or the nation as a whole?

How extensive will the "off limits" perimeter be?

To protect against nuclear or terrorism, will the Air Force be required to fire on anyone who comes
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HEARING OFFICER MORRIS: Mr. Manning, will the railroad safety director please appear?... in the hearing.

Ernie Spuck, Mr. Manning, you're the railroad safety director...

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?

Mr. Spuck, do you have a comment on the railroad safety director's then negotiations for the railroad for... and the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. And the railroad company will be responsible for the railroad tracks for all railroads in the state. What is their role?
The fact that the United States and Russia have begun reductions in nuclear weapons makes increasing the number and deployment of the MX destabilizing factor, one which destroys the environment which now seems could lead to an even further reduction of nuclear and conventional arms. An environment which makes peace a clear reality is one we all wish to live in as well as leave to future generations.

The United States Catholic Bishops also raise questions on environments such as clear air, clean water, adequate food and medical provisions, suitable housing, to name a few.

These environments are not being developed as sufficiently as possible, both for our own citizens and all of the inhabitants of the world due to the economic distortions resulting from excessive attention to weapon systems. These environments do not consider in this EIS, they deserve priority treatment.

Increasing the scope of the EIS does not weaken it, but enhances its capabilities. In this way members of Congress will receive more comprehensive information on which to base their actions.

Thank you.

[Audem:]

HEARING OFFICER McSHANE: Thank you. A perfect

too high center of gravity, tipping, and weight distribution, flexible and turning radius, and how easy it is to identify on the roads for terrorists or attackers.

Obviously -- I don't even know how you're going to call those things back. You get these things rolling around, how do you even call them back?

But the point is that this car that you're going to start out from the Air Force Base is going to go right down the track, it's going to go right through a site that somebody here in Jacksonville talked about tonight which is called the Vertac site.

There are presently something like 10,000 loading drums of dioxin on that site. This is considered the US Attorney General to be one of the most toxic contaminated sites in the United States. Incidentally, while you're at it, on behalf of the people of Jacksonville I'd like to ask you to clean up the 10,000 barrels of Agent Orange which you've left stored there, which is Air Force responsibility and is threatening the people of Jacksonville. I think you ought to clean up that mess before you start another one.

But, in any case, I would like a serious addressing of the problem of passing this train through the VerTac site in Jacksonville, which is a very serious contamination situation.
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I think this country has a real future. It's a beacon for the world. I'm trying day and night to make it happen. And one is that there has been many questions brought up and asked tonight, and I appreciate your honesty in trying to answer those questions.

But the truth of the matter is, only God knows the answers to a lot of those questions. I know a lot of those were hypothetical questions, but as we all know, there is no perfect plan for peace.

Your answer on the rail system to me told me that there was a good incentive for Russia, or whoever, not to initiate a nuclear attack. I also have agreed enough to know that if there is a nuclear attack, we're not going to send one missile and they're going to send one and that's going to be the end of it.

I imagine if one is to ever start, it's going to be an all-out war and no matter where they're going to end up, nobody is safe, period. I realize that, but that's the cost and the price that we pay to live in the high-tech society that we live in today.

I too as a student of history and, like Mr. Brooks that spoke earlier tonight, I know that if we do not learn from the mistakes of the past, we're going to do nothing but repeat them.

Our country has stood for freedom for the past 200 years, and that this didn't come without a cost or a risk, and that we will not be able to maintain or keep this freedom that we have without costs and with future costs as well.

I have also kept up a lot with the conditions of the world as far as the Communist movement in the past 60 years or so. It's obvious that the Communists have promised that they're going to dominate the world one day and they are certainly trying.

I'm amazed how -- to listen to someone like Ortega talk about what we can have peace down here in Nicaragua if people will only give up their freedom.

But I think this country has been a beacon for many, many centuries -- or two centuries at least for freedom.

That's what we stand for.
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Gary Fletcher.

Mr. Fletcher: My name is Gary Fletcher. I'm City Alderman in Jacksonville.

First off, I want to apologize for being a politician. I'm one because I'm a concerned citizen. That's the reason I got into it.

Many of these people here are friends of mine. We are standing on the same side of some issues, which are environmental issues, as, therefore, no one in this auditorium will doubt or question my concern about the environment.

I don't want to take up my time in talking about the environmental issues on that deal, but I'd like to bring up some points. And one is that there has been many questions brought up and asked tonight, and I appreciate your honesty in trying to answer those questions.

But the truth of the matter is, only God knows the answers to a lot of those questions. I know a lot of those were hypothetical questions, but as we all know, there is no perfect plan for peace.

Your answer on the rail system to me told me that there was a good incentive for Russia, or whoever, not to initiate a nuclear attack. I also have agreed enough to know that if there is a nuclear attack, we're not going to send one missile and they're going to send one and that's going to be the end of it.

I imagine if one is to ever start, it's going to be an all-out war and no matter where they're going to end up, nobody is safe, period. I realize that, but that's the cost and the price that we pay to live in the high-tech society that we live in today.

I too as a student of history and, like Mr. Brooks that spoke earlier tonight, I know that if we do not learn from the mistakes of the past, we're going to do nothing but repeat them.

Our country has stood for freedom for the past 200 years, and that this didn't come without a cost or a risk, and that we will not be able to maintain or keep this freedom that we have without costs and with future costs as well.

I have also kept up a lot with the conditions of the world as far as the Communist movement in the past 60 years or so. It's obvious that the Communists have promised that they're going to dominate the world one day and they are certainly trying.

I'm amazed how -- to listen to someone like Ortega talk about what we can have peace down here in Nicaragua if people will only give up their freedom.

But I think this country has been a beacon for many, many centuries -- or two centuries at least for freedom.

That's what we stand for.
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We talk about peace and anybody can have peace if they're willing to lay down and let somebody dictate how they're going to live their lives and the quality of their lives. But I want my children to have the quality and the freedom that I have.

And I too work for a living. As a matter of fact, I ran for mayor and I recall a phone call that my wife got by a man who said he was going to vote for me because of my handshake. He said I had the hardest hands of anyone he's ever met. So I too am in construction work, and I know what it's like to work, and I can sympathize with many of these people up here.

But the question comes down to -- again people talk about being pacifists. You know, I'm all for that too. I'm upset that we've got people outside prisons protesting the death penalty being carried out on someone who's taken the life of some innocent person when they should be put here -- no one's out here trying to keep the killing of innocent babies at abortion clinics. That bothers me as well, so I too have a concern about the morals of the country.

I also want to tell you that --

Healing Officer McNabb: Time.

Mr. Fletcher: -- I have never spied in the face of

Supervise for a very good reason; he was a lot bigger and sadder than I was.
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HEARING OFFICER NASHE: Thank you. Jeannie Williams.

JEANNIE WILLIAMS: I'm from North Little Rock. I'm a resident of this area. I have many friends all over this area. I am for a very strong defense, I have always been. I support this rail garrison very much.

If we did not have a strong defense, we would have Russian or someone else invading our shores. Where we have strong defense is because they are not going to invade our shores just because we have a strong defense. I've always been in favor of strong defense, and I'm for this rail garrison.

Frankly, as long as this country stays strong we will not have to worry about fighting in this country on our continent because they have had wars, rumors of wars for many -- since the Bible began, since the world started, and there will always be wars and rumors of wars.

But one thing I can say is we are going to have to continue to have a strong defense. And I think that the people that feel the way I do are 100 to 1 of those that are opposed.

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER NASHE: Thank you.

We will conclude the proceedings at this time.

Madeleine D. McClure, Certified Court Reporter, certify that during the public hearing of the foregoing styled cause I was the reporter and took in oral stenography the proceedings of said public hearing, and I have transcribed the same as shown by the above and foregoing 50 pages, and that said transcript is true and correct.

Madeleine D. McClure, Certified Court Reporter
Certificate No. 178

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
I recognize that some people may wish to make
statements on defense policy, nuclear weapons, arm cont -
and fiscal policy at this meeting. However, such comments
are best directed to your congressmen and senators. Please
limit your comments to environmental issues. Please refrain
from public demonstrations, either for or against statements
made, since this merely obstructs the time available for
others to make statements or ask questions. Remember that
each person should be given a respectful hearing, even if his
or her views differ from your own.

Let's take about a ten-minute recess now. If you
could be back here about three, four minutes after eight,
we'll start up again.

Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.

Colonel McSkame: First thing I'd like to start out
with is to have Colonel Walsh introduce the other members
of the panel.

Lt. Colonel Walsh: On my immediate right is Major
Van Ness. He is a lawyer for the Air Force, and he's
assigned to the Air Force Regional Civil Engineering, and he
will respond to questions on legal matters and safety.

On my far right is Colonel Branch. He is assigned
to Headquarters Air Command, and he will respond to questions
on the operational consent.

On my immediate left is Mr. Richman. He works for
JOHN PHILLIPS: Thank you, Colonel. For the record, I'm Representative John Phillips, Montana House of Representatives, House District 35 here in Great Falls. My district encompasses Malstrom Air Base and the adjoining area south and east of town.

I don't think it's real popular for politicians to get in these emotional issues sometimes, but I read the ad in the paper today, and it kind of made me want to say something, and I think with all due respect to the Committees of the `80s in their ad, I'd like to address a couple of their concerns.

I don't know how many folks read the ad, but it was talking about the environmental impact noting that we're having here tonight. The first question was, it says, "How do you feel about nuclear weapons being flown in and out of Malstrom on a regular basis?" Well, I don't think it's any big secret that Malstrom Air Base has been on the map since October of 1962 when John F. Kennedy made his famous statement about the ace in the hole, so what has been being housed in and out of Malstrom Air Base with 200 missiles being out here, well, the 200 come on line with the passage of four in 1966. So it's been many years. So that to me doesn't seem like we're changing much.

The next question says, "Do you like the idea of eight to twelve MX missiles on alert 24 hours a day right here in Great Falls?" I don't know, and what I heard your plan for the MX rail Garrison, sure, I guess I suppose they stay on alert, but I think within a 20-mile radius here, if you want to look out at Vaughn at Idaho 10 or Idaho 11 over here with the buffalo jump, or Alpha 9 up here on the hill at Stockett, we've had missiles out here for years, right here. So that isn't something that really to me is an exciting thing.

"Will the Air Force pay for the extra demands placed on our schools in Great Falls, our street or county services?"

COLONEL McSHANE: Time's up.

JOHN PHILLIPS: Oh, are we finished?

COLONEL McSHANE: Yes, sir.

JOHN PHILLIPS: I'm sorry, I had three more questions. I mean three more answers. I had them all together, but I appreciate, Colonel, I know you've got to do this. I'd just like to say that I think that the issue here shouldn't be whether we have nuclear weapons or not, that is left up to the people in Washington. It's what it's for North Central Montana or Great Falls, what is the impact here? Thank you.

COLONEL McSHANE: Thank you, you may, of course, add written comments to be considered.

JOHN PHILLIPS: Thank you.
COLONEL McSHANE: Next will be Doug Williamson.

DOUG WILLIAMSON: Good evening. I'm Doug Williamson. I'm with the Committee of the '80s. My question to you, maybe not so much question to you, but I'd like to make just a brief statement to our audience here, to our gathering, and that if I may --

COLONEL McSHANE: The microphone is set up so that the sound will carry to them if you speak right into it.

DOUG WILLIAMSON: Okay. First of all, this system is not intended to be a first strike system. President Reagan stated that on May 11 of 1983. However, if we consider the system, the very presence of this, in my belief, and maybe some others, constitutes a very real threat to the Soviets, that being that at present in 1985, we could have destroyed about one-third of all their nuclear weapons. In 1995, with installation of the MX Rail Garrison System, in addition to the other system we already have in place, would allow us to destroy approximately 90 percent of their systems.

It seems that this is by its presence threatening to our Soviet counterpart, or Soviet people, in which case if we were to send the Ball Garrison System out, it could be misinterpreted as a threat which could initiate a first strike scenario from the Soviets.

Also, there's a question. do we really need the MX...
breakthrough would occur, we’ll be extremely vulnerable, so we don’t wish to put all our resources into one ocean of the triad.

We do not have airborne bomber forces. They are sitting on alert, and they’re ready for dispersal should the President so determine. And the costs for this program are not 30 to 40 billion, but 10 to 15 billion dollars in 1986 dollars.

I should also point out to you that on a day-to-day basis, the Soviet Union does not have sufficient forces deployed that it could successfully, or could launch an attack upon the United States and successfully attack the entire triad from their current posture. They would be attacking knowing that certain elements of our triad would survive and be able to retaliate and do unacceptable damage to the Soviet Union. We do not believe any Soviet leader would ever initiate such an attack knowing what the consequences might be.

If he were to start increasing the deployment of his forces so that he could launch a credible attack on the triad, we have a high confidence liability to observe such movements. For instance he kept most of his submarine force in port, so suddenly we would see his post force moved out to sea. That would be a clear signal to us that we should take some counter measures, and some of our counter measures would

be dispersal of the bomber force or the dispersal of the train.

So that the dispersal of the train would be in response to an initial attack by the Soviet Union, and should not be seen as an initial threat to him but should be seen as a responsive action to an offensive move made by the Soviet Union.

Thank you very much, sir.

MR. DOUG WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

COLONEL BRANCH: I need to respond to two aspects of your question, if I may. One, do we know the routes upon which we’re going to set these trains and do the Soviets know that, and the answer is yes, that’s at least 120,000 miles of track in the United States, and we hope the Soviets know that because it constitutes the credible deterrent system that is. In other words, the system is potentially deployable over the entire continental United States rail network, which is at least 120,000 miles of good credible track.

Secondly, I’d like to dispel the notion that by deploying the train somehow creates a deplorable situation. In fact, deploying the trains only puts these trains in a more defensive posture, because in fact the missiles, we have not added any missiles, we have added only warheads to our nuclear readiness. We simply are dispersing these trains so that if the Soviets tried to attack us in a first attack, we would have some residual capable weapons, and that should be seen as a stabilizing rather than a provocative fact.

Thank you.

DOUG WILLIAMSON: Okay, just one other thing. You say credible track. Credible as in believable, we believe it’s there, but is it verifiable and operable?

COLONEL BRANCH: Yes, what we’ve done is we’ve worked through the Federal Railroad Administration and the Association of American Railroads and we’ve commissioned a study for them to tell us what kind of track is suitable for the weight and class of train. The track typically today operates very heavy long haul freight trains over day-to-day, and that study indicates that those are typically 170,000 miles, but at least 120,000 linear miles of those track are totally suitable for the kind of missiles that the rail industry calls it, the makeup of this train that we wish to operate, that’s a railroad figure.

DOUG WILLIAMSON: Okay, and also 1986, I don’t know if the figures for 1987, but 1986 saw almost no accident involving chemical or contaminants on our rail systems.

That’s one a day, which means if our, if the system was dispersed one day, that doesn’t mean that it couldn’t happen on that one day. Are we ready for that?

LT. COLONEL WALTER: What is that a rhetorical
question, of would you like us to --

DOUG WILLIAMSON: Yes, that's a rhetorical question, we'll just leave it at that. Thank you.

COLONEL MCNABE: Thank you. Tim Ryan, please.

TIM RYAN: Colonel McNab, members of the committee. My name is Tim Ryan. I'm chairman of the Committee of the '08s. Our position is and always has been that we leave the decisions as to the defense of our country to the policymakers in Washington, D.C., the Department of Defense and the elected officials of this country. We also support those decisions and stand ready to implement them in our community in any way that we can.

We feel strongly that the price of peace is constant vigilance, and we stand as a free nation here this evening, able to discuss this, because we've been able, we've been willing to pay the price in the past, and we believe we're still willing to pay the price tonight.

Thank you.

COLONEL McNABE: Thank you. Sister Pat, Funderas, is that close? Sister Pat?

SISTER PAT FUNDARIDE: I'll pass.

COLONEL McNABE: You pass?

SISTER PAT FUNDARIDE: Yes.

COLONEL McNABE: All right, thank you. Paul Stephens?

PAUL STEPHENS: Colonel McNab, first of all, is this just a question, will I have another chance to make a statement, or is this everything?

PAUL STEPHENS: Okay, my name is Paul Stephens, and I'm speaking as a member of the Committee of the '08s, the national organization whose goal is to create a healthy nonmilitaristic economy through a broad military awareness of the M1 and how they impact the local economy.

In the middle of the drought, a regional economic depression and a national economic situation characterized by massive deficits, a shortage of investment capital, a gigantic trade deficit and shortage of government funds for social programs, education, high tech research and development, medical gear and other vital needs, we find it hard to believe that the Air Force and various military contractors would ask the American people and the Congress that represents us to spend tens of billions of dollars on a new land-based strategic missile system. All expert testimony indicates that there is no need for this system, the Midgetman or anything like it.

We are presently in the midst of a serious arms negotiations process with the other nuclear powers, and there's every indication that we all have a common interest in dismantling our nuclear weapons completely. Yes, this is

Let's go on to a question here. The proper production of nuclear weapons hidden within the civilian budget of the Energy Department is probably the most environmentally harmful, destructive and costly environmental impact. Right now, it is estimated that merely to clean up and dispose of all the nuclear waste at Savannah River and other nuclear waste sites will cost in excess of a hundred billion dollars. Decommissioning and disposing of all the civilian knowledge associated with nuclear power will cost hundreds of billions more.

Why does the EIS not include an analysis of these costs and how they will be paid? This is one of the fundamental issues surrounding the development of and deployment of nuclear weapons, yet the government continually stalls and puts off giving us any answers to these questions. Can you give us one here tonight?

LT. COLONEL MALONE: I will ask Major Van Ness to respond to that question.

MAJOR VAN NESS: If the appropriate, or the nature of your question is why we have not discussed the environmental factors associated with the commission, the answer is essentially what we carry in the document itself, and that is simply that it's difficult at this time to project what legal regime we'll be under say 10, 15, 20 years from now, at the point we might be asked to consider

an environmental impact hearing and we are supposed to address the environmental impacts of this proposed deployment. The intent of the act which requires this hearing is to protect the environment. In our view, there is no single greater threat to the environment than nuclear weapons, their production, deployment and possible utilization.

It is futile and illogical for the Air Force to claim that these weapons are being deployed and maintained so that they will never be used. If they will never be used, why deploy them in the first place? It is clear to us here in Great Falls that it is economic interest, defense contractors and local business people who favor this deployment. Out of all the counties in Montana, only one will realize any short-term net economic benefit.

These missiles aren't built with free money. Every dollar allocated to their production and maintenance must be taken away from some other use. Since most of this defense build-up is believed to have been financed by deficits, it is the capital market and investments in American business which have suffered the most. Our lack of competitiveness, the expense of millions of jobs, and our continuing massive budget deficits in international trade all have a significant impact on our economy.

Having spent over a trillion dollars on weapons acquisition over the past eight years.
Paul Stephens: That isn't quite the question I have. I want to know what, first of all it's the nuclear weapons I'm most concerned with. I actually decommissioning the weapon system at a future date is a minor expense. I'm talking about the 100 billion dollars projected to clean up Hanford and Savannah River and those other nuclear weapons plants, Rocky Flats, Amarillo, these other places. We're looking at a bill there of at least 100 billion dollars or more. Yet when it comes to those associated costs with building nuclear weapons, I realize this isn't even the Air Force's baby; this is the Department of Energy. All the nuclear weapons are produced under the mantle of the Department of Energy, so they're not even probably listed as a military expenditure as far as I know, but that's the real problem I'm concerned about here.

Paul Stephens: It seems to me that the Air Force or the military, the Defense Department in particular, should have the responsibility for like cleaning up Hanford, and a little bit more I want to say here. The Air Force would be doing a major public service by drawing up plans to clean up and dispose of all the nuclear waste which now nuclear weapons systems have produced. Spend the 20 to 30 billion dollars earmarked for NE and Midgetman systems in this effort, and then come back and ask for more, because they would probably need more than that. Whenever this is cleaned up, look at the international situation. If we are being threatened by...
find ourselves caught in the middle of an argument not of our own choosing. Some in Congress would have us welcome the deployment of the Midgetman nuclear system. Others in Congress and the Defense Department would have us host the nuclear MX rail gunnison. A handful of extremists would saddle us with both, an instead of being a regional trade center that happens to have a base nearby, we are on the threshold of becoming a garrison town, a nuclear city. We are on the threshold of a boom and bust economy.

The assumptions of Congress and the Air Force are arrogant at best, absurd at worst. Assumption Number 1 is that we need more nuclear weapons. This assumption falls flat on two counts. First, is that both the U.S. and the Soviets have run out of viable targets, making both of these systems redundant. Count Number 2, we don’t even know how to safely store the current wastes of current and past bomb production, just alone add to that pile. Witness the leakage at Sandford Reservation and from our eight in Washington state and the Air Force cannot separate its responsibility from those wastes.

Assumption Number 2 is that our rural folks are more expendable than urban folks. This assumption has been operative 30 years. We get the crumb and associated hazards and dangers of deployment, while our urban cousins get the plume of research, design and construction. If these death tolls are so benifcent, place them where they’re built, or place them in Washington D.C. itself.

Assumption Number 3, both Congress and the Air Force assume that we can afford more nuclear systems. Even without cost overruns and procurement fraud, we cannot afford to build more nuclear bombs while our very infrastructure falls apart before our eyes. In view of budget deficiency and the serious area limitation negotiations, it’s time for us to say enough is enough.

In conclusion, let me quote President Eisenhower.

“This world in area is not spending money alone.

“It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children. This is not a way of life at all in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron.”

Thank you.

COLONEL MCBRIDE: Thank you, Gordon White.

GORDON WHITE: Colonel McBride, members of the panel, my name is Gordon White. I’m a resident of Great Falls, speaking for myself.

When I read the draft environmental statement, I find not an objective analysis of impacts, but an elaborate and expensive rationalization of decisions already made. And I wonder if you are listening to the people of this country.

I wonder why only one hearing is being held in Montana.

19) affordable housing. It’s important to remember that the impacts and risks will also be multiplied potentially eleven times for each of the garrison communities. My belief is that we cannot abdicate our responsibility to someone in Washington. But the time has come to quit wasting money on unsafe, unstable, destabilizing new weapons systems. Our real security and well-being will be better served by a strong, private sector economy. We must learn to turn our capital and our creativity toward productive uses, and turn our hearts toward living.

Thank you.

COLONEL MCBRIDE: Thank you, Jim Cummings.

JIM CUMMINGS: I’m Jim Cummings and I am a resident of Great Falls. I’ve lived in this area during the nuclear arms race period, with the Minuteman program, and I’ve seen the benefit to the local community work for us in the community well-being. The proposed Air Force program can and would address the significant impacts to the communities and to the environment, and if the implementation of this program is in the best interests of the country and our well-being, it would be implemented. I believe an upgraded missile program would assist the U.S. continue to deter, and maintain our current peaceful status.

Thank you.

COLONEL MCBRIDE: Thank you, Mr. Matteucci!
COLONEL MATHESON: I meant to say that my name also is GORDON MATHESON. And I live here in Great Falls. As we try to understand the word freedom, it's meaning that the word has the word "free" in it. I don't think freedom in any sense of the word has ever been free. It does cost something. It costs money. It costs manpower. It costs a lot of things to remain free. As we live in our democracy, we're certainly.

I'm a little time. I've been. I've been busy with harvest. I've glanced through a little bit and I think it leaves a lot of questions kind of having with addictions that don't really define. I think, maybe what he meant to say. I would like to ask another question. When there was an acquisition of land for the purpose of building the missiles, landowners were paid fair market value. Yet that land was taken forever out of production, forever removed from that person's livelihood and converted to a different use, and in my opinion, when you convert land to another use, fair market value for agricultural or other use should not be what prevails, but the use to which you're getting it. And I think consideration should be given to the time period that you're taking that land out of production and sit the tax rolls and so forth. So I wondered what you mean by fair market value.

LT. COLONEL WALSH: I'll ask Major Van Ness to respond to that question, please.

MAJOR VAN NESS: Well, the process we go through when we need to acquire land, whether it be in fee simple, meaning the entire ownership, or whether it be an easement to be imposed to affect our safety clear zone, is that we, either through the Air Force itself or through our acquisition agent, the Army Corps of Engineers, contract with appraisers in the community, typically members of the appraisal institute who are familiar with local realty conditions, and we ask them to calculate for us fair market value, just as you would in any other sort of land transaction, what a willing buyer would pay a willing seller for the property. And that's what we offer you, that is our first offer to you, because we are required by law to offer you the full value that the appraiser determines that interest is worth.

I might also point out that most of the real estate that is necessary for this program here at Malvin Air Force Base is in the nature of a quantitative safety zone, that is simply an easement. The imposition of the easement on that property does not prohibit its use typically for the activity that it's presently being used for. It would permit continued agricultural use. It's principally -- the safety zone is primarily designed to prohibit the building of homes for human occupation or large gatherings of people.

GORDON MATHESON: I recognize that, but if you're going to convert it to housing, then it ought to be appraised.

MAJOR VAN NESS: That is a fee piece that was being appraised for housing. Yes, sir.
GORDON MATHERSON: Okay, at any rate, I'm concerned with some of the other issues that have been raised here. I'm not going to go into those, but safety, in the case that we dismantle these things, I think is of real concern, and I don't think the Air Force was passing the buck on that issue. I think they really should be doing something about the nuclear wastes that are up wind from us. But I am not going to leave those issues to the elected officials or appointed officials, either. I make my wishes known to our delegation and to our other officials, so that's my stand on that.

Thank you.

COLONEL RICKEAN: Thank you. Sheila Maybanks, please?

SHEILA MAYBANKS: I'm Sheila Maybanks. I live in Great Falls. I'm here as a representative of the League of Women Voters, and I would like to put it on the record again that the League of Women Voters of America does not support the M5 in any busing mode. They don't support modernization of the land, because it both increases the vulnerability and it's destabilizing.

Aside from that, at the hearing this spring, several people brought up the problem of possible sabotage of rail lines, and although I looked at the M5, I didn't see that addressed. And it seems to me that, you know, maybe it's safe for transit, and once the train has got integrated into the system, it would be very difficult for the potential saboteur to know precisely where the train is and sabotage that line. We feel that even if he were successful in one train, that the other trains would be able to be unzached. So we do not feel that that is a potential problem. There is a security force on the train that is to prevent any unauthorized access to the weapon system. However, the measures that they use and the size of force is, for obvious reasons, classified, so I will not go into any further detail on that.

Does that answer your question, Ma'am?

SHEILA MAYBANKS: Well, kind of, maybe sabotage is the wrong word, maybe vandalism or destruction. I mean, there's foreign powers that could do that and there's also crazy people. Again, did you all read the papers this week? You know, I think that points out how very fragile this mode of transportation can be, you know. Anyway, I don't think that was adequately addressed in the M5. Thank you.

COLONEL RICKEAN: Thank you. Tom Boland?

TOM BOLAND: I have read this EIS, and I'd like to have a couple of questions answered if I may, the first one by Mr. Hickman of the panel table.

Mr. Hickman, I understand from reading the back of this book that you are one of the principal authors in this.ep.

you'll say that that's classified or something. I don't know. But if it's not guarded, if there aren't some kind of security measures along train tracks, all 120,000 miles of it, it's going to be very vulnerable, it's a rather fragile system, and if it is guarded I think that has a lot of implications for the quality of life, not just for us but all over the country. Wherever this might go, in terms of civil liberties, access to property, freedom to go places, you know, and I don't know that -- like could you speak to that?

LT. COLONEL WALKER: Yes, Ma'am. We feel that there is a very low probability of sabotage to the system, and the reason we feel that is because it would be unambigious warning to us of some ill intent on the behalf of a foreign country, and it would allow us to take the appropriate action to alert our strategic forces, and that would be exactly the opposite of what any potential enemy would want to give us some strategic warning. So we feel that there is very low probability of such an attempt.

Further, it should be emphasized that the train can launch the missiles can be launched from the train itself so it sits within the garrison. So even though the tracks could be sabotaged immediately outside the gate, the train could still fulfill its mission.

Further, we will of course be able to physically review the track immediately outside the base to insure that...
preparing the entire document. That is leading to the final
EIS, that would be in the neighborhood of between 7 and 8
million dollars.

TOM BOLAND: The reason I ask is this, if anyone
would carefully pursue, or quickly pursue the list of
preparers and see the number of Ph.D.'s and MBA's, MA's, MB's
and so on that are purportedly employees of Tetra Tech, Inc.,
it literally spans not only the United States, but reaches
into Canada and so on, and I'm wondering if someone could
very quickly, using their time, not mine, tell me a little
bit about Tetra Tech, Inc., because it's frankly a
concern I've never heard of.

LT. COLONEL WALSH: I will explain the process.
you, sir. Three years ago, a contract expired where we had
hired a company to work on the Peacekeeper Minuteman sites
project. We, the Air Force put out a request for proposals
nationwide for the major, or any, for that matter.
Environmental corporations in the country. We had over a
hundred corporations express interest in competing for the
program. Of that number, some of them consolidated their
proposals, some went into subcontracts to some proposals, but
nevertheless we had some of the most capable environmental
contractors in the country compete for this program, with
representatives from, well, from the, from all over;
representing the East Coast, the West Coast and some of the

draft was prepared.
I put my name on the list and asked for a draft to
be sent to my home, and I read it from time to time when I
had the chance. I do not find a single comment or question
responded to or considered if in this draft based upon the three
or more hour's participation from both sides of the issue
during this Great Falls hearing. And from my personal
perspective, I think this draft EIS is an insult to the
political and the public process in this country, because it
simply does not purport to be what we were promised by it.

Colonel Walsh it would be.

And when Lt. Colonel Walsh tells us again tonight
that our comments will be carefully considered and that we
should write our comments and postmark them by such and such
a date so that they can be carefully considered, with all due
respect to Colonel Walsh, I don't believe it.

LT. COLONEL WALSH: May I respond, please?
Lt. Colonel McRae: Go ahead, Colonel.

LT. COLONEL WALSH: Sir, there is a distinction
between a scoping meeting and a public hearing. We took the
inputs that were provided to us at all eleven locations, and
we carefully considered them, and some of those were
incorporated into the document, some of those were not
considered appropriate, and some of those would not offer a
big enough or large enough impact to warrant a discussion in

this document. I should point out to you that we're
discussing the impacts at eleven bases, and to discuss every
detail of the deployment at each location would require
probably eleven volumes, the size of the one you received.

That defeats the purpose of an EIS. So in the interest of
making a usable document, we had to make some concessions to
being concise, precise and making a usable document to the
decision maker. And that's what you see in front of you.

Now, we come before you tonight to get your
comments on the adequacy of that document. This is a public
hearing as opposed to a scoping meeting. We have a legal
responsibility to provide a verbatim transcript of what
happens here tonight and a legal responsibility in the final
EIS to respond to every issue that you raise here as an
example of the document's inadequacy, and we have to explain
to you why we did not incorporate your comments in the final
document, or identify where we made the appropriate changes
in the document in response to your input. That is the
difference between a scoping meeting and a public hearing.

Thank you very much, sir.

Lt. Colonel McRae: Allan Rahn.

ALLAN RAHN: My name is Allan Rahn. I live at 707

Tenth Street North in Great Falls, Montana. Unfortunately I
was unable to read the impact statement in my environmental
study. As Colonel up there observed, it was turned around
backwards, and I'm a little bit confused.

I do have several problems with what I have seen.

One, as the gentleman explained very eloquently, is I did not see in what I was able to read some of my concerns that I did express at that meeting. And those do concern me. What I was able to read, I have questions about the validity of the statistics that are used.

I do know of just the other day a train derailed because of bad track on a major rail track that dumped an Amtrak train, as a matter of fact, all on its side. I've noticed that the statistics sit down and say there's one in a thousand and so many people died. There was an accident just the other day, just recently, of one of the missiles blew up in Utah, and already more people died than what it is in the statistics.

I sit down -- I believe the statement was made that 14 million dollars in income from the Air Force was added to the community. I sat down and roughly figured up the housing requirements, not for what is added, and the Air Force is in direct competition with local business. It has taken 5.91 million of that out of the local economy. Is this -- my question comes down, if this is so, do the statistics come off how much is paid out or how much actually gets out into the community?

COLONEL WALSH: Did you want an answer to that.

COLONEL WALSH: Well, first of all, I would like to reassure you that there is no possibility of a nuclear detonation. These needs to be a very logical sequence of events that would occur to activate the warhead, and these events cannot occur until the weapons system has reached ballistic velocities, and only then on the trajectory. It is impossible in the day-to-day activities of all personnel movements for such activation to occur. So the nuclear detonation is not a possibility.

Now, we do acknowledge within the document the possibility, however remote, of an explosion of the propellant, a propellant fire, or an explosion. We feel that this is very remote, but on the other hand we do acknowledge that we could create a scenario where an explosion could occur. For that reason, we have established a safety zone around where it would be stored probably about 99.9 percent of the time. Now, just like you do not have an explosive danger zone or protective zones around the railroad for the movement of poisonous gases or other hazardous materials moved by the rail, and the reason they don't have that is because the exposure of the public is very, very tiny. But for the same reason, we would not have a safety zone around the rail for the movement of the Peacekeeper rail Garrison, and in fact the threat or the potential danger posed by the Peacekeeper missile in movement is much less than that posed by merely the hazardous materials that are on the tracks today.

Thank you, sir.

ALLAN HAWK: This goes back, this goes back to statistics again. The greatest majority of accidents that I've seen and read in newspapers have all involved urban areas, thousands of people have had to be evacuated. I look at the statistics that were given to us tonight, and unfortunately I couldn't read them because, like I say, my book is a little piled up, those statistics say if you took the entire rail area and sat down and said, okay, we'll divide this and that, those statistics would hold true. But one statistic happens in Great Falls or in the immediate vicinity, not in the Peacekeeper garrison, say there was an
of the accident outside of there, and they were transported, then it affects a much larger area and a great number of people would be in danger. A lot of accidents happen in transfer yards where they're changing trains, so a lot of them seem to be happening not out on the open rail. That's where I'm concerned.

LT. COLONEL MAHAN: You're correct, sir. In our analysis, however, we took the worst case and we did not take any credit for not using any portion of the rail. However, it would be very unlikely that we would be, would have the Peacemaker rail garrison in a transfer yard being subjected to something where most of the accidents do occur. But we took the worst case in our scenario, in our analysis, and did not take credit for that.

ALLAN HAIM: Okay, thank you. COLUMBIA MCINNIS: Thank you. Harvey Lowthian, I'm Harvey Lowthian, a resident of Great Falls, taxpayer of Cascade County, Montana, the United States. I've got one question; if I may. Can you tell us what the average speed of an operational train would be in the system?

LT. COLONEL WALSH: Colonel Branch, would you answer that, please?

COLONEL BRANCH: Yes, sir, we anticipate that the train will be capable of 55 to perhaps 60 miles an hour, but


document, it comes right down to it, is the reliability of the X makes it, makes it right down to it, is the reliability of the X makes it a Great Falls native and resident. I am ideologically opposed to nuclear weapon technology. It ought to be enough that surveys indicate that people in this nation oppose nuclear proliferation, but it is as though the military is setting us to justify saving ourselves as Montanans or citizens of a great nation or members of the human race. But the basic dignity and divinity of the human spirit is not reason enough to stop the X. You want specific, not moral issues. And with this incredibly flawed weapons system, enough details come to mind to defeat the X on its own distinctive lack of merits.

Second, reliability. How can the Air Force assess the reliability of the X if no planned testing on the rail?
And by the way, I'd like you to answer the questions in the Environmental Impact Statement to give us fellow citizens more time to present their questions. Thank you.

MAHER: Thank you, Bill Parker. My name is Bill Parker. I'm a resident of Great Falls, and among other things I'm a member of the Committee of the 80s, and as such, I support the position of the Committee of the 80s as already stated by Tim Ryan and a few others, and that is basically that as members of a representative democracy, we elect people who are responsible for gathering information far beyond that available to most of us mere citizens, and as such, I think it's incumbent upon us to support the decisions those people make. If we're uncomfortable with the decision of our representatives, then it is further incumbent upon us to do something about it and elect somebody else.

That being said, I can't argue a whole lot with what some of the Committee of the 80's members have said.

This country and the Soviet Union have been fighting a cold war for many years, and I'm coming to the conclusion that the cold war probably ended some years ago, and neither one of us realizes it yet. We both about broke ourselves trying to support the build up of weapons systems over the years. The Soviet economy is an absolute disaster, and it seems to me that we're trying to support the build up of systems that are not going to be used.

Now, granted, we cannot unilaterally try to disarm, either, because unless they do it, we can't do it. The answer is simply not that simple, it's a very complex issue.

But I do have one little general question. One of the things that, or a couple of things that you mentioned had to do with the things in Great Falls that were, that would be environmentally, or the true environmental impacts: That was the transportation issues and the jail issues. Other communities, and I can't remember all of them, but some of the communities did have other things that were detrimental to them. But even the packing orders of bases is lined out, and for instance Dyess, which I recall from the slide, didn't have anything, no major impacts against it, but if Dyess came lower on the list than Mainstrom does when the priority list is laid out, is there any federal funds available somewhere to help defray the cost of these for Great Falls or

any other communities that may need support for that matter?

LT. COLONEL WALSH: What we have done -- I guess the best answer to your question, sir, is to give you an example of what we've done in the past as a clear indication of how we wish to work with the communities to resolve any impacts that we're imposing upon the community. In the case of Wyoming, where we deployed the Peacemaker and Minuteman alone, we worked very closely with that community, with the local officials, with the state officials, first of all to help identify what the impacts were and to pick the appropriate mitigations and to help implement those mitigations. We helped them in the planning, we helped them to collect, we actually went to Congress and got money so they could build a new elementary school to accommodate the children associated with the large immigration into the area. We also got money from the Congress to help them upgrade their water collection system; their water system of wells that needed to be upgraded to insure a reliable source of water during the peak construction period. We also worked with them to insure maximum participation or maximum opportunity of local companies to compete for the contracts that were being provided, and we were very successful there, with both a third of the prime contracts and very large part of the subcontracting going to Wyoming companies. We also worked with them to insure that any other company that would be doing business in the area would actually get a license to operate in Wyoming, and so therefore add further to the tax revenue base.

So there was various ways in which we worked with that community to alleviate impacts, and we also followed up with a monitoring program to identify how successful we were.

And I think the conclusions of that community were that it was very successful, that the impacts actually were much less than we predicted, and the community actually benefited from this program.

And they were, they are so enthused about it that one of the things -- the way we did business last time, that one of the things I have to do tomorrow afternoon is sit down with the community leaders again to discuss how we're going to implement similar measures this time around. So I think that is the best approach of how the Air Force can work with the community to resolve these problems.

BILL PARKER: Thank you.

MAHER: Thank you, Alyne Reichert.

ALYNE REICHERT: Gentlemen, the panel, I'm sorry there are no women on the panel, but nevertheless I'm Alyne Reichert, a former legislator, Constitutional Convention delegate. When I told a visiting relative from out of state that we were having this HE hearing, he said, 'Why bother?"
Be said, "Our congressional leaders will never go far in it."
And I've talked to many along the beltway, and they
seem to think this is a waste of time, too, but
nevertheless since we're being confronted with this 7 or 8
million dollar environmental statement, I think we have to
take it seriously, and Great Falls is our environment that
would be impacted.

So I have two specific questions. One, in the
south site option, the air strip itself is located within the
explosive safety zone. Is this wise planning? Would you
like to address that, please?

LT. COLONEL WALKER: In developing the explosive
safety zones, there were different criteria for different
classes of operations. And there's an inhabited building
zone, which is the one I referred to today, but there are
other intermagazine zones.

For instance, there might be an intermagazine zone
to separate one facility from another that might have
explosives in it so that you could have a sympathetic
detonation. You have intermagazine zones, where you would
separate facilities where you might have people working in
support of the program. And then you have a zone for public
transportation routes, and that would include highways, major
highways, utility lines that were providing prime source of
power to a particular area. And we have honored the public
the obligation to the responsibilities that all of you
gentlemen have. I'm sure you're doing the best within your
official capacities.

However, after spending 35 years in the military
service and working with the fallacy of the ascension of
military programs and the counter programs by the Soviets,
the absurdity of the situation becomes recognisable.

I would like to read into the record a book by
Professor Kenneth Ross Toole; the name of the book is the
History of the Great Plains.

COLONEL McKEE: Can you spell that name.
please, for the reporter?

ROCCO CANON: Kenneth Ross, K-O-R-E-S, Toole.

To-zil-e, recent Professor of History, Western History at
University of Montana.

COLONEL McKEE: Thank you.

ROCCO CANON: This book has an indirect bearing on
the situation, in that he documents the fallacy of the
American system in regards to the responsibility to our
total environment.

The human fallacy of not looking beyond our noses
is very, very highly documented. Especially inability of
human beings to match their own resources, let alone their
own technology. To go a little bit further, I'm a
representative of the United Methodist Church, and the recent
transportation route quantity distance for the sitting to
Great Falls Air Force Base. That was the appropriate distance
to use for that particular facility.

ANNIE REICHERT: Appropriate, thank you. My
second question, Montana Power has inadequate lines to
Great Falls Air Force Base to handle the extra load by NE Rail
Garrison. Will the internal power system be adequate for the
NE Rail Garrison NEZ?

LT. COLONEL WALKER: I will ask Mr. Nickel to respond to that question.

MR. NICKEL: We have been in contact with Montana
Power, and currently they have told us that the additional
energy requirement would not put an undue load on the current
delivery system. If in the future some change would occur,
additional lines may be required.

ANNIE REICHERT: I hope that Montana Power is more
correct in its evaluation than I was with the Colstrip
project. I happened to be in the legislature when Colstrip 4
passed, and they were a little wrong in their assessment of
that power supply. Thank you.

COLONEL McKEE: Thank you. Roscoe Canon.

ROCCO CANON: I know this is getting to be a long
drawn out process, so I'll keep my comments very minimal.
I'm a retired Master Sergeant, Air Force, having
worked in civil engineering for some ten years, and I respect
the state conference has come out diametrically opposed to any
military improvements in the system, and I'm sure when the
National Conference comes up that that will be
unanimously voted on through the National Church.

Everybody else has spoken to the issues very
nicely, and I would like to close with one single comment.
As responsible American citizens, I'd like to see an old
English expression, it is incumbent upon all of us Americans
to be honest, loyal, opposed to anything we feel is
inadequate, unnecessary. Especially in regards to our Soviet
relations improving now and being a military man, I know how
obvious that is, and I know we have to be prepared and aware,
but I hope we can find a middle ground for the utilization of
this money for civilian purposes instead of military
purposes.

I am also a member of the Sharing Committee of the
90's, and we are aiming at creating a large organization to
change our intrasociety from a military economy of some 50
years duration to one of civilian economy and creativity.

Thank you, gentlemen.

COLONEL McKEE: Thank you. Will Crough?

WILL CROUGH: My name is Will Crough, I'm a
husband, father and builder here in Great Falls.

I think the panel has sided the people. You talk
about national need, the trains will only go out on the rails
3-150
In national need, in times of national need, but national need changes. Back in the 1940's when they built strategic bombers, they had no conception that they'd be flying, they'd be scattered at all times, not necessarily B-52's today, but there would be missiles on station in the United States, in the oceans at all times. Your national need, the Department of Defense could change tomorrow the idea of national need for the WE, it could be without your consent, just the fact that the Department of Defense and the Administration decides that they should be on the rails, they could be there tomorrow and we would not have a comment. So that's something that you cannot address and you can't deny it.

Mr. Hickman, does your company, it's a subsidiary, is it a subsidiary of a defense contractor?

MR. HICKMAN: No, sir.

WILL CHORUS: Who owns Tetra Tech.

MR. HICKMAN: Tetra Tech is in currently an employee owned company.

WILL CHORUS: Okay. All right. There's been talk about what it takes to be a good citizen, that we sit, we elect representatives and they go and do their job. Well, I think a citizen's job is to ride your legislator, to tell him what you want to do. The information is out there about dangerous, about area. It has nothing to do with sitting there and letting the legislators do their job and vote; it's your job. It's your responsibility as citizens to tell them exactly how you feel.

Thank you.


Not here. Patricia Aliperto? Art Dickhoff?

ART DICKHOFF: Colonel McHans, members of the panel, I'm Art Dickhoff, resident of Great Falls. Chairman of the Great Falls Area Chamber of Commerce, would like to read a statement of a position the Chamber of Commerce has taken.

If the administration and the Congress conclude that the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison are in the national interest, and if the military or environmental strategic and tactical reasons select the state of Montana as a site of deployment site, the state administration, legislators, local government and the citizenry should welcome the mission, cooperate with it fully and continue the excellent base.

Community relationship which Great Falls and Montana have had the past 25 years with rail garrison.

Thank you.

COLONEL McHAN: Thank you, Patricia Aliperto?

Not here either? James Humphrey, Jr.?

JAMES HUMPHREY, JR.: Good evening, I'm Jim Humphrey, Jr., I'm a Great Falls resident and a Great Falls resident.

1. your job. It's your responsibility as citizens to tell them exactly how you feel.

2. Thank you.


5. ART DICKHOFF: Colonel McHans, members of the panel, I'm Art Dickhoff, resident of Great Falls. Chairman of the Great Falls Area Chamber of Commerce, would like to read a statement of a position the Chamber of Commerce has taken.

6. If the administration and the Congress conclude that the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison are in the national interest, and if the military or environmental strategic and tactical reasons select the state of Montana as a site of deployment site, the state administration, legislators, local government and the citizenry should welcome the mission, cooperate with it fully and continue the excellent base.

7. Community relationship which Great Falls and Montana have had the past 25 years with rail garrison.

8. Thank you.

9. COLONEL McHAN: Thank you, Patricia Aliperto?

10. Not here either? James Humphrey, Jr.?

11. JAMES HUMPHREY, JR.: Good evening, I'm Jim Humphrey, Jr., I'm a Great Falls resident and a Great Falls resident.

12. which are planned to be in existence for the rest of our strategic forces, that is for our strategic bombers and the submarines at sea. So this will not use any technology or any new systems other than those which are currently planned.

13. In other words, this system will fit within the strategic command controlling architecture for all systems, and there are, for example, strategic system satellites which this particular rail garrison would be able to communicate with.

14. But just the rail garrison system is primarily in a listen mode. In other words, it doesn't transmit hardly at all, except to interface on the normal radio communications net, primarily the VHF which the trains use now for interoperations, dispatch.

15. JAMES HUMPHREY, JR.: Thank you. My second question is a voicing of concern on my part about the physical safety of Great Falls residents and the effect on that safety of the housing program within city limits of eight to twelve WE missiles carrying 80 to 130 nuclear warheads of 300 ktonnes or so each. I'm concerned about the possible effect of the dispersal of the poisonous clouds if the fuel is either burnt up or evaporated, as described in Chapter 3 of the draft EIS, and I'm concerned about the remote possibility of a dispersal of plutonium in most places of substance in earth through infiltration. And I realize that the EIS document tries to make a convincing case that...
As 25 to 24 kilotons. Thank you. 24 too. It's a distance, there would be a 10 percent casualty rate for humans within 1.6 miles of the disaster, and my memory further is that if the fourth stage, which has liquid fuel, were to even escape its containment and evaporate, that would pose a tremendous fire hazard, especially since one of the fuels promotes spontaneous combustion by everything within a certain distance, and if the fourth stage liquid fuel were to ignite, it seems quite likely the solid stage fumes might go off, too. It seems like a genuine hazard, and I just want to say I'm a little uneasy living next to it.

Thank you.

COLONEL WISEMAN: Thank you. Colonel Walsh, is the expectation of the Environmental Impact Statement are very good, based on our appraisal and experience.

COLONEL WISEMAN: Dr. Wise, Dr. Humphrey? LUCRETTIA HUMPHREY: My name is Lucretia Humphrey, I live here in Great Falls, Montana, and I'm a mother.

Good evening, gentlemen, good evening concerned citizens. I want to thank you for going through this whole process tonight and taking advantage of what democracy has to offer us.

I guess I find it almost ironic that we're meeting tonight on the night of Nagasaki 41 years ago. I just think it's important to remember what kind of killing power we're talking about. Hiroshima was devastated by a bomb of 13 kilotons, 10,000 to 100,000 people died immediately.

Nagasaki three days later was hit with a 22 kiloton bomb, 40,000 people died immediately with 40,000 being injured.

If we go on the number of those who died or were injured, we can see the smaller bomb killed more people; that's because of the geography of the two areas, some of which you already know that.

We're talking about the KH, we're talking about one bomb being 300 kilotons, there are ten of those on a missile and two of those on a train, and you can multiply to find out that we have about 1,020 Nagasakis represented if the garrison should go through with four trains. 1,040 Hiroshimas represented next door to us.

that something you can respond to? Can you answer that question tonight?

LT. COLONEL WALSH: Well, perhaps Colonel Branch can answer the question.

COLONEL BRANCH: I can tell you we've been operating a liquid, sealed liquid fuel for the fourth stage system similar to what is in there right now, which is operation deployed, at F. E. Warren Air Force Base, we've been operating that kind of system for 15 years, and we've never even had anything close to a leak out of that system, so we're really pleased with that. That's about 15 years of experience.

In terms of solid propellants, we've been in that business for about 15 years or more, and they never really had an accident where those propellants in any operational sense, you know, at any time that we've had it as a deployed system, have ever come close to exploding or burning or causing any accident. We've had some liquid fuel problems, but we've never had any solid fuel problems, and as I say we do have the Peacekeeper deployed at F. E. Warren now, so we have some operational experience.

But that fourth stage sealed liquid system has turned out over the past 15 years, and which is very similar, to be an extremely safe way of handling it, so we feel confident that the statistics that are generated on the
LT. COLONEL WALS: Mr. Hickman, would you like to answer that?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, sir, they were. We still, however, looked at the impacts on traffic during the construction period on South Tenth and at the main gate as being one that would be perceived by drivers in the area, so we saw that to be a problem. However, once we got to the operational phase, those problems really will not be great enough to be perceived by most drivers on the road.

COLONEL WALS: So you feel it's a temporary problem or minimal problem?

MR. HICKMAN: The major change and the major impact would occur during the two-year construction period, yes, sir.

ALAN HOBS: Once the final draft is prepared, who will have the final review of your Environmental Impact Statement?

LT. COLONEL WALS: Major Van Ress will answer that question.

MAJOR VAN RESS: Well, the purpose of the statement is to of course provide the decision makers with the, a

discussion of the environmental consequences associated with the project. In that respect, the statement goes to the Department of Defense, to Congress, to the President.

The review process, the public doesn't participate in the review of the final document in the same way it participates in the review of the draft document. There will not be another set of hearings where the public will have another opportunity to comment. So they really only have two avenues for commenting on the final document, and that is they may make comments to their elected representatives so that their comments can be taken into consideration along with the document itself, or to the Air Force so their comments can accompany the document, perhaps, or if history repeats itself, we'll be bound and we'll respond in that way.

COLONEL WALS: So what you're saying is Congress and the administration will have final say as to approval, whether or not it will be implemented?

MAJOR VAN RESS: The program itself?

ALAN HOBS: Yes.

MAJOR VAN RESS: The environmental document only provides a tiny piece of that puzzle. Our task is to provide the decision makers an objective appraisal of the environmental impacts associated with the deployment of the system. Added to that, the decision makers will take into consideration a lot of things that Colonel Walsh has

discussed with you tonight, operational aspects, costs, strategic posturing. At that point, a lot of other considerations will take place, of which only one is the environmental impacts that would be associated with the program.

So it's not the environmental document that necessarily determines whether the system will be deployed, and if so when it will come to Malmstrom or go someplace else.

COLONEL WALS: Well, speaking for myself -- my children have had to leave the state. It's a little hard to find good paying jobs here in Montana -- speaking for myself, if it is decided that the MX is Midwayman is deemed necessary, and with the good relationship we've had with the personnel at Malmstrom, I personally would welcome any additional people you want to move to Montana.

COLONEL WALS: Major Van Ress back? 

MAJOR VAN RESS: Thanks for waiting, Gentlemen. Ma'am.

First I'd like to ask a few questions, if I might. Someone a little while ago mentioned their dissatisfaction that the only hearing was here in Great Falls, and I would like to echo that. I'm a representative from Liberty, Liberty People for Peace, which is an interfaith group in Chester, Montana, and seeing how there is a major line going through the Hi-Line of Montana. I think there should have been a hearing.

a construction approved along River Road just outside of Malmstrom. Were these two projects taken into consideration, considering congestion or potential around Malmstrom?

LT. COLONEL WALS: Mr. Novak, would you like to answer that?

MR. NOVAK: Yes, sir, they were. We still, however, looked at the impacts on traffic during the construction period on South Tenth and at the main gate as being one that would be perceived by drivers in the area, so we saw that to be a problem. However, once we got to the operational phase, those problems really will not be great enough to be perceived by most drivers on the road.

ALAN HOBS: So you feel it's a temporary problem or minimal problem?

MR. HICKMAN: The major change and the major impact would occur during the two-year construction period, yes, sir.

ALAN HOBS: Once the final draft is prepared, who will have the final review of your Environmental Impact Statement?

LT. COLONEL WALS: Major Van Ress will answer that question.

MAJOR VAN RESS: Well, the purpose of the statement is to of course provide the decision makers with the, a

discussion of the environmental consequences associated with the program. In that respect, the statement goes to the Department of Defense, to Congress, to the President.

The review process, the public doesn't participate in the review of the final document in the same way it participates in the review of the draft document. There will not be another set of hearings where the public will have another opportunity to comment. So they really only have two avenues for commenting on the final document, and that is they may make comments to their elected representatives so that their comments can be taken into consideration along with the document itself, or to the Air Force so their comments can accompany the document, perhaps, or if history repeats itself, we'll be bound and we'll respond in that way.

COLONEL WALS: So what you're saying is Congress and the administration will have final say as to approval, whether or not it will be implemented?

MAJOR VAN RESS: The program itself?

ALAN HOBS: Yes.

MAJOR VAN RESS: The environmental document only provides a tiny piece of that puzzle. Our task is to provide the decision makers an objective appraisal of the environmental impacts associated with the deployment of the system. Added to that, the decision makers will take into consideration a lot of things that Colonel Walsh has

discussed with you tonight, operational aspects, costs, strategic posturing. At that point, a lot of other considerations will take place, of which only one is the environmental impacts that would be associated with the program.

So it's not the environmental document that necessarily determines whether the system will be deployed, and if so when it will come to Malmstrom or go someplace else.

COLONEL WALS: Well, speaking for myself -- my children have had to leave the state. It's a little hard to find good paying jobs here in Montana -- speaking for myself, if it is decided that the MX is Midwayman is deemed necessary, and with the good relationship we've had with the personnel at Malmstrom, I personally would welcome any additional people you want to move to Montana.

COLONEL WALS: Major Van Ress back? 

MAJOR VAN RESS: Thanks for waiting, Gentlemen. Ma'am.

First I'd like to ask a few questions, if I might. Someone a little while ago mentioned their dissatisfaction that the only hearing was here in Great Falls, and I would like to echo that. I'm a representative from Liberty, Liberty People for Peace, which is an interfaith group in Chester, Montana, and seeing how there is a major line going through the Hi-Line of Montana. I think there should have been a hearing.
in nurse or Shelby or any of the towns along the Hi-Line, if
that is indeed where some of the trains are proposed to go
through.

My first question is directed to Colonel Walsh.
Earlier, you mentioned that one of the purposes of the
defense system is to insure that we have adequate defense if
the Soviets or someone else should have a breakthrough and be
able to see our submarines, and I understand that reasoning.
But wouldn't it be easier now already for them to look down
from their satellites and see our trains going out on the
rail system? It seems to me that they already have the
satellites in place to see those trains, whereas the
possibility of them discovering where the submarines are at
any given time is a nice to have possibility. Could you
address that?

LT. COLONEL WALSH: Okay, go, Colonel Branch.

COLONEL BRANCH: Our operational assessment of the
operability of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System has to do
with an assessment of the capabilities of the Soviets to in
fact have enough assets to see them satellites to whatever, to
keep track of all of these trains and to see them all, and
the threat assessment folks say that now and in the
foreseeable future that they're not at all able to do that,

that would be an inordinately difficult task for the Soviets
to have the assets and the capability to do that. I am not a
threat expert. You get into that in more detail probably
gets into classified, but that's what the threat analysis
experts say.

MAURI NOVAK: How many different garrisons are
there proposed, how many different --

COLONEL BRANCH: How many different garrisons?

MAURI NOVAK: Okay, and each one has one or two
trains?

COLONEL BRANCH: Depends on the number deployed,
whether you're talking about the 50 trains deployed or 25
trains deployed.

MAURI NOVAK: Okay. I don't know if that makes
sense to me, but okay. How many trains are proposed for
Great Falls?

COLONEL BRANCH: Well, again it depends on the
proposed alternative. Peter, what's the number of trains?

MR. NICHOLS: 25 trains.

LT. COLONEL WALSH: Between four and six trains.

COLONEL BRANCH: Between four and six.

MAURI NOVAK: Okay.

COLONEL BRANCH: I'm trying to understand where
we're going with these questions so I can be specific about
the answer.

MAURI NOVAK: Well, I don't know.

COLOEhl COLONEL BUSINESS: He'll ask the
questions.

MARI NOVAK: Many of my questions and concerns
have already been brought up tonight, many of the specifics
were in the CRS. One that wasn't was, I'll give you a
scenario. If a sneak attack was launched, say from off our
shores outside of Washington, and a missile was headed
towards Great Falls, how much time would we have to deploy
our rail garrison, our rail network?

COLONEL BRANCH: It is the extraordinarily unlikely
scenario of what we term the Boldabo attacks. In other words the
Soviets for some reason decided to launch, right now as we
sit here they just decided that now is the time to attack,
and of course that's why we need a system like this, but if
they were to suddenly decide that through some irrational
assessment, then the trains would not move at all; in fact,
they would get ready to launch, just like our silo based
missile launch would. In other words, we wouldn't move the
trains out at all.

Okay, however, the normal scenario for deployment
has to do with what's called strategic warning, and that is
watching the great indicators of the kind of things that
Soviets would have to do to get their strategic forces ready
for a strategic global conflict, and there are many, many of
those, and that would take days, not weeks.

MAURO NOVAK: I think I'm going to skip my
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associated with this deployment, we firmly believe we have
the capacity and the talent to deal with that.

Great Falls and Montana has had an excellent close
working relationship with the military for many years and
we're confident that that relationship will continue with the
Peacekeeper.

COLONEL MCFARLANE: Thank you. We will conclude the
proceedings at this time. Please remember that you have
until 31 August to submit written materials to be included in
the transcript of the hearing. Once again, oral and written
statements or comments will be afforded equal weight. Please
be assured that Air Force decision makers will carefully
consider each viewpoint raised here tonight when deciding the
ultimate course of action on this proposal.

Thank you. This public hearing is adjourned at
10:00.

HEARING CONCLUSION

not because of nuclear weapons.

We are not a safer world now because of the
Wasserfall bomb. That bomb is a fire in a forest fire when
compared to the terrific stock pile of nuclear weapons
today. We are not safer because of nuclear weapons. One
more system out of the pile will only make a poor, more
threatened world. The MX system is only one more accident
waiting to happen. It is time to turn away from our trust in
our own infallible technology and instead trust in one
another and trust in God.

COLONEL MCFARLANE: Time, Mr. Novak.

LADY IN THE AUDIENCE: How many more people are
to testify?

COLONEL MCFARLANE: I'm going to take one more.

LADY IN THE AUDIENCE: Could you let us know how
many are signed up?

COLONEL MCFARLANE: Sure, Roger Young?

ROGER YOUNG: My name is Roger Young and I'm
President of the Great Falls Area Chamber of Commerce. I am
willing to speak in support of the Draft Environmental Impact
Statement, which I have read.

It is my assessment that the statement makes
considerable efforts to address the issues and concerns
which are raised by the possibility of Peacekeeper Rail
Garrison's deployment in the Great Falls area. As I see it,

problems which the community may face in infrastructure, such
as housing, schools, etcetera, are similar to those problems
which we are experiencing currently with the activation of
the 31st Air Refueling Wing. We're managing and dealing with
these problems quite capably. Indeed, that's the purpose of
the EIS to identify the problems so that the military and
the Federal government are given proper responsibility for
mitigating it.

As was pointed out earlier, and in Mr. Parker's
questions, you can, I think, help us litigate those two
significant impacts. You can help us overcome the problem of
replacing an overcrowded jail, a jail that is already
overcrowded, and perhaps our traffic congestion on Tenth
Avenue South can also be relieved with construction of an
articul, which is also currently needed but on the
long-range building plan.

The Chamber disagrees with those who believe that
just because these problems have been identified, that should
be reason enough to oppose the placement of the Peacekeeper
Rail Garrison here. On the contrary, we believe that if the
Peacekeeper is deemed essential to the nation's defense by
the President and the Congress, we believe it will be good
for Montana and good for Great Falls. If the weapon system
is going to be deployed, we believe it might as well be here
as anywhere else. If there will be environmental problems
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Thank you, Colonel Walsh. We have a lot of folks who want to speak tonight. We’ll get underway here. First, I would like to start out by asking Colonel Walsh to introduce the other members of the panel.

Lt. Colonel Walsh: On my immediate right is Major Van Xeese. He is a lawyer with the Air Force, and he will respond to questions on legal matters and safety. On my far right is Colonel Branch. He is assigned right now to Headquarters Strategic Air Command, and he will respond to questions on the operational concept. On my immediate left is Mr. Xichem. He is employed by Tetra Tech Corporation. That company was hired by the Air Force to prepare this Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Xichem will respond to questions on the effects on human resources. And on my far left is Mr. Xross, Xeese is also employed by Tetra Tech Corporation, and he will respond to questions on the effects on physical resources. Thank you, sir.

Colonel McShane: Thank you, Colonel Walsh. We have now turned to the question and answer period of this public hearing. This time is set aside to allow you to ask questions about the content of the briefing and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and to make statements about it.
The Garrison would strengthen Minot's GPA and would be a positive economic development for Minot. In addition, the Garrison would provide a sense of security and pride to the community.

It is important to note that the Garrison would not interfere with the existing infrastructure or the city's existing operations. The Garrison would be operated within the existing city limits and would not impact the city's existing transportation or energy systems.

The Garrison would also provide economic benefits to the community, including job creation and increased revenue. It is estimated that the Garrison would create over 1,000 jobs and generate over $3 million in annual revenue.

The Garrison would be located on a 1,000-acre site in the northwestern part of the city and would be designed to be a self-sustaining community. The Garrison would have its own water supply and wastewater treatment system, and would be connected to the city's electrical grid.

The Garrison would also be designed to be environmentally friendly, with a focus on sustainability and energy efficiency. The Garrison would use solar and wind power, and would be designed to have a low carbon footprint.

In conclusion, the Garrison would be a significant economic and social development for Minot. It would provide a sense of security and pride to the community, while also creating jobs and generating revenue. The Garrison would be a positive development for Minot, and the city is excited to move forward with the project.
flow either the Minot or the Sunkre aquifer would not substantially affect groundwater levels. Thank you.

COLONEL McHANE: Thank you.

Next is Senator James Nason.

MR. CHUMAS: Good evening. My name is Stella Chumas, and I'm here tonight representing Senator Jim Nason, who could not be here because of a prior commitment in Fargo, North Dakota concerning his private law practice, but I do have his statement.

To whom it may concern regarding the proposed Val-Garrison project. Believe it or not, I have actually reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement regarding the proposal Val-Garrison project for Minot Air Force Base. The placement of this project at Minot Air Force Base would have a positive economic impact on the Minot area and would do no damage to our environment. There is a history of some 30 years of cooperation and friendship between the military community and civilian community in Minot. This would only be strengthened by any additions to Minot Air Force Base.

Many, including me, have empathy for the opinions of those who wish there were no such thing

as nuclear weapons anywhere. We share their wishes but are realistic enough to comprehend that nuclear weapons are a necessary evil. The United States and the Soviet Union are no longer the only nuclear powers in the world. If we make peace with the Soviet Union, there are a number of potentially dangerous Third World countries who are capable of providing a nuclear threat. If not now, in the future. There will always be people in the world such as Hitler, Mussolini, Stalady and Khomeini who hate America and everything for which it stands. A strong deterrent is a people like that understand. History has proven that appeasement is akin to surrender.

We have had a nuclear arsenal in Minot for more than a generation. It is a part of our reality. If there is going to be a nuclear arsenal in America, we are no more or less safe in Minot, North Dakota, if the arsenal is in our backyard, in Arkansas, in Louisiana, or Wyoming.

The overwhelming majority of the people in the Minot area would, in my opinion, readily welcome any form of economic infusion into their community.

We are realistic and we are patriotic. If the Val-Garrison project is to be built, why not Minot, Jim...
the overall health of the species by placing it in a richer, better environment.

12 A third item is plants and plant cover. The EIS statement says there will be destruction of plants and plant cover. The destruction of naturally-occurring plants and plant cover would be replaced after construction by more desirable cover. For example, grass, shrubbery, and trees. This coverage is more conducive to many species of wildlife, tree dwelling birds, grass and berry-consuming species, and would provide a means of small scale diversification.

13 COLONEL McBRANE: Time, sir.

14 MR. TOLLEFSON: I strongly urge you to consider bringing the NE to Minot. The citizens of this community are ready, willing, and able to participate in all ways to make it a success. Thank you.

15 MR. TOLLEFSON: Thank you.

16 Representative James Peterson.

17 MR. PETTISON: Gentlemen, for the record, I'm Jim Peterson, representative of the 40-50 District in Minot, and mine will be considerably shorter than Mr. E's.

18 The Draft EIS says the construction of Minot, or...
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and has enabled this country to be free of wars or  
even any threats of war for the last several years.  
The Peacekeeper missile in Minot would enhance  
the opportunity to maintain our peace and our  
freedom.

The Environmental Impact Statement has my  
support and also that of a vast majority of the  
people in this community. Thank you.

COLONEL ROLLAND: Thank you, Colonel. Next will be  
Representative Dave Roland.

Mr. ROLLAND: Thank you, Colonel. I am  
State Representative Dave Roland from District 5 in  
North Dakota. I would like to testify in support of the  
Environmental Impact Statement released by the Air  
Force about Minot Air Force Base.  

In the North Dakota Legislature, I have  
served on the Natural Resources Committee and on the  
industrial, business, and labor committees. As a  
representative of District 5, I must support the EIS  
in its entirety, and I would like to address a  
couple of specific areas.

I refer to page 4.10-6 of the EIS. The  
infrastructure on the area would be of benefit  
to our community. The increased employment  
opportunities would be most welcome to an area that
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has been undergoing some extremely trying economic  
hardships during the last five years. The table  
listed 4.10-1 on page 4.10-3 is indicative of  
future employment opportunities.

The Alternative Action plan would be of even  
greater benefit to the Minot area. I draw your  
attention particularly to the impact mitigation plan  
on page A-2 that outlines a plan to avoid multiple  
small contracts to enable local firms to bid, and  
compliment you for including that in the report and  
hope that it will be in the final report also.

I request your support of the EIS and  
encourage the Air Force to choose Minot Air Force  
Base as a site for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison  
project. Thank you.

COLONEL ROLLAND: Thank you. Next will be  
Representative Janet Wents. Janet Wents (W-e-n-t-s).

Is she here? Apparently not. Representative  
Haugland.

Mr. SYNDRE: Thank you, Colonel.

Representative Haugland has yielded her three  
minutes to me. My name is Steve Synder, and I  
thank you for the opportunity to comment tonight on  
the Environmental Impact Statement.

I think it's clear from the crowd
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assembled tonight that there's a great deal of  
interest in having the Peacekeeper missile here in  
Minot and assessing its potential impact on North  
Dakota and the city of Minot. It's clear from  
the detailed Environmental Impact Statement that we  
discussed this evening that there is very little  
cause for concern about Minot being chosen as a host  
for the rail-based missile.

I think the impact that also should be  
concerned and considered tonight is the impact if  
the MX missile is not deployed in Minot or  
elsewhere. We need to be concerned about how the  
people and others might view such action. We need  
to be concerned about the impact that that action  
would have. I'm quite certain that that impact  
would be undesirable. We have listened through the  
last several years that peace and security come  
through national strength, and that's what the  
rail-based Peacekeeper would provide, additional  
strength to protect our security and our peace.

Those who oppose us understand strength. They  
respect strength. And it's becoming apparent that  
it is our commitment to strength that has convinced  
them to negotiate seriously towards area reductions.  
We can all join in prayers for the day
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when weapons like the MX and others will no longer  
be needed, and what we scattered across our  
prairies, but today for the first time we can  
evaporize a threat. We can envision such a  
world because our leaders were wise enough to  
accept it into a strong defense. We have lived in  
the world we value our peace and our freedom and we are prepared  
to protect it. The Peacekeeper supports this.  
We must continue to send that message throughout the  
world, that we will, until we all can agree to rid  
our planet of weapons such as these.

I think most people here understand the  
need for the MX and are willing to accept it into  
our community as it. As we can have reasonable  
safety and security as to the safety of the system. Tonight  
we have seen from the Environmental Impact Statement  
that we can have those assurances. The Peacekeeper  
is in fact a safe system.

Others have commented, and others will yet  
tonight tell, I'm sure, about the beneficial  
economic impact that the Peacekeeper would have on  
this region of our state, and that consideration is  
not a small one. We welcome the jobs and the people  
that Peacekeeper would bring to our state. The  
more than 400 construction jobs and the more than
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1 The Minot Air Force Base and community of Minot have maintained a harmonious working relationship. I salute the U.S. Air Force for its professional attitude in working with the surrounding communities and the avoidance of developing community towns which, in my experience as an Army officer, frequently developed around Army posts. The community of Minot greatly appreciates the impact Minot Air Force Base has had and will continue to have in this region. As the largest single employer in this region, the Minot Air Force Base has broadened the economic and cultural scope of Minot and surrounding communities. Thank you.

Sincerely, Representative Kenneth Frey
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COMMERCIAL NUCLEAR AND NONNUCLEAR INDUSTRIES.

The Minot Air Force Base and community of Minot have maintained a harmonious working relationship. I salute the U.S. Air Force for its professional attitude in working with the surrounding communities and the avoidance of developing community towns which, in my experience as an Army officer, frequently developed around Army posts. The community of Minot greatly appreciates the impact Minot Air Force Base has had and will continue to have in this region. As the largest single employer in this region, the Minot Air Force Base has broadened the economic and cultural scope of Minot and surrounding communities. Thank you.

Sincerely, Representative Kenneth Frey.

Col. McIlvain: Thank you. I'll call for Janet Kents one more time. Apparently she's not here. Okay. Now I have shuffled the rest of them aside and they are totally at random. Start with calling Gary Wicke.

Mr. Wicke: Good evening, My name is Gary Wicke. I live in Minot, and I am Chairman of the Minot Area Development Corporation. The Minot Area Development Corporation is comprised of 22 businesses, represented by 19 voting directors and
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villages, however they want to people it, whether or not -- what kind of a racial mix they want to have between Indian folk and ourselves as white people.

I would like to give you just a couple seconds here. If you had your own one square mile piece of land, what would it look like? Envision that just a few moments. Now I would like to ask any of you, with all due honesty, reaching to the bottom of your heart, thinking about the future of all generations to come, tomorrow's great grandchildren, grandchildren beyond them, how many of you can stand up and say that you would really want to see the MX Peacekeeper rail garrison system on that one square mile piece of land which is exclusively your responsibility given to you under God?

COLONEL MCFARLANE: Time.

MR. DISNEY: Time? Thank you very much.

COLONEL MCFARLANE: Art Ekblad.

MR. EKBLAD: Colonel Ekblad, member of the panel. I am Art Ekblad, President of the Minot Area Chamber of Commerce. The Minot Chamber of Commerce represents a membership of about 600 -- over 600 business people here in the city and the surrounding area. I am Art Ekblad, and I wish to
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Three hours is insufficient time for this presentation. I received a copy of the DEIS on July 20, 1983. The time is not sufficient from the distribution of the DEIS to this hearing to prepare an adequate critique. It is no solution that additional testimony can be submitted in writing, because part of the process is to inform and influence my neighbors and legislators to oppose this project. Therefore, a major part of the discussion of the DEIS to this hearing to prepare an adequate critique. It is no solution that additional testimony can be submitted in writing, because part of the process is to inform and influence my neighbors and legislators to oppose this project.

Therefore, COLONEL McNABE: Time, Mr. Rosenberge. MS. ROSENBERGE: Thank you. LIL. COLONEL WALSH: Excuse me, sir. COLONEL McNABE: Colonel Walsh. LIL. COLONEL WALSH: I would like to ask Major Van Hess to reply to some of those issues raised, please. MAJOR VAN HESS: We would just like to reply here this evening to two of the points you have made. The remainder we will address in the final DEIS. But we thought that with the wider audience, they might be interested in hearing at least two of those answers.

One is that you object that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement doesn't cover the No Action Alternative. That may be somewhat misleading in that you may not understand how we have discussed the No Action Alternative in the document. We believe that our discussions of the present and future baseline conditions constitutes the discussion of the No Action Alternative, that would happen absent the impacts of our project. And if you look at the amount of the document that is devoted to a discussion of the present and future baseline, I think you will find that exceeds in volume the number of pages associated with the discussion of the impacts involving the actual deployment of the system.

Secondly, you raised the issue with regard to controversy. And you may be right that we need to clarify what we have said in the document. But there is a subtle point here that I think needs to be made, and that is under the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, what the agency is required to disclose a controversy among experts, informed public concerning the impacts themselves. Controversy to the extent it implies mere opposition of the program isn't the kind of controversy that we are required to discuss under the National Environmental Policy Act. And that is simply what we were trying to describe or explain in the passage that you refer to.

MS. ROSENBERGE: The document is ambiguous, but thanks for your opinion.

COLONEL McNABE: Larry Lange.

MR. LANCE: Good evening. I am Larry Lange from Devil's Lake, Nashwauke. I object to the rail-based NE as the grounds of pollution.
who represent them, out of fear for their futures, tend to vote in favor of such mindless expenditures to please their constituents. This is political pollution.

Lastly, and most importantly, the MX is a spiritually polluting affair. It trafficks in fear which Jesus warned us against. It violates the first commandment in which God says to us, "I am the Lord, Your God. You shall have no strange gods before me." To trust the MX for our security instead of God is to make of it an idol and thus a strange god. To call the MX the Peacekeeper is blasphemy for Christians. We who follow Jesus know He is the Peacekeeper and the Peacemaker, and there is no other. May God and His son Jesus help us.

COLONEL MUSHLIN: Thank you. Colonel Walsh.

LT. COLONEL WALSH: Yes, sir. I would like to note -- make two comments on issues that you raised. In the Star talks with the Soviet Union, the United States has proposed the elimination of mobile weapon systems. The Soviet Union has rejected that proposal and has already pursued deployment of two mobile systems. The SS-24 is their rail mobile system and the SS-25 is their road mobile system. That was the Soviet Union's reply to the United States' proposal.

And the other issue that I should point out to you is that we are preparing the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program as a solution to providing a more survivable ICBM system. The economic benefits that the communities would derive from such deployment are incidental to such deployment. They are not the prime reason or selling point for the program. Thank you very much, sir.

COLONEL MCGAHAN: Bill Breding.

MR. BREDDING: I totally support the SS-8 statement, and I believe that if you gentlemen lived in North Dakota, you'd have a greater appreciation of why we say it's cleaner and greener in the summertime; whiter and brighter in the wintertime. Thank you.

COLONEL MCGAHAN: Thank you, Albert Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: This is Albert Robinson, and I do support the Environmental Impact Statement wholeheartedly.

COLONEL MCGAHAN: Thank you, Steve Batts.

MR. BATTES: I am Steve Batts, a local citizen.
The DEIS for Minot does not adequately consider whether the overall unemployment rate would increase for 13,900 and thereafter. The section on the Great Forks area, for example, the DEIS predicted that the unemployment rate would be increased after the initial construction phase due to the influx of military dependents who would compete with local residents for nonproject jobs. No such calculations were submitted for Minot.

On page 4.10-24 of the DEIS, it states that three state sensitive species would receive minor adverse impacts. The language is unclear as to how the species would be affected, by what means, and whether any measures to mitigate were considered. The native handling on the section of wildlife is not very clear.
39

22
20
19 NB. ROS

17
16
15
14
13
12
11
10 full

9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

25 of central

24
23
22
21
20
19
18
17
16
15
14
13
12
11
10 full

9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

25 of central

24
23
22
21
20
19
18
17
16
15
14
13
12
11
10 full

9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

25 of central

24
23
22
21
20
19
18
17
16
15
14
13
12
11
10 full

9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

25 of central

24
23
22
21
20
19
18
17
16
15
14
13
12
11
10 full

9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

25 of central
The impact is on the thinking of mankind all over the world. It is everywhere assuming that might is right.

This is not only for the super powers, but also for all those who have entered into a nuclear arms race. Unfortunately, I'm thinking of the millions who suffer throughout the world because of the lack of benefits that modern technology could bring were it not that that technology is given over to the building of weapons of destruction. It is indeed a cruel hoax on mankind to perpetuate the most noble thoughts we have of creating a patriotism of sacrifice in order to support a military economy.

No, I don't want the MX missile garrisoned here or anywhere. And I'm not chicken. I'm not afraid of us being a prime target. I'm not afraid of an accident occurring. What I hate is the fear associated with the fear of an accident occurring. That hate is to me is the fear continued. The fear, suspicion, and animosity that we have towards others because they do not think quite like we do.

COLONEL MCBRANE: Thank you, Mr. Greenup.

MR. GREENUP: Thank you. I'm Wayne Greenup from Minot, and I support the Environmental Impact Statement. I feel that it would be a direct, positive influence on the city and surrounding area.

Fourth, the draft indicates -- the RIE indicates that the trains would only move out of the garrison when major repairs or maintenance were necessary that they be transported to the main operating base at Warren Air Force Base near Cheyenne, Wyoming, or when directed to disperse during time of national need. In my opinion, this would not significantly impact the rail network and would not interfere with normal commerce or transportation along the rail network in Minot.

For more than a century, Minot has been known as a railroad town. For the last three decades, we have also been known for our close working arrangements with the Air Force at Minot Air Force Base. As a result, I believe that we are uniquely situated to handle the impact of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and look forward to the opportunity to do so.

In conclusion, if it is the ultimate decision of the President and Congress to deploy the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program, then I believe that Minot Air Force Base should be chosen as one of the sites. Thank you.

COLONEL MCBRANE: Thank you, John Pence. Please.

EMTETE & ASSOCIATES - COURT REPORTERS
1809 B. BROADWAY, MINOT, ND 58701 (701) 838-1557

EMTETE & ASSOCIATES - COURT REPORTERS
1809 B. BROADWAY, MINOT, ND 58701 (701) 838-1557

EMTETE & ASSOCIATES - COURT REPORTERS
1809 B. BROADWAY, MINOT, ND 58701 (701) 838-1557
MR. PENCE: Colonel McNamee, and panel.

I'm John Pence, one of the five commissioners from Ward County. I had intended to insert a number of statements regarding the impact report that has been given. I saw no reason for me to stand here and use up three minutes of time to repeat what has already been said. And in favor of the attorney from Grand Forks or so, I will relinquish the rest of my time for other speakers.

I do want it known that the Ward County Commissioners solidly support the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison plan. Thank you.

COLONEL McNAMEE: Thank you, David Waich.

Mr. Waich: My name is David Waich, and I have been employed in various capacities with the City of Minot for nearly ten years. I presently serve as an assistant city manager, and I am here this evening representing myself and the city manager, Robert Schapp.

I have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program, particularly that portion of the DEIS that deals with impact at Minot Air Force Base and the

on environmental quality, we believe that favorable consideration should be given to locating the Rail Garrison in Minot.

For more than three decades the City of Minot has worked with the Air Force Base in accommodating both change and growth. We stand tonight ready, willing, and able to handle the impact if Minot Air Force Base is chosen as one of the locations for the Rail Garrison. Thank you.

COLONEL McNAMEE: Thank you, Charles Hoffman.

Mr. Hoffman: My name is Charles Hoffman.

I came to Minot to teach at the University in 1953 and have lived here for the past 55 years. I speak for myself.

Our national security does not necessarily increase with an increase in the military spending. Our national security is based on a healthy economy, providing steady jobs for the workers gives a chance for advancement for whoever meets human needs more efficiently.

But it takes money to create every kind of job. In the last four years, from 1981 -- in the four years from 1981 to '84, military expenditures increased, became greater, by $190 billion. About 66 percent beyond the rise due to inflation. A million is a thousand thousand, and a billion is a thousand million. To get this extra 190 billion, our country boosted its federal debt and cut other federal spending. Spending $190 billion created over 7 million new jobs. But if this had been spent on civilian jobs, it would have created over 8 million new jobs, because civilian jobs are about 15 percent more labor intensive than military jobs. Thus, this new military spending cost our nation 1,147,000 lost jobs because our federal spending had to be cut. I quote figures from Employment Research Associates of Lansing, Michigan. California gained 607 more jobs than it lost. New Hampshire gained 3,460 more than it lost. And 13 other states had a net gain. But 35 other states lost some of their jobs that they gained -- more than they gained.

The 10-780 more jobs than it gained. Even Washington, D.C. lost a net of 10,660 jobs. Rail Garrison promises a temporary money gain to Minot, but not to North Dakota or the United States. Which is more important, Minot or the whole nation? Let's be truly patriotic.

It has been estimated that about 40 percent of the total research and development funds
in the United States are being spent for civilian use. In Germany, it's 96 percent instead of 60 percent. In Japan, 98 percent. More money has been spent on research and development of the B-1 bomber than the total research and development budget for the whole U.S. steel industry. A strong healthy economy cannot be based on a military budget larger than the civilian. I don't care --

COLONEL MCBRANE: Time, sir.

MR. ROFFMAN: -- to have a hand in the nuclear creation of millions of lives of civilians, either in Russia or here, or more likely in both.

COLONEL MCBRANE: Time, sir. Julia

Odland.

MR. ODLAND: I'd like to defer to Ethel Rae Morrison.

MR. MORRISON: I have lived in Minot for 20 years and raised my children here.

It seems if the Rail Garrison is voted on by our nation, okay, have it in Minot. But Rail Garrison to me is a very bad idea. It's very shortsighted and selfish to want Rail Garrison in Minot so we can have a few more jobs and some kind of economic progress when it's bad for the whole nation and for the whole world. I care for the
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environment of the whole world.

I would like to quote from Christian railing of GOD. I believe it is finally, it is nonsense to claim that we must add 50 MX missiles carrying 500 warheads to our arsenal of more than 13,000 long-range nuclear weapons in order to deter the Soviet Union from attacking our land-based missiles. To actually believe that our ICBMs are vulnerable to a Soviet first-strike attack, one must assume that the Soviet leaders would be insane or suicidal. Why? Because even if the Soviets could destroy most of United States' land-based missiles, surviving United States' bombers and submarines could quickly destroy the Soviet Union.

The nuclear warheads on just two of our 36 missile-carrying submarines could demolish every large and medium-sized city in the Soviet Union. Our submarine-launched missiles, our bombers, our cruise missiles are more than sufficient to deter any rational Soviet from attacking the United States. And if the Soviets are bent on this suicidal idea, no additional weapon system will prevent them from attacking us.

I feel -- I have enjoyed meeting your base people, but that has nothing to do with this Rail
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Garrison system, which is to me, a very bad idea.

COLONEL MCBRANE: Ma'am, you were Ethel Rae Morrison; is that correct?

MR. MORRISON: Right.

COLONEL MCBRANE: Thank you, Marvin.

Mr. DEMAU: Colonel Mcbrane, members of the panel. My name is Marvin Demau. I'm a resident of the City of Minot, having been born and raised in the City of Minot and grown up comfortably with the "not Air Force Base." I support the

findings in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. In addition to that, I support the deployment of the RS Rail Garrison because of its deterrent capabilities, and I understand that without deterrent capabilities that maybe one of us here may have an environment to worry about. Thank you.

You.

COLONEL MCBRANE: Thank you, Gary.

MR. KVAlLICH: I'm Gary Kovalich, president-elect of the Minot Chamber of Commerce, but I'm speaking tonight as a citizen in support of the RS and particularly from where I came.

I'm a realtor and a home builder. Section
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1. Native American Resources. "Although the study area is within the traditional territory of the Oseeteta, specific Native American resources such as sacred sites have not been identified. Therefore, no one would be affected by the Proposed Action." Whether or not research has been done in the area, and I understand that it has, to state that therefore nothing would be affected is not logical, but I think it is rather cavalier and casual.

2. Secondly, there's a section about a possible second rail connector going north to Lasneford. I have heard nothing about that before. In discussing this possibility, Section 4.16.14 it states, quote, none of the streams, Little Deep Creek, Esq Creek, and an unnamed creek, requiring bridges have state-designated cases, indicating that they are not particularly sensitive streams, and quote. I really doubt that conclusion, just because they haven't been designated state-designated streams.

3. Then the statement continues, 'The right-of-way to Lasneford would be about 122 acres of land and could probably be sited to avoid scattered farmlands. There could, however, be a conflict with existing structures or roads at...
With respect to the alternate routes, this
is not an RIA to support selection of an alternate
route. At this particular time, we do not feel that
we need an alternate route from the base. However,
we are identifying that we may at some future time,
if a threat changes or our needs change, like to go
with an alternate route. We have identified the
appropriate corridor that we would be looking at,
and then at the time that a decision was made that
we need an alternate route, then we would lay out
proposed and reasonable alternatives for the people
to look at and accomplish an RIA on those routes and
then ask the people to comment on it. Thank you
very much, sir.

MR. MUSTISILLI: I think it's important
that people are aware of that possibility. Thank
you.

COLONEL McSHANE: I think you had further
questions there. If you don't get back up here,
please remember to submit them in writing. Earl
Allen, please.

MR. ALLEN: Colonel McShane, members of
the panel. I am Earl Allen, Minot resident for 35
years, have considerable roots here. The writer,
myself, is an agricultural economic graduate with
a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison project very well and, as has been
stated earlier, safely.

As for land use, it would seem conclusive
that we have the lowest land cost in relation to
land quality of any place in the United States.
Landholdings are large. Accounting for the very
sparsely populated area. It would seem that the
Peacemaker Rail Garrison project would shy away
from heavily populated rural areas where the farms
are smaller and there are no ranches, and where the
market value of the land is extremely high by
colomparison.

As far as cultural resources, Minot is
simply outstanding. Its small university has done
much to accomplish this. The size of the university
is emphasized because it does not harbor adverse
social and political activists who often reach the
militant stage. There is virtually none of this
congenital pathological element in the Mi-

The water resources in the Minot area are
more than adequate. The mathematical probability
that there could be any water pollution from this
project strains the imagination since it is
virtually zero.

COLONEL McSHANE: Time, sir.

MR. ALLEN: May I run over for just a
minute. Air quality in the Minot and northwest
North Dakota certainly is the highest and best
quality in the United States and is not jeopardized
by the Rail Garrison in any way.

There is much more to say. I appreciate
this opportunity to be heard. And we welcome you,
and we do hereby endorse this Draft Environmental
Impact Statement.

COLONEL McSHANE: Thank you, sir. And you
may submit any written comments. Charles Brevik,
Charles Brevik?Breiv -- there he is. Okay.

MR. BREVIK: Thank you. I am Charles
Brevik of Minot, North Dakota, and I appreciate the
opportunity this evening to voice support for the
Rail Garrison employment at Minot Air Force Base on
behalf of myself and the Minot Association of
Builders.

The Draft RIA supports the fact that Minot
has the means to support the Rail Garrison
deployment. We have highly capable contractors. We
have willing workers. We have adequate housing. We
have adequate utilities, excellent school system.
The positive impacts of this program, the economies
of it would be a tremendous benefit to all of

MR. BREVIK: Time, sir.
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1. In conclusion, I feel that the gains in United States' defense capability achieved in the first half of this decade are being negated by congressional indecisiveness and political maneuvering that amount to playing Russian roulette with our national security. These conditions cry out for correction. The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison system is a must, and I highly support the Minot Air Force Base as the facility to garrison the Peacekeeper missile forces. Thank you very much, sir.

2. COLONEL McKEEN: Thank you, Ronald.

3. STAFF: I refer to Al Meredith.

4. MR. MEREDITH: Thank you. My name is Al Meredith.

5. I believe I'm speaking here tonight in an effort to prevent a crime. I believe that the US is in a crime under international law. In a 1960 Jessica case, the United States Supreme Court held that international law is part and parcel of the structure of federal law. International law includes the law of war. Under the Fourth Hague

6. referred to as the Scowcroft Commission. As stated in the Scowcroft report, Soviet advantages in ICBM capability -- may I correct that. As stated in the Scowcroft report, and I quote, deployment of MX is essential in order to preserve the Soviet advantage in ICBM capability and help deter the threat of conventional or limited nuclear attacks on the alliance. Such deployment is also necessary to encourage the Soviets to move toward a more stable regime of deployments and arms control, unquote.

7. Our Minuteman forces have been outstripped by the Soviet's improvements in their land-based ICBMs, and we cannot adequately hold them at risk.

8. Therefore, the primary purpose of United States' ICBM modernization is to redress this growing imbalance in prompt, hardened-target kill capability, and to improve the deterrent value of the land-based ICBM leg of the Triad. The Scowcroft Commission, quoted, abandoning Peacekeeper deployment would jeopardize, not enhance, the likelihood of reaching a stabilizing and equitable agreement, unquote. Continued deployment beyond the first 50 missiles in a testing mode acceptable to Congress is essential to meet our immediate military requirement, providing even further incentives for
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11. 103

12. western North Dakota. Thank you.


15. MR. FEDORCAK: Thank you, Ardie. My name is Mike Fedorchak. I'm president of the General


17. I'm representing approximately 900 members of our

18. association and 100 businesses of Minot, as

19. community partners. With regard to the EIS

20. executive summary, page 2-44, I quote, "Minot Air

21. Force Base, North Dakota. The proposed and

22. Alternative Actions at Minot Air Force Base would

23. not result in significant impacts on any resources." This therefore leads me to the conclusion that there will be no adverse impact to coincidental

24. utilities, transportation, land use, cultural, biological, water, geological and soil, air quality

25. and noise within our area. Further, based on the

26. support documentation contained in the EIS draft.

27. Minot Air Force Base is a logical choice to be at

28. the top of the list for favorable consideration to

29. garrison the Peacekeeper missiles.

30. The EIS makes reference to President

31. Reagan establishing a bipartisan commission, called

32. the President's Commission on Strategic Forces, also
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And since there's no reason to hit an empty silo, we must assume the MX is part of the United States' first-strike nuclear war strategy. In addition to being a first-strike weapon, the MX is inherently destabilizing due to its multiple warheads and its pugnacious basing mode. Deployment of the MX in any basing mode will therefore decrease national security because deployment increases the likelihood of nuclear exchange.

Now, we have talked about, and we have heard about, peace through strength and we need a secure peace and we must be sitting and we need all this strength. But you have said tonight that we're here to talk about survivability. Now, the Congressional Budget Office, in November of '85, said that under the worst case scenario, 97% of U.S. nuclear weapons would survive a Soviet surprise attack. And considering the fact that only a few of those would obliterate the Soviet Union, probably initiate nuclear winter, and contaminate the entire world in an unhealthable state, I ask, what is sufficient?

And to point out what we have today, I'm going to do a little demonstration. In this bucket, I'm going to drop a BB. This BB represents all of the Second World War. the destruction in the Second World War. It, coincidentally, represents one MX missile. I'll do that again. That's the Second World War. Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is what we possess today in nuclear weapons alone.

Colonel McNamara: Yes, sir.

Mr. Staff: I ask, how much is enough?

When do we have sufficient power?

Colonel McNamara: Colonel Walsh.

ST. COLONEL WALSH: Yes, sir. First of all, I would like to oppose your conclusion that this is a first-strike weapon based upon the fact, as you assert, that you only attack full silos, and, of course, you would have to do that prior to the Soviets launching any attack. I would submit to you, sir, that first of all, if the Soviets did launch an attack, they would not see all their missiles. That would be a poor operational decision. They would certainly hold some in reserve. So, therefore, there will be silos with missiles in there to attack.

Second, the Soviet method of launch allows them to reload their silos, and the Soviets never get rid of any of their missiles, so they could go and reload their silos for another attack on the United States.

Mr. Keehn: I'm not talking about adding additional warheads. We're looking at a more reliable way of delivering and a more survivable way of containing them.

And furthermore, you should note that over the last decade, there has been a dramatic decrease in the number of warheads that the United States has, and an even more dramatic decrease in the total explosive power of what we have. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Keehn: Thank you for your opinion. But I would argue that --

Colonel McNamara: Mr. Keehn. I'm calling on Ronald Iverson at this time. You may talk to Colonel Walsh after the meeting ends, if you desire.

Mr. Iverson: I would like to give my time to Leon Hallberg.

Colonel McNamara: Thank you.

Mr. Hallberg: My name is Leon Hallberg.

I'm a candidate for governor in the state of North Dakota. I wish to thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening. I would like to state my support for the
system's requirements and can easily be upgraded if needed. Sixth, Minot has not benefited from a new system such as the B-1B and should be in line to move forward with the Air Force in its modernization effort. Seventh, Minot recently lost the 5th Fighter Interceptor Squadron, which had a severe negative economic impact on North Dakota, and Minot in particular.

First and foremost, at Minot, North Dakota.

There are other reasons I feel that one of the locations should be at Minot, North Dakota.

First, the northern location would make it ideal for targeting flexibility. Second, inland locations make it easier to defend from potential enemy attack. Third, Minot's community support is the best anywhere, and there has been a single demonstration or protest. Fourth, Minot is -- has already mitigated Peacekeeper basing regrets, including negotiation of options for land acquisition to expand the size of Minot Air Force Base and obtain the necessary rights and easements to accommodate the system's requirements. Fifth, Minot's rail network is sufficient to support the

MR. HALLBERG: Yes, I'm just asking if there were any restrictions that you would note, and there was a comment made on page 4.0.2 about the potential restrictions of state and local laws or regulations. I was just asking if you had incurred anything that had been a deterrent.

MAJOR VAN NESS: You mean that would discourage us from coming here as a result of that?

MR. HALLBERG: Yes.

MAJOR VAN NESS: None that I know of.

MR. HALLBERG: Thank you very much.

COLONEL MCBRANE: Thank you.

We will conclude the proceedings at this time. Please remember that you have until 31 August to submit written material to be included in the transcript of this hearing. Once again, oral and written statements or comments will be afforded equal weight.

Thank you. This public hearing is adjourned at 10:04 P.M.

(Closed at 10:04 P.M., the same day.)
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I recognize that some people may wish to make statements on defense policy, nuclear weapons, arms control, and fiscal policy at this meeting. However, such comments are best directed to your congressmen and senators. Please limit your comments to environmental issues.

Please refrain from public demonstrations either for or against statements made since this merely subtracts from the time available for others to make statements or ask questions.

Remember that each person should be given a respectful hearing even if his or her own views differ from your own.

We'll take a ten minute recess at this point. Please be back here ready to go about three minutes after eight.

(Silence taken.)

(Back on ' ' record.)

COL. MCMANUS: Everyone please have a seat. Sounds like we're back on the air here.

We got a couple minutes late start there and we have just had a little trouble with the

microphone so we will be running until 10:10 just to compensate for the ten minutes we lost here by starting late and microphone trouble.

What we're going to do first is call on the elected officials who have indicated a desire to speak.

Mayor Edward Dannan.

I'm sorry, before you start, sir, let me have Colonel Walsh introduce the other panel members so everyone knows who is here.

MR. WALK: On my immediate right is Major Van Ness, he's a lawyer with the Air Force assigned to the Air Force Regional Engineering. On my far right is Lt. Col. Dams. He's assigned to headquarters in the Strategic Air Command. He will respond to questions on operations. On my immediate left is Mr. Nitsch. He's employed by Tetra-Tech Corporation. Tetra-Tech was hired by the Air Force to prepare this environmental impact statement. Mr. Nitsch will respond to questions related to the effects on human resources. On my far left is Doctor Eiser. He's also employed by Tetra-Tech, and he will respond to questions on the effects on physical resources. Thank you sir.

COL. MCMANUS: Thank you, Colonel
Mayor of the City of Clinton, Missouri which is approximately 37 miles southeast or southwesterly from Whiteman Air Force Base. It's within the confines of the area currently served, currently supporting the 351st Strategic Missile Wing.

Not only the communities contiguous to Whiteman Air Force Base, but to a wide area around it.

The Clinton City Council, on behalf of its constituents has gone on record in support of the proposed rail Garrison basing at Whiteman Air Force Base as evidence by an adoption of a supporting resolution, and I will present a copy to the recorder.

Furthur that position similar action was taken on a position presented during a previous hearing on 7 April 1988. We're cognizant of the great contributions that military personnel make in the area, that they are readily accepted and encouraged to interact in community programs and efforts.

It is the considered opinion that through the present efforts of the Whiteman Army Steering Council, the increased activities that may be brought about by locating the rail Garrison at Whiteman Air Force Base can be adequately, expeditiously and effectively dealt with to the positive benefit of all. We stand ready to do our part to assure the success to the benefits.

In summary, the City of Clinton wholeheartedly supports the concept of basing the Peacekeeper as an additional mission for Whiteman Air Force Base. We will continue to strive to maintain cooperative and coordinated efforts of the military community to minimize the obstacles in this undertaking which will act as a catalyst to overcome our struggle with an already depressed agricultural economy.

In reiteration ---

COL. McHANE: Your time has run out.

MAYOR DENNAM: I was almost through.

COL. McHANE: I'll give you a few seconds.

MAYOR DENNAM: In reiteration, the citizens of Clinton do actively support the efforts to designate Whiteman Air Force Base as a Peacekeeper rail Garrison and give assurance of cooperation, coordination and open communications to this effort.

On behalf of the citizens of Clinton, I want to thank you for this opportunity.

COL. McHANE: Mr. Ben Mangia.

MAYOR MANGIA: Col. McHane, Col. Walsh, I am Ben Mangia, Mayor of the City of Windsor, Missouri, which is located...
fifteen miles south of the base.

Let the record show that the City of Windsor
fully supports the basing of the Peacekeeper Rail
Garrison System at Whiteman Air Force Base,
Missouri.

Our city, along with many of the other cities
near and around the base have for many years
supported the various military missions assigned
to the base. Its present responsibility
in maintaining and controlling 190 Minuteman II
missile sites is in every way compatible with
accepting an additional missile mission.

There are other reasons at do of a positive
nature for basing the Rail Garrison System on
Whiteman Air Force base. It is centrally located
and readily accessible to the various modes of
transportation both east, west, north and south.
This is especially true of the network of rail
systems which would provide the multiple level of
opportunities of choice for deployment of the
Peacekeeper missile system.

The feasibility of adding this second rail
connector, addressed in the draft environmental
impact statement on page 4.11 dash 46, greatly
enhances the exit opportunities of the missile
system from the base mode.

A further appraisal of these opportunities are
graphically portrayed on the National Rail Network
on page 4.1 dash 4, figure 4.1.2 dash 1.

No other base being considered for this mission
may match these exit opportunities.

I have reviewed the impact charts on pages 8-46.
41. figures 3-33 and found that in both the
Proposed and Alternative Action, with the exception
of the land use and biological resources, the
impacts on all other resources would not be
significant.

Many of the military personnel and their
families have, since the establishment of this base,
selected to reside in the City of Windsor and
the other communities surrounding this
installation. They had not only authorized --
only contributed service to this action but also to
the cities in which they live. They have been a
definite asset to our city.

And conversely, many of our citizens have been
afforded the opportunity of employment at this
installation thereby contributing to the economic
well being of this area.

The security of this nation is the

responsibility of every citizen of these United
States, not just the military. It is in this
spirit of common bond of responsibility that --

COL. MCRAN: That's your time.

MR. MARING: One sentence.

COL. MCRAN: I'm sorry, we have
one 116, 120 people want to talk.

MR. MARING: One sentence.

COL. MCRAN: I'm sorry.

Woodrow North.

MR. KIRK: I am Woodrow Kirk.

Mayor of Concordia. We're only 17 miles north of
the base but were separated from the base by three
great draws and by the Blackwater River which
floods every time we have a sprinkle in
Warrensburg. Consequently, I'm not sure we have a
tremendous impact on the base, but we would -- as
citizens I would certainly like to support the
various efforts because I can see no additions;
hence especially after viewing the presentation this
evening as adverse impact upon the area.

We already have the missiles within our area and
they been here for 25 years or longer. I don't know
that they have done any harm to anyone. And I will
certainly support the effort of the deployment of

MR. KIRK: In the area because it has, as one speaker
previously indicated, it is centrally located. It
is located apart from any metropolitan, great
metropolitan area like Seattle or San Francisco
which would certainly be a target before those of
us who live in the City of Concordia.

So, I will certainly like to add my statement
into the record together with the others and the people
of Concordia do support to the deployment of this
because ultimately that's the purpose of the United
States government not to feed the hungry and to
provide houses for everybody else --

COL. MCRAN: Folks, please.

MR. KIRK: That's the function of
the State. Thank you very much.

COL. MCRAN: Ray, please.

MR. KIRK: Gentlemen, my name is
Ray Kirk. I'm Presiding Commissioner of Johnson
County, the county in which Whiteman's located.
The Johnson County Commission would like to go
on record in supporting the Rail Garrison
Peacekeeper network designation of Whiteman Air
Force Base as one of the deployment bases for the
Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System.

Logistics have always depended on strategic
locations. Whiteman Air Force Base is located centrally in the United States, therefore, its accessibility to points throughout the country should be considered a positive factor.

The citizens of Johnson County have lived up among Minuteman missile bases for years and are very aware of the importance of a strong military defense. Johnson County has always supported Whiteman Air Force Base basic missions, have welcomed the base personnel into its community. Many military families have returned to live in Johnson County after discharge. Businesses and local communities continue to welcome the added economy the base generates.

In conclusion, Johnson County views the deployment of Whiteman Air Force Base and the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison Network as a very positive situation for the United States government. Johnson County and surrounding counties.

This is signed by the Johnson County Commission.

Ray Haring, Presiding Commissioner, Glen Goodwin,
Western Commissioner, Leland Stewart, Eastern Commissioner.

Thank you.

COL. McSHAHE: Thank you.

I have been impressed with the professional manner in which those stationed there have carried out their missions for defense. And have felt comfortable with the way it's been handled and do not know of any problems that have resulted in deployment of the Minuteman missiles over our area. I feel that the addition of approximately half a section of land to the Peacekeeper Ball Garrison would be an asset to the area and strongly support this measure coming to our community.

COL. McSHAHE: Thank you.

The balance of these cards are from individuals who did not indicate they were elected officials or holding any office. They have been shuffled by the public affairs folks that collected them. I've shuffled them myself and they are in totally random order.

Leroy Krider, please.

LEROY KRIDER: Leroy Krider.

Executive Director of Keaysinger Basin Regional Planning Commission in Clinton, Missouri. And I represent a body of elected officials and citizens representing seven counties in an area south known as Casser (phonoetic) Basin. We live within the area of 70 missile sites and so far we have never had any problems from any of the transportation of the missiles to our area.

I want to address this evening what I hope to be the environmental impact statement.

The statistical impact. What I did. I went through these and looked at some of the areas of statistical impact of the rail garrison would not present a different picture from what exists at the present time except the new spur rail that would be through a sparsely populated area. Slightly affecting a few households.

Noise level would not increase on the main line. The frequency would be a use normally that exists at this particular time. In fact, the Katy Rail. I would be addressing this at this time. would be decreasing somewhat in service so the rail missile would not increase existing traffic.

The spur would create new impacted persons but -- as it would be going close to some areas that are not presently affected by the spur. I called an archaeological surveyor that had formally resided in Clinton, he indicated to me that the general area had been surveyed. Just in general, not in specific. And he knew of no archeologically significant sites. There are minor sites, but none
of archaeological significance.

I spoke with four Missouri conservation specialists that gave the following information, and I will supply this as documentation in writing if you want. I can also give their names. Some affected wildlife were found in the general area. For example, blacktail jack rabbits is considered state rare but not nationally rare.

There are some remnants of the population over the vicinity, however, the railroad right-of-way as far as the statistics are concerned, would be considered as excellent habitat for those particular species and probably would enhance their existence in this area.

There is the prairie chicken ground on the southeast corner Whiteman Air Force Base. However, the spring survey was done and there was no indication that this ground was still being used by the prairie chickens. That doesn't mean they wouldn't come back, but they're not presently being used at this time.

Again, the conservation agent indicated that the railroad right-of-way would be an excellent site for habitat for the prairie chickens as well as the rabbits.

As a result of the conservation computer search nothing was found that indicated any natural prairie plant remnants that were still in this particular area.

The spur rail was to pass through natural timber stands, the standing dead trees may be some coincidence of summer colonies of gray bats: they know of no incident, no reported sightings of any colonies in this area.

COL. MCKEAN: Time, Mr. Krider.

MR. KNIDER: Thank you. I will send in a prepared statement later.

COL. MCKEAN: Thank you.

Lorraine Crouch: I'm sorry?

VOICE: Someone want to go get her.

COL. MCKEAN: I will come back to her after the next speaker.

Eric Wilbur?

MR. WILBUR: I don't have a prepared statement or anything. I think that as you can see around the wall you see a lot of signs and hear people talking. A lot of people have come up said they supported this. As you can see on the wall there's people that don't support it. I think part of this process is to raise the consciousness...
Many people could not come.

I would like to ask you, as I did once before, to please allow for more hearings and in more places. This is not just a concern to simply Whiteman Air Force Base and surrounding environments. We're very happy that Clinton and Cordray and all are very happy to have the missile, that's good for them. They're going to get a little welfare ride from defense systems.

But, there are other parts of this state where these things could conceivably be rolling through. We know the rail line runs through Springfield. So it's only fair that we would have public access to these kind of hearings.

[APPLAUSE]

I want to make one practical comment here, not that it wasn't practical enough.

The DESI, as I have had limited time to take a look at it, but the DEIS as I see it did not address any economic impacts in a tourist state that may go on as a result of what you called significant economic impacts.

I don't want you to answer this now but I would like for that to be addressed in the environmental impact statement at the end result. But you have not really considered the economic impacts that might result from the following of various environments in the area.

Finally, I will probably say that out of time but I do want to mention I find the whole prospect of our outlining or considering outside the category of consideration, the prospect of the use of these weapons.

I know you're hearing that old logic. We build these not to use them. I see for a strong defense, but the use of these weapons in the situation that you have set them up is very destabilizing and frightening to me. I don't feel that it makes for a valid environment impact statement if you have not included the possibility of some kind of use of the weapon or use of weapons against the weapon.

COL. McSHEA: Time.

MR. MCKEL: Thank you.

COL. McSHEA: Susan Rieger.

VOICE: She had to leave and yields her time to Mike Magee (phonetic).

COL. McSHEA: Is she here?

VOICE: She just walked out the door; she has to go to work.

COL. McSHEA: I call Eva Myers.
power.

The impact may not be that significant, when you talk about running it through our State on a fairly inadequate rail system it may very well be appropriate for you to consider.

I know you, Colonel, and it is a pleasure to call you Colonel, but this is not in your bailiwick. I think it would merit the Air Force's consideration to talk to people and have these hearings in cities other than the immediately affected vicinity, because I think there's other parts along our rail system that are equally affected.

I thank you very much for your courtesy.

COL. MCBRANE: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

COL. MCBRANE: Mike Langworthy?

MR. LANGWORTHY: I would like to yield to Greg Lombardi.

MR. LOMBARDI: My name is Greg Lombardi, I'm a member of the Kansas City Nuclear Weapons Coalition. I would like to address a few issues in regards to rail safety not adequately addressed in the draft environmental impact statement.

...
Mr. Walsh: I would like to respond to it, please.

Mr. Lombardi: You're not being asked to respond to it. This is absolutely off because the Air Force now says it's going to be 96 feet in length. But as such would still be the longest car on the track. Once more, it will weigh substantially more than any other rail car on the tracks. We do not know what the unloaded weight of the HF rail car would be and that a something that was not addressed in the draft environmental impact statement and should be addressed but --

Col. McNamara: Time.

Mr. Lombardi: I have additional comments to make.

(Applause)

Col. McNamara: I told you earlier not to use the time for expressions of approval or disapproval the clock is running.

Mr. Walsh: May I make a comment there on the information incorporated into a question?

Col. McNamara: I think there are some comments which would be appropriate to the discussions. I think Mr. Lombardi is going to speak some more about that. When he finishes that I will give you an opportunity to talk about it.

Scott Wittstruck.

Mr. Wittstruck: Your Honor, my name is Scott Wittstruck. I'm a concerned citizen from Columbia, Missouri. I would like to present a few comments concerning the psychological and medical impacts of the HF rail garrison not addressed in the DIDS.

I first became aware of nuclear weapons only six years ago. In 1982 my English teacher attempted to explain to the fifth-grade class the concept of the nuclear clock. He told us nuclear war would be inevitable when the clock reached midnight, and in 1983 we had little chance of surviving nuclear war.

He told us if the clock moved over five minutes to midnight that we would all die in nuclear war in five years, which would have been 1987. Needless to say I was terrified.

I became obsessed with the belief I would never live to finish my education or graduate from high school. My fear of nuclear weapons grew as I read about Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I saw movies such as Doctor Strangelove and The Day After.

As 1987 became history my obsession didn't diminish. My fear of nuclear war didn't disappear. Not any uncommon feeling among the youth of America.

Although some young people choose to ignore the problem or choose to do nothing to solve the problem, the fear is there. We do not agree with Pete Townsend who wrote, I hope I die before I get old. I want to live to become an adult.

Children are the future of the human race. The world we will inherit is not a happy one. However, the ozone layer is crumbling, our land is terribly polluted, our natural resources are dwindling and the U.S. national debt is unbelievable.

However, the problem that is worse than all the others is the arms race. We heritage a world in which we can live.

People suggest we should not fear nuclear weapons because they will never be used, if that were true then the U.S. government is simply wasting tax dollars, money which could be used much more positive and efficient ways.

People suggest nuclear weapons provide a deterrent against war. The nuclear weapons are not built to keep the peace, nuclear weapons are built for one sole purpose, genocide.

The government can attempt to convince people that the HF Peacekeeper missile put on railroad cars will be kept in place with minimal change to the rail and there is no sensible nuclear level of actions -- dealing with nuclear weapons. Before the decision is made before you decide whether to follow through with the plan to mount HF missiles on railroad trains. I implore you to please consider the future of the race. Think twice about the children.

Thank you.

Col. McNamara: John Klotz.

Mr. Klotz: I just wanted to be brief. I'm from Kansas City. I am a concerned citizen. I wanted to be sure the environmental -- I wanted to be sure the environmental considerations that went into the declaration of nuclear weapons along with other weapons, certain other weapons, as being illegal in terms of international law and some of the treaties of the United States and, therefore, the Constitution being considered. I'm sure that environmental concerns are major concerns in the international
and size it will be very similar to a high cube car which you see very frequently on the track for a triple deck car carrier.

As far as weight is concerned, it will be slightly unusual. But there are many railroad cars on the railroad tracks that are of this weight. There are commercial trains for cars currently moving over the rail system. We have done a very detailed analysis of the rail track of the -- working with the various rail companies as well as with the national -- the Federal Railway Administration. We have determined that of the available track over 200 thousand miles of it would be available to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison System.

COL. McShane: Greg Lombardi.

MR. LOMBARDI: Just a few more comments here. Your Honor.

Again, what the MX rail car may weigh, again, we don't know because the Air Force hasn't told us. That the weight unloaded may be as much as 200 thousand pounds. We don't know that. The total weight of the rail car may range anywhere, again, we don't know because the Air Force hasn't told us.

From 450 thousand to 800 thousand pounds. That's

Another fault is just simply going around curves because of the great weight. Another thing is that these cars are being easily identifiable by anyone who wants to sabotage them for several reasons.

Again, they'll be the biggest, the longest cars on the tracks. Be the only car on the track that is not opened. They will be a covered car and will also have at least eight axles. No other car on the road at that length will have that many axles. Anybody that wants to sabotage the MX rail car, all they have to do is look for the 89 foot car with eight axles. It's like it will almost be written on the side and should be extremely easy to sabotage those.

For those reasons, and because of the consequences of a rail accident, if one of these has an accident, even if the warhead does not explode, even if it's just the that fuel that goes off, a one thousand foot radius around the rail car would be fattened.

The Air Force says that all life structures in that area would be in total collapse. I assume the Air Force means that to include human beings. Also, this would spray hydrochloric and nitric acid in potentially lethal doses. This was what the B38

Bodies and in the Congress of the United States.

COL. McShane: Thank you.

Thomas Fitzpatrick.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Mr. McShane.

Col. Walsh, welcome back. I'm Tom Fitzpatrick. A

Warrensburg resident by choice. I support the

basing of the Rail Garrison here in Warrensburg and

Johnson County.

I appreciate the comments of the younger people.

the older people. The people who are against the

basing system here. But I think that fears are

groundless, and I just wanted to publicly state

that as a private citizen on behalf myself and my

family. I think that we can certainly accommodate

the Air Force people and the system here in

Warrensburg.

Col. Walsh, I have one question for you sir.

would you please describe the length and the weight

of the rail car for the carrying of the missile?

MR. WALSH: Str. the length of the

of the rail car -- As I coming through?

VOICES: No.

MR. WALSH: The length of the rail

car would be approximately 89 feet long. 17 feet

high and approximately 10 feet wide. In appearance

more than a half a million pounds.

The idea that this is safe on America's rail

lines which are quickly going into disrepair is

just not right.

The Air Force's assumption these rail cars will

be as safe as normal commercial rail cars is

just -- it is unbelievable. The problems include

again, here we have what's an MX rail car

approximation compared with the average rail car.

Problems include potential rail or rail failure

Because of the incredible weight of this rail car.

Second, this rail car is going to have a very

high center of gravity. First time these rail cars

are going to be 17 feet high, the normal railroad

is approximately 13 feet high. Lt. Col. Walsh says

this is going to be like an exposed triple deck car

that's used for transporting automobiles. But

those cars can carry a much much lighter weight

the MX rail car is expected to carry. Probably

half the weight. Again, we don't know because the

Air Force hasn't provided us with statistics. I

hope they do in the final B38.

The high center of gravity will lead to

excessive rock because the great weight of this

will make accidents highly probable.
I have been a resident of Warrensburg since 1949. The presence of Whiteman Air Force Base has always been a part of my life. While the military operations at Whiteman Air Force Base have changed over the years, it has always supplied employment and stability to the Warrensburg. Johnson County economy.

I wholeheartedly endorse the additional military activity connected with the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program. The economic impact of Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program and the additional diversification of people coming from various parts of the United States to enrich the new mission would be a benefit to Warrensburg. Johnson County and the surrounding area. Thank you.

MS. COPFMANN: I'm just a concerned citizen from Springfield, Missouri. I'm a concerned citizen from Springfield, Missouri. I would like to address the lady who said she felt secure by having the missiles were going to be around. I just want to say, my father is a retired Colonel in the Army. I lived on many, many bases, and I want to say I never once felt secure. But I felt threatened by a war at all times.

My testimony concerns the inadequacy of the draft environmental impact statement, and I don't believe that three minutes is enough time to give everybody enough time to convey pro or con to the missile.

I would also like to communicate two of my personal statements concerning the MX. One, nuclear weapons, including the MX, are a self fulfilling prophecy. Just think about it. You're asking for -- we are asking for death.

Two, there are no jobs in the nuclear war. I mean, you're concerned about the jobs but after the war there are no jobs. And in the words of a musician, Tracy Chapman, I would voice the common question to all the people here, why are the missiles called Peacekeepers when their aim is to kill?
COL. MCGHANE: Miss Coffman, you may of course address written comments if you didn't feel three minutes was sufficient.

Laura Bogue.

MR. BOUGIE: I would like to thank everybody for the opportunity to speak tonight. I would like to state first my objections to some procedural issues.

I do feel like the scope of the environmental impact study that the Air Force is conducting is too narrow. I think if we're going to consider the impact of this project, we have to look further than simply the physical close by surrounding impact it has. I believe that we need to spread out to who's route of the trains that pass through, also consider the impact of a nuclear war. That is what we are talking about. Nuclear weapons, they are meant to kill.

I am very nearly speechless, but not quite speechless, in the face of the grand assurances I get from the Air Force that accidents are impossible. The evidence that you are gathering imperial as it may be seen to rule out anything that we haven't seen before. We haven't seen a derailment of a rail car such as the NS rail car that would provide in our neighborhood and community. There is no imperative evidence to support what the impact of any kind of accident whether it be a derailment, whether it be operator problems, whether it be sabotage. There is no imperative evidence short of an accident.

If you are waiting for that kind of evidence in order to make a finding on that evidence, you will be too late. You have to decide these issues before the fact it's the only way possible. There is no way to try this out and put back if there is no accident. That is not possible.

I would like to point to a couple of incidents. I don't know how only have the vague details of them. I would wonder if the accidents that occurred, for example, the fuel plant in Nevada exploding was that provided for? Was there a contingency plan? Was there imperative evidence to support the possibility of that accident occurring before the fact? I would suggest that there wasn't. The Titan Two explosion in Arkansas, was that predictable by you gentlemen by the environmental impact siting or whatever siting was or before.

that method was put into use?

I would say that we have to use little bit of imagination. I don't think that we can stand by and say it hasn't happened yet because it only takes once for it to be a catastrophe. And that's what we're worried about. We don't want to live with this kind of fear. The economic impacts of that kind of fear can be as damaging as an accident can be. People perceive this system to be dangerous. People live in fear that you are hiding their weapons behind their backs in their midst. That's environmental impact, a mental impact that can boil down to being an economic impact. Can this system for predicting environmental impact come up with that? It think not.

I think your draft environmental impact statement is inadequate in that respect and I will ask for you examine it in the next statement.

Thank you very much.

COL. MCGHANE: Thank you.

Col. Walsh, did you have a response to that?

MR. WALSH: In response to your question, ma'am, the Air Force did not assume that there could not be an accident involving the Peacekeeper train. In fact in our analysis we identified first of all the possibility of normal rail accidents, and we identified the normal over the life of system there could be up to three fatalities, sixteen incapacitations. We also did analysis of what the types of forces that were developed. The various types of accidents would be that would cause a missile or missile propellant to ignite and then we look to the types of accidents that would create such a force and using that analysis we had a prediction on the types and the extent of the --

MR. BOUGE: Excuse me.

MR. WALSH: Excuse me. Will you listen to your question. I'm answering your question.

COL. MCGHANE: You asked the question, ma'am.

MR. BOUGE: I didn't --

MR. WALSH: We identified what the --

MR. BOUGE: (Not audible.)

COL. MCGHANE: Answer the question.

MR. WALSH: We identified the full extent and consequences.

(CORRUPTION)
At this point when I would like to hear the impact of the Air Force study.

The report, however, indicates that the proposed system will result in a relatively isolated area. Furthermore, it indicates that the system is not feasible or adequately developed due to the costs and the need for further study.

In order to implement the system, we need to consider the impact on the surrounding communities. This is critical to the success of the project and will require further consideration.

Is it acceptable to proceed with the system as proposed? Is it even feasible?
where will it go. How far are we willing to go as a nation in putting our own citizens at such high risk in supposedly defending ourselves against the Soviets?

Why does the draft not examine and prepared a comparative study of the more than 30 basing modes? Why have you considered the one hundred MX missiles an alternative when Congress has specifically mandated fifty missiles? This is not a proper alternative.

COL. McSHANE: Time.

MS. PRINS: Why have you not considered the No Action Alternative? Why do --

COL. McSHANE: Time.

MS. PRINS: Thank you.

Kimberly Massey.

MS. MASSEY: My name is Kimberly Massey. I am from Springfield, Missouri. I'm here to speak on behalf of myself and my future grand children.

I would like to address the security issue. With a system as powerful as this around there will have to be stepped up securities action. I would like to address my questions to the ISR and have them answered in that.

Thank you.

COL. McSHANE: Marc Bachand.

MS. BACHAND: Good evening.

gentlemen, my name is Marc Bachand, and I'm here as a private citizen. I'm the father of two young boys. I've recently contracted to build my home about a mile and a half from Whiteman Air Force Base. I fell in love with this area of the country.

Missouri is one of the beautiful states I've ever seen. As I have traveled around I have seen a lot of missile sites, like every one else I'm not real thrilled with nuclear war, but because I have traveled the world I do know there are people out there willing and ready and able to do just that. I think we need to be prepared.

I think that the Air Force and the Department of Defense has done a good job keeping faith with the people of Missouri. I think the missiles sites are low keyed as they possibly can be and that the safety record here at Whiteman is unbelievable. I think any rational person is going base future performance on past performance, and if that is so I think rail Garrison is going to be a safe system. I hope it is as the Minuteman system which has never had a serious or any nuclear accident.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

COL. McSHANE: Helen Burkam.

MS. BURKAN: My name's Helen Burkam. I'm from Columbia, Missouri. I read once a quote in the Reader's Digest that said the United States is the only country deliberately founded on a good idea. Part of that good idea was that we the people have a say in what happens to us. We do not want anymore nuclear weapons.

This is not a safe game, we're talking about people, people's lives. We're not just little specks on the highway you can fly over, clusters of subdivisions. We are people with lives we care about.

I have a nine year old son who loves baseball. I have six year old twin daughter learning to read. I've a chubby little toddler who trusts me to take care of him, and I am very, very much afraid of nuclear war.

There's so many things to worry about, there are natural disasters, there's traffic accidents there's, drunken drivers. There's toxic waste. Please let's don't manufacture things that are so dangerous that they make all of these things pale
will be minimal or no environmental impacts and find these to be acceptable as well.

Col. Walsh, I would like you to address a question once again of the dimensions of the rail car for the people that didn’t hear it earlier.

MR. WALSH: Rather than take up the time I will ask you afterwards. I would like to give as much time to the people as possible since I’ve already commented.

COL. McKEE: Ron Bankeski.

MR. BANKESKI: Ron Bankeski from Pioneer. I’m a member of Christians for Nuclear Disarmament. Please answer our concerns in the final EIS.

First procedural item, the draft EIS was not available soon enough for concerned citizens to study it and consider the information. I borrowed a copy briefly. I borrowed it from a group at least 300 miles from my home.

Jesuus taught, don’t lie. Don’t steal. Don’t kill. He also told us to feed the hungry.

I know the quote a false statement of an outrageous magnitude employed as a propaganda measure in the belief that a lesser falsehood would not be credible that’s the definition of the big lie. It is a propaganda technique perfected by Hitler’s Nazi’s in the 30s and 40s. Having the MX missile the Peacekeeper is a big lie. /

The MX is a war starter missile. It was designed. It has been deployed and you’re planning to deploy it further in a first strike mode. It is a weapon intended to be launched to start a nuclear war.

The missiles already deployed in Wyoming cannot survive a first strike back to the Soviets.

Therefore, they must be launched very early.

The MX has a surgical error or probable C. E. P. of 300 feet. That means if they are launched to the 42 hundred nautical miles of the MN Site will land or explode within one city block of the aiming point.

My question will approximately forty or more of these very accurate hydrogen bombs on rail cars in an area of two city blocks, 400 feet by 400 feet, will that cause the Soviets to launch an attack or some other adversary to attack that spot early during a crisis instead of waiting for tension to build up for us to move them out of the way?

Another area the Air Force did not examine was the secondary effects of a rail accident. I’ve been a volunteer fire department fire fighter. In that training with hazardous materials, the fire chief from over here by Booneville on the edge of the missile field explained they had two accidents recently. One of them a semi-trailer truck ran off I-70 and landed and stopped across the railroad tracks. I believe it was the same tracks that cross through and connect with Whiteman Air Force Base. A train came through there and cut the tanker in two.

He had two accidents. I can’t remember which which chemical was spilled this time. One time it was hydrochloric acid. The other time was hydrocyanic acid. Sodium hydrosulfite, which is lie.

Drainage.

What would those kind of chemicals do to an MX missile in a derailment. If you hit another train or hit a tanker truck, what happens to those missiles and components and control systems?

Thank you. Please answer these questions in the EIS. Thank you.

COL. McKEE: Robert Marble.

MR. MARBLE: Sir, I appeal to you as a member of the judiciary and ask you the question whether or not this hearing is not so
I would like to speak from this about the MX missile.

The public has a much larger interest than the many unwinding technicalities that are raised in this report.

In order to look at some of the deeper things I would like to go to the union of concerned scientists, an organization of our nation that includes within it scientists from nearly every major university in the United States. I would like to speak from this about the MX missile.

--

COL. MCSEAM: Time. Mr. Marble.

MR. MARBLE: Thank you very much.

I will address your one comment. you talked about vested interest talking first, or talking first. the folks that talked first are elected officials and are those who represent the most people, so they were given the courtesy of speaking first. There were five people. The balance of the people have been randomly selected, and I think you can see that the deck has not been loaded.

Yes, sir.

VOICE: This is my very point that the few people that are represented in these communities are not the whole public that is affected by this plan.

COL. MCSEAM: I understand your point.

Doctor James Jones.

MR. JONES: James Jones from Springfield, Missouri. James Jones from Springfield. Missouri. This is my comment on the previous hearing and on the draft of the environmental impact statement.

(SITTING)
Missouri.

Briefly, I would like to say I'm greatly disappointed in the bill drafted by this panel of they say professionals. The display they showed us here had absolutely no numbers and I sincerely hope in the final bill they do have some facts and details and specifics such as the specific feet and length of the train. I would like to yield the rest of my time to Kathy Thomas.

MS. THOMAS: My name's Kathy Thomas. I'm here representing the Missouri Rural Crisis Center, a state-wide vast organization of more than thousand members of workers of farmers and agriculture in Strongwell, Missouri.

At the April 7 scoping hearing I voiced our concern about how the deployment of the MX missile in Missouri would affect rural areas. This is an agricultural state made up for the most part of small family farms and the economy of the State is heavily dependent on the survival of these farms.

Agriculture counts for 33 percent of State's jobs. Missouri is one of states hit hardest by the rural crisis. Bankruptcies increasing 300 percent between 1981 and 1985. You can't eliminate family farms without eliminating the rural towns and their construction. After that it would be for a very short time then would drop off sharply.

Rural workers believe in a strong defense. We need life to defend. The technique of portraying missiles as a job program for rural areas is not going to work this time as it did with the Minuteman missileшелите --

COL. McFARREN: Time, ma'am.

-- that cover a large portion of our State, much of it rich food producing lands. Therefore --

COL. McFARREN: Time, ma'am, time.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you.

COL. McFARREN: Helen Chudomelka.

Sorry if I mispronounced that.

MS. CHUDOMELEA: I'm Helen Chudomelka from Aurora, Missouri. We're here I understand to address the environment. If we're not alive the environment is not going to matter. Apparently we now have dangerous missiles we don't know what to do with. My question is, haven't we learned anything from producing nuclear energy before we know what to do with nuclear waste?

I would like to give the rest of my time to Bob Harbell.

COL. McFARREN: Ma'am, hold on. The ground rules do not really call for that. I let that go last time because it snaked up on me there but give up your entire time or you speak for yourself.

MS. CHUDOMELEA: One question answered by the E. I. S.

COL. McFARREN: Thank you. What I said earlier was that you could yield your time your entire time to an individual if you were here. That was how it happened the first times and --

(COMMENTS NOT UNDERSTANDABLE)

COL. McFARREN: I'm sorry you didn't understand it.


MR. WAX: My name is Jack Wax. I'm a private citizen from Columbia, Missouri. I want first to respond to the question by the Roman Catholic Priest.

COL. McFARREN: Keep the microphone up.

MR. WAX: I want to first respond to the question by the Roman Catholic Priest about the environmental impact of the these weapons if their ever used. I've an account here from Doctor Charles Stevensen, first U.S. physician to through
medical assistance to Nagaakhi. It’s very brief.

So says, we walked up the ladder, the whole
place was absolutely silent, there wasn’t a sound.
there wasn’t one human being in sight. As I
reached the top of the floor I did look over the entire
and of valley where the city had been and it just
looked like everything had been covered with black
or dark gray cover of ashes. I didn’t know enough
about the bomb to know heat set everything on fire
that could burn. The people who were closely
exposed were quickly fried into an ash. Others
looked like something like over cooked soft shelled
crab. I couldn’t believe they were human beings.
We felt like we were walking on the moon shovelling
through all that dust.

I don’t think it is the will of the American
people to have more nuclear weapons. Call them
Peacekeepers, call them whatever you want to call
them, they are weapons built to kill thousands of
people. Children, women, other civilians guilty
of what crime? It is not my will. I don’t believe it
is the will of any other Americans in this room to
go ahead and produce more over these weapons and
eventually use them.

Why would our counterparts, the civilians in

essentially for me as it is for the local folks.

I really find it puzzling why it’s important for
us to spend ten, fifteen billion dollars to produce
a mobile railway MX missile when we have already in
invested some three billion, at least appropriated
some three billion, for a Trident II missile, which
will be far more adequately concealed under the
ocean and which will be at least as effective in
producing peace as the Peacekeeper.

COL. McS1AJS: Thank you.

MR. RUSSELL: I have some

statements that are repetitions, but I would like
to read them. They are short.

My name is Frances Russell. I’m a native of
Missouri; I’m a Sister of Charity Convent in
Kansas. My community is sisters of Charity at
Leavenworth.

I have worked in the Midwest and western part of
the United States for 120 years. Members of the
Sisters of Charity, approximately 200 in number,
presently work in six of the States’ proposed as
locations for the MX rail garrison. So I’m here as
a Missourian and as a representative of the Sisters
of Charity in our social justice network, but
especially for the Sisters of Charity who work in
Missouri and have the welfare of the people of
Missouri in mind and heart.

In addition, I’m a professional social worker.

As a Missourian, a voter, and a representative of
others who work for the health and welfare of
people, I oppose the MX rail garrison plan. My
opposition to it is as follows:

It does not respect the will of the majority of
the American people who have stated that arms
control is a major concern that they want
addressed. It does not give credence to the
significance of the INF or SALT treaties which
have provided a break through to the international
treatment of the arms race.

It further ignores part of the proposal which
has the deployment of mobile based nuclear missiles. My
own thesis is that the rail Garrison plan is in part
of an old agenda, a political agenda, and I believe
that the American people are now choosing a new
agenda.

I have several specific points that I would
like to address in the MX. The major
consideration tonight as Lieutenant Col. Walsh

other countries deserves to die and be killed
horribly. We should forget these people in our
environmental impact especially considering the Air
Force sees fit to consider the life of water fowls
and jack rabbits in there.

The environmental impact statement mentioned
today also neglects the moral dimension of
our decision to allow these weapons into our
communities.

It will affect our educational systems and it
will be teaching our children that these weapons,
weapons such as these are acceptable. I find it
unacceptable.

Finally, I do have the right and responsibility
to defend ourselves and our country. I can hardly
believe we’re so stupid and vicious we can’t think
of something better than this crude, morally
repugnant method that will certainly carry out and
increase the risk of nuclear war.

COL. McS1AJS: Thank you. R. H.
Ash.

MR. ASH: My name is Richard Ash.

I’m an Episcopal Priest from Mexico, Missouri.

Mexico, Missouri is about 150 driving miles from
here, therefore, the impact environmental is
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pointed out was that the MX garrison plan complicates enemy targeting. That's its claim to fame. And I see that as a liability, because I feel that the MX rail garrison plan expands the targeting area and places many more people and much more lead at risk. The missiles are considered mobile but they're on a slow train. The advantage of mobility is to offer rapid deployment. But the rail garrison system does not provide for rapid deployment since I believe it's estimated they would take four to six hours to disperse the trains from their garrisons.

COL. MCNABE: Time. If you had further questions you can put them in writing.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you.

COL. MCNABE: Herb and Doris Bauer.

MR. BAUER: I yield to Mark Rain.

MR. RAIN: Good evening. My name's Mark Rain. I'm director of the Mid-Missouri Nuclear Weapons Group from Columbia, Missouri.

I think it's unfortunate that there were a number of significant environmental concerns that were not adequately addressed in the DEIS. The ultimate environmental problem of nuclear garrison be authorized, we must get clear answers to serious environmental problems associated with warhead production. The environmental issues which must be addressed, and course I want these addressed in the DEIS and not now, are questions which are included but not limited to the issues of first, the impact of the plutonium production at Savannah River in South Carolina, including worker exposure, routine and accidental environmental releases, and eventual waste processing, handling, isolation, shipping, so-called disposal of the waste.

I would like these categories to be handled in all these areas I'm raising now.

I would also like to know about the impacts from the reprocessing and the Furor processing in the Savannah River to isolate the plutonium for use.

I'd like to know about the impacts of handling and transporting plutonium to Rocky Flats in Colorado.

I'd like to know about the impacts from the manufacture of plutonium parts at Rocky Flats in Colorado. I'd also like to know about the impact from production of tritium at Savannah River, South Carolina, and also the impacts from handling transportation of this tritium to Pantex in Texas.

I would like to know about the impacts from process handling and shipping of highly enriched uranium at, to and from Pantex and Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

I would like to know about the impacts of the assembly of these warheads. Their handling and shipment to their points of deployment.

Finally, I would like to know about the impacts of any and all other processes and/or activities I've not included in this list at other locations not specifically noted above that are part of the warhead manufacturing process.

Since the dawn of nuclear age the U.S. has produced a horrendous legacy of nuclear weapon waste. Approximately 60 thousand nuclear warheads have been manufactured.

COL. MCNABE: Time.

MR. RAIN: Well, in conclusion, they're talking about a system, a weapons system; where is the bomb?

COL. MCNABE: Could I have your last name again and spell it, please.

MR. RAIN: R-a-i-w, Mark Rain.

COL. MCNABE: David Pearce.
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which is placing eight to twelve multi-warhead
missiles, not Peacekeepers in one location near a
population center in uncovered garages. Each of
these missiles has the explosive power hundreds of
times the bomb dropped in Hiroshima.

I think this poses a great threat to the people
of this area and should be addressed in the DEIS.

One issue of importance that is not adequately
addressed in the draft environmental impact
statement deals with the economic impacts. The
DEIS examines accidents in isolation where there's
likely to be secondary effects of cost. For
example, if there were an explosion and consequence
release of radioactive material, even if the
exposure levels were not harmful to humans, there
would be an economic impact.

The public mind in such situations perceive
agricultural products from this area of the
accident as unsafe and might, thus, buy less of
them. The cost of a one percent drop in
agricultural sales from Johnson County would run
into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It is possible that the public might respond by
decreasing their purchases of all Missouri
agricultural products resulting in millions of

Advancing this in the final environmental impact
statement.

I also have some other question about
procedures. I think that there should be more time
and that there should be more hearings throughout
the state, and people have mentioned it affects the
people all over the state. I think that people
should be able to get up on the stage and talk and
have water available as Col. Walsh and -- Lt. Col.
Walsh and Col. McShane, and we --

COL. McSHANE: Time, ma'am.

MS. YOUNG: Thank you.

COL. McSHANE: Brian Page.

MR. PAGE: I would like to yield to
Anna Ginsburg.

MS. GINSBURG: My name is Anna
Ginsburg. I am Director of the St. Louis Community
for Nuclear Weapons Freeze, which is affiliated
with the national campaign to stop the.

First of all, I would like to thank the Air
Force for holding these hearings and giving us the
opportunity to comment. And Lt. Col. Walsh I'd like
to thank you for giving the citizens more time to

75

come this evening.

I also would like to make a request that the
comment period be extended beyond the current
deadline of August 30th. It's a very technical
document to those of us who don't have the
expertise, and we would very much like more time to
study it to be able to determine what the issues we
would like to raise, what questions we would like
to have asked.

I would also like to request that hearings be
held in St. Louis and other locations around the
state where there is concern. My organization has
1,300 members, I know a significant number of them
would be interested in coming to a public hearing
were it to be held in the St. Louis area. It took
me about four hours to drive over this afternoon.

In addition, Mike Wolf's comments about riding
the train across the State of Missouri made me
remember what it's like to be on that train. There
are times when the train comes particularly close to
the Missouri River. This is a state where there is
serious problem of soil erosion. I would like to

know if you considered what the cumulative affects
might be of a train accident along the Missouri
River where soil erosion might play a role? If you
choose to answer that tonight that's fine. If not I
would definitely like to see it addressed in the
final DEIS.

Thank you.

COL. McSHANE: Thank you. Jeff
Stack.

MR. STACK: Good evening. First of
all, no disrespect for you folks. I need to address
the audience. This is a public hearing. I will
address them.

First of all, I'm here as a citizen from
Columbia, Missouri. I'm a new father, a couple
months old last job. I'm here for my son. I am
also here to make several points, one I think this
public hearing has been a farce on democracy.

The Air Force presented forty minutes worth of
public relations information; we had the
opportunity of three minutes each.

As members of the public should have three
minutes well as we should. Also I would like to
point to the -- talked to earlier and mentioned to
me that all public comments are incorporated into
The DEB. I didn't see any names mentioned along
with any comments. I think the public has not been
included in this process. The House Armed Service
Committee in 1966 has given
little weight to critical reaction from society. I
think that's continuing on. That was from the
Columbia Tribune in April.
Also I would like to see some hands of those
that had a chance to comment. How many people are
there opposed to the MX: can I see some hands.

COL. McKEE: We're not taking a
vote or a referendum tonight.

MR. STACK: Better than that, well
well over half of the people I think that needs to
be brought out because not everyone can make the
comments at this time.

Sorry, nothing against you let them
consider that in basing.

Also the effects of nuclear war. We need to
counter that as well and keep that in mind.

Also the effects of nuclear weapons if you will
now. There are two million homeless people in the
country, we're talking about one hundred million

fishing hook.
The lady talked of coming across families, including
her relatives. People who remained just burning the
remains of these relatives just to prevent the
disease. 70 thousand people were burned. Were
burned after being burned and incinerated.
Again I would like to encourage people in
considering this process to be considered, get more
public input. Like to have the draft environmental
impact statement look at the nuclear war effects of
that in basing.

COL. McKEE: Time. Mr. Stack.

VOICE: We had to leave.

COL. McKEE: Thank you.

Robert James.

MR. JAMES: Excuse me everybody, but
I am going to face the gentlemen on the panel.
Excuse me. I'm going to face the gentlemen.
I'm going to go ahead and speak. I'd like to
speak to the people back here. I'm going to turn
and face the people I want to speak to, that's the
people on the panel. I want to say that I think
that the attitude of federal government in sending
this panel here to whitewash what's going to be
gooding on with the MX missile is insulting every
single person who believes in democracy in the
United States. And if you gentlemen had this
happen in a country that our government says is not
democratic you would be talking about the mockery
and travesty of justice that's occurring here
tonight.

There's no way that you can look at a statement
that's as thick as the statement we're looking at
today and talk about it in three minutes. You
can't talk about the environmental impact that's
going on Europe on Asia, on the entire world.
We're seeing it here in the United States today and
in the midwest, and we're seeing the family farms
go under because of what we have done to the ozone
cover and we're talking about using a bomb that
will do a thousand times more damage than what
we're seeing happen to the industry that's the most
important in Missouri, the agricultural industry.
The agriculture will go downhill in Europe, the
water system will go downhill in Europe. We're not
just talking about the Soviet Union, we're talking
about all of Europe. We're talking about a nuclear
winter, a nuclear winter that will wipe out
everything in existence on the planet of the earth.

dollars for an MX basing program in Missouri alone.
We have at least two or three million homeless
people now, there will be more than seven million
homeless people by the end of the century.

We need to deal with these people. They are
individuals, we should care for. We should be
working on trying to destroy people. Soviet people
or who else or all the people of the world or all
life on this planet.

I was in Hiroshima a couple years ago in 1983. I
had the opportunity to talk to some survivors of
atomic bomb. It is a very somber experience. I
wanted to pass on some comments from one woman.
She had lost most of her family in the war. In the
atomic bombing.

By the way, that weapon was very small in
comparison to what we are talking about. 140
thousand people died Hiroshima alone. Eight
thousand people more in the bombing of Nagasaki
and the years since then.

Also the effects of nuclear war. We need to
consider that as well and keep that in mind.

Also the effects of nuclear weapons if you will
now. There are two million homeless people in the
country, we're talking about one hundred million

We're seeing people die. We're seeing more in the
bombing. We're seeing homes destroyed. We're
seeing lives destroyed. We're seeing homes.

There's no way you can look at a statement
that's as thick as the statement we're looking at
today and talk about it in three minutes. You
can't talk about the environmental impact that's
going on Europe on Asia, on the entire world.
We're seeing it here in the United States today and
in the midwest, and we're seeing the family farms
go under because of what we have done to the ozone
cover and we're talking about using a bomb that
will do a thousand times more damage than what
we're seeing happen to the industry that's the most
important in Missouri, the agricultural industry.
The agriculture will go downhill in Europe, the
water system will go downhill in Europe. We're not
just talking about the Soviet Union, we're talking
about all of Europe. We're talking about a nuclear
winter, a nuclear winter that will wipe out
everything in existence on the planet of the earth.
Why can't we make people realize that. And what's the environmental impact statement that talks about the effects of the water in the area where these bombs are used. I want the environmental impact statement to talk about the impact that's going to occur when there's no more agriculture products to feed the people that live in the area where the bombs were dropped. And we are talking about some people, we are not just talking about the enemy.

We are talking -- I want the environmental impact statement to talk about what the effect is going to be on education. What the effect is going to be on the economy in Europe. What effect the going to be on the economy here. And I can guarantee the people that have come here and talked about the effect and how proud they are to have this new housing system come in here that their going to be thousand of people sitting on these tracks saying, "gave piece of trash. give a piece of trash." (APPLAUSE)

COL. McGRAW: Judy Anne Goldman.

MS. GOLDMAN: I refer to Lukanne of a missile basing mode for a strong defense however you choose to define that.

Secondly, people have talked about the privileges that we do enjoy here in the United States. Driving here I drove through at least twelve municipalities that I was aware of with independent fire and police protection.

In going through the environmental impact statement a great deal is made about responding to a mishap. quote unquote. I can't imagine first of all how you would try to respond to the kinds of problems that are lightly brushed over in the impact statement.

But of most concern to me was this statement. I would like to quote from page 3-40 of the impact statement. I'm quoting.

"This is in relation to an actual mishap. the initial press release may or may not disclose the presence or absence of a nuclear weapon at the missile site."

I would just ask the people that are here tonight to think about that as they drive home. If there was a mishap in their block would they want that information or not or is that what they think of is terms of privileges that we do enjoy as U.S. citizens. I would like this issue addressed not at this time but in the environmental impact statement.

Thank you.

COL. McGRAW: Cyril Walter.

APPARENTLY NOT HERE. PATTY PURVES.

MR. PURVES: Good evening. gentleman and I respectfully hope your stay in our proud state has been enjoyable and your contact with Missourians pleasant. I am the fact that many of you hope you never have the occasion to return here on business again.

My concerns arising from the otherwise carefully prepared DEDIS stem from the many assumptions and interferences in Section 5, Safety Considerations.

As no one can foresee all the possible variables in each of the following cases, I would like to list a few of the more obvious assumptions.

On air transport, the probability of a mishap during air transport of the seventy systems is extremely small.

On tornadoes, a moving train could be derailed by track damage by a tornado or could be derailed by the force of a tornado. The probability of such mishap is very small and none would be severe.
enough to cause release of any hazardous material.

On earthquakes. Earthquakes from intensity of 6.1 and higher could cause derailment of trains, destroy buildings, and derail trains. However, it would not result in damage to the Peacekeeper missile which could cause a hazardous material release.

I'm sure the people living in the area of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant assumed the safety systems there precluded all risk to bodily injury and destruction of their environment and were reassured of that by the branches of their government.

The disturbing inference on which invalid conclusions were drawn were because the Air Force special cargo squadron has not experienced a mishap transporting nuclear materials in 25 years, which created damage to the reentry system. It never will happen.

The second inference is that because the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Energy have transported nuclear weapons by rail for over 25 years without any mishaps reportable under FAA standards that once again, an accident never will happen.

Thank you.

COL. McSHANE: Barbara Geometer.

MS. Geometer: I yield to Jerry Brown of Knob Header.

MR. Brown: Thank you Col. McShane.

Gentlemen, public officials. Commander of Whitesman Air Force Base. ladies and gentlemen:

I am Jerry Brown representing the Whitesman Committee, which is a committee with the stated purpose to promote expansion, development and effectiveness of the Whitesman Air Force Base.

In an effort to reserve my remarks to the public hearings of the draft environmental impact statement, it must be said the document is second to none. I have had the experience of handling inference.

The military mentality that computes for levels of acceptable losses of human lives does not apply to the civilian population. It only takes one time and the results would be catastrophic.

Please go back to your rooms tonight and consider how very important it is to recommend now Action alternative in the final EIS.

I feel it's your responsibility as defenders of American lives.

Thank you.

Until July 3, 1988 the mishap record of the sophisticated radar technology of the type aboard the Vinson nuclear battleship would have allowed inferences to be drawn that the destruction of 200 civilian lives would never have happened.

As I stated in my previous testimony, a plane crash did occur in Greenland in January, 1986. The B-32 bomber carried four nuclear weapons, all destroyed by fire. Radioactive contamination occurred over 237,000 cubic feet.

Let's consider what would happen if one of the accidents mentioned above, and dismissed by assumption and inference in the EIS should occur as happened in Thule, Greenland.

It is no longer a crash site of uninhabited sea ice, now it's our countryside it is the very air we breath poisoned, and there is no escaping it.

It is turning to the children we gave life to and watch as they increase their risk of horrible death with every breath they take. Your tables for calculating risk to the general population caused by the MX Rail Garrison Plan are very impressive, but not the least bit comforting. It takes a mightier power than the Air Force to control for the margin of error created by assumption and
and have created severe limitations to aircraft
operations at Whitman Air Force Base. The
inspection and foreign object damage will become
more significant as the base takes on a more
significant role for aircraft operations.
However, I think this is a very positive thing
that the Real Garrison would move these wetlands
and take this wildlife with them, therefore, we
would reduce the aircraft operation inspection and
also assist the environmental impact.
Your considerations on 4.1-14 and in other
locations throughout the impact statement entitled
"mitigating reasons" are outstanding. There are
types of considerations required by your
communities and towns within the Whitman region of
influence to feel comfortable with a new defensive
system which will make the Real Garrison Program
very effective.

COL. MCGARRE: Time.
MR. BROWN: Thank you.
COL. MCGARRE: We're going to
conclude the proceedings at this time. Please
remember you have until 31 August to submit written
statements to be included in the transcript of this
hearing.
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PUBLIC MEETING

Detroit, Michigan
28 July, 1985

Due to the large number of attendees, this meeting will begin promptly at 7:00 PM.

Regional Liaison Engineer: We are here tonight to discuss the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed development of a new military facility at Warren Air Force Base. The EIS is a comprehensive document that assesses the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. It is intended to provide a basis for informed decision-making regarding the proposed development.

1. The purpose of the meeting is to gather public input and feedback on the EIS. This input will be considered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other federal agencies responsible for reviewing the EIS.

2. The meeting will consist of a presentation by the Regional Liaison Engineer, followed by a public comment period. The presentation will last approximately 30 minutes, during which the engineer will present the key findings and conclusions of the EIS.

3. The public comment period will begin immediately after the presentation. Attendees are encouraged to submit questions and comments in writing prior to the meeting, as this will help facilitate the discussion.

4. During the public comment period, attendees will have the opportunity to ask questions and make comments related to the EIS. The comments will be recorded and considered by the EPA and other federal agencies.

5. The meeting is open to the public, and attendees are welcome to attend and participate. Attendees are encouraged to provide their input and feedback on the EIS.

6. The meeting will conclude with a brief总结 of the key points discussed during the presentation and comment period. Attendees will have the opportunity to ask final questions or make final comments.

7. The meeting will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and all attendees are encouraged to participate in the discussion.

8. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the draft EIS. Attendees are encouraged to provide their input and feedback on the draft EIS.

9. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the draft EIS.

10. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS. Attendees are encouraged to provide their input and feedback on the final EIS.

11. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

12. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

13. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

14. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

15. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

16. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

17. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

18. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

19. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

20. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

21. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

22. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

23. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

24. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

25. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

26. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

27. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

28. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

29. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

30. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

31. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.

32. The meeting will conclude with a presentation of the final EIS, which will be published in the Federal Register for public review.

33. The meeting will conclude with a public comment period. Attendees are encouraged to ask questions and make comments related to the final EIS.
be incorrect. However, I have known the Mortlake Air Force 11 base mission is to be non-discriminatory to this point by the ground water contamination problem that has been in existence for a 12 decade. Since 1970, the base has contained, pumped and 13 cleaned the aquifer on base while working in cooperation with 14 Michigan Department of Natural Resources, the Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Geology Survey and the Strategic Air Command Headquarters. The involvement of the latter entity is 15 noted for the specific fact that they have not come on board 16 and proposed the closure of Mortlake Air Force Base, or an 17 other diminishment of affect, here because of a water 18 problem. It is difficult for me to understand, as citizen in 19 the locale who share the same aquifer as does Mortlake, and 20 all other communities up and down this Great Lake shoreline, 21 why the spectre of water quality is an issue in the context of 22 a new mission addition to Mortlake when it is not in my 23 mind 24 with the continuing mission Mortlake holds at this time. 25 There is no question that a broad equilibration down to AS feet if 26 any location prevents the vulnerability for contamination. 27 There is also no question that the contamination, in that location 28 up until the last decade, on one of our outer and some 29 it's on, or dump sites on the ground. Mortlake Air Force Base is an 30 equal polluter, one confused it's to the real difference 31 that anywhere else in this country, falls into off military 32 installations. If the difference that separates Mortlake Air 33 Base from the candidate sites, in single the fact that 34 they have identified, and have cleaned up the legacy of our 35 past conscience in this country, it clearly means to me that 36 they are on the forefront of technology, and should be singled 37 out in a positive rather than a negative fashion. There is 38 not a liability associated with the Mortlake water 39 circumstances. As previously mentioned, the base has had the 40 U.S. Geological Survey Agency involved here for many years, 41 and they have mapped the ground water circumstances on base 42 since the single pollution source was discovered in December 43 of 77. There are over 100 million wells on base, and 44 Billions of gallons of water have been sampled removed from the 45 ground, polished through carbon, and charged into the 46 storage tank. Two phases of contamination have been 47 lifted on their agreement, and cleanup over the years has diminished 48 their concentrations to below the limits required for drinking 49 water standards. Alternative well fields on the base have been 50 developed. A project to drink water from Lake Huron was 51 lodged a number of years ago in the military installations 52 program that requires Congressional approval and funding. The 53 staffs who worked both with Congressional Chiefs and Senator 54 Levin have been briefed on numerous occasions relative to the 55 future need to upgrade Mortlake water system.

Dwight H. Eisenhower: Mr. Rose, I'm sorry, but 56 as I indicated, we are going to have to limit...
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Mr. ROBERT M. SIDLER: It is a pleasure to be
Present.

COLONEL M. SHORE: Then you, you are present.

MR. SIDLER: But civilians outside military
posts and bases should not be exposed to the possibility of
catastrophic danger of high explosives that one may be
aware of. It is one thing to live next to a military camp,
and accept the presence of danger, but a complete absence
of that to know the minimum time is passing through the
neighborhood. In the aforementioned short period of time
Environmental Impact Statement by the Air Force stated that
80%, Table 9-1.1, specifies the weight of the propellants,
and the equivalent explosive units equal to 70% of the
70% for each of the two reactors in a single commercial
plant. These areas not only will pass through small villages
and towns as they are deployed, but will also pass through
Flint, Pontiac, and Adrian, Michigan, and Chicago, in their
way to their maintenance plant at South Bend, Indiana. There
is inherent risk of safety to human life and the environment
in operating facilities on base in national resources which
are not noted for their good conditions. All elements of the
pipeline rail garrison sites, and the ANF Environmental Impact Statement leave no doubt as to the
Air Force admission that an explosion potential is very
real.

6

indications are that they are from private citizens, and in
order to be fair and have the individuals who are called upon,
the cards have been shuffled several times by other
individuals, and by myself. They're not prearranged in any
order, and I don't know most of these people, so, I'll just be
telling them out in the order they are now in.

Robert M. SIDLER

Mr. ROBERT M. SIDLER: It's a pleasure to be
present.

Number 6. Colonel McCloud, I come here as a citizen, and my
name is Robert M. Sidler from Michigan, and I have a
statement of about two minutes. As a former Air Force
Officer, and currently an engineer, I come here as a
Michigan citizen with concern for the safety of human life,
and concern for the environment. I do not accept the
safety and environmental risk the massive rail garrison
program imposes on the people of Michigan. While the risk
can be predicted to be small, there are many documented
accounts of catastrophic accidents by well meaning people and
government, as well as to acts of nature itself. The way we
are all connected to aircraft, and these people, and their
operations, have always been such that we serve our
country, and yet always been a mix of life for those in service.

COLONEL McCloud: Sir, just a second. I would
ask that everyone else please sit down. I said no,

3-203
stop, because it is a democracy. We are living in a democracy, and the people need to be able to speak. I would like to speak to you as individuals, not as a corporate entity. Not as the Air Force, or at anything else, because we are all individuals, and we are all very responsible for maintaining this planet in a good state of order for our children, and I would hope that you would reconsider placing this missile in our state. Thank you.

COLONEL McGOWEN: Thank you.

Colossus

COLONEL McGOWEN: What is your specific mission or role for the moment? Are you opposed to the deployment of this missile in our state? I heard your妻子, she's a very brave woman, as is your daughter. What about your son? What about your father? What about these people who are affected by this?

Here I am, a man who has never before been involved in this kind of controversy. But I have a responsibility to speak to you about what I think is a very serious issue. This missile would create a very serious problem in this area. It would be a threat to the safety of our children, and I would hope that you would reconsider placing this missile in our state. Thank you.

COLONEL McGOWEN: Thank you.

Colossus

COLONEL McGOWEN: How do you feel about this?

MR. KEITH TAYLOR: Mr. Taylor is a local resident. He speaks for his wife, his sister, and for Tony and Sue, and Neil, and for people who live in this area.

Mr. Taylor is a local resident who has lived in this area for many years. He believes that placing this missile in our state would be a threat to the safety of our children and he would hope that you would reconsider placing this missile in our state. Thank you.

COLONEL McGOWEN: Thank you.

Colossus

COLONEL McGOWEN: Before I close the meeting, I would like to ask you to consider the consequences of placing this missile in our state. It would be a threat to the safety of our children, and I would hope that you would reconsider placing this missile in our state. Thank you.

COLONEL McGOWEN: Thank you.

Colossus

COLONEL McGOWEN: We appreciate your concern, and we will consider the consequences of placing this missile in our state. Thank you.

COLONEL McGOWEN: Thank you.

Colossus

COLONEL McGOWEN: We appreciate your concern, and we will consider the consequences of placing this missile in our state. Thank you.
Mr. Ralph Feller: Colonel, my name is Ralph Feller, President-Chief Executive Officer, First of America Bank, Toledo. On behalf of the three banking institutions, First of America, Farmers & Merchants, and Hennepin Community Bank, we have placed the housing shortage concern as the Environmental Impact Statement high in our planning process. It is our desire to determine the funds necessary to build the housing required to correct this particular concern.

The planner call session program is an important part of the overall mission, and we, the financial institutions of Topeka County, want to do our part to see that the planner is deployed here at Willow Air Force Base. Thank you.

Colonel Rhinehart: Thank you.

(Reaplace)

Colonel Rhinehart: Remember the ground rules.

James Anderson:

Mr. James Anderson: Good evening. I'm Dr. James R. Anderson, Professor of Humanities at Michigan State University. I've published extensively on the impact of the military budget on U.S. cities and states.

I wish to examine the Draft EIS in light of two central provisions of NEPA regarding EIS contents. They are: (1) alternatives, and (2) the maintenance and enhancement of

...
DOCUMENT 510

1. ALTERNATIVES. The only alternative seriously discussed is the deployment of 650 MTRs, on 50 trains. The 650 regulation requires that the 150 process specifically take into account the alternative of no action. The consideration of the no action alternative is a matter. In the entire document only at times of text, the equivalent of one page, mention this alternative, and this is lines an original text.

2. PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFICIENCY. Clearly, carefully planned, a new system, the existing level of unproductive military consumption, as a federal transportation investment, I nominate it for the most unproductive and inefficient rail investment in the history of our gallows. National security is not enhanced by such guls, and destructive inefficiency.

3. COLONEL McQUADE: Thank you, Terry Miller.

4. COLONEL McQUADE: Good day, sir.

5. COLONEL McQUADE: I was, Colonel McQuade.

6. COLONEL McQUADE: I need to point out some corrections to the last gentlemen's statement. The first assertion was that insufficient attention had been played to the No Action Alternative. I would like to point out to you that the section entitled Existing and Future Base Line Conditions for each resource, for each base, actually encompasses more volume than that given to the Proposed Action and the Alternative, and that the Existing and Future Base Line is the No Action Alternative.

7. I'd also like to address the second subject. Clearly, the gentleman brought up with respect to the alternatives. NFR requires that the Air Force consider those alternatives to the Proposed Action that meet the underlying need that has been identified, that is, a more survivable ICBM system. It does not require us to look at other alternative systems.

8. 3-207
The state and locally. That is why I'm here this evening.

Scientists tell us there are at least four ecological situations that demand immediate remedial action on a global scale. I want to discuss two of these.

The first is the rapid destruction of ocean life forms. As we explore our oceans, we are discovering one of our greatest sources of oxygen for all life. Now many of us have seen the horror stories about the destruction of ocean life forms with pictures of dead plankton, dead fish, and dead and decaying corals.

The second is the depletion of the stratospheric ozone. The hole in the ozone layer is large enough to easily see with the naked eye. This hole is located over areas of low latitude, typically near the equator. The hole is growing larger and deeper each year.

Until we address these problems, our health and well-being will be severely threatened. We need to act now to protect our planet and ensure a better future for generations to come.
DOCUMENT 510
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It is some, probably used crank case oil, in barrels that may be used in servicing the motor vehicles, these may be leaded gasoline that we take from vehicles, these kinds of things, We will dispose of them in accordance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act and hazardous waste is not being disposed at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, and presently what happens is in storage for less than 90 days, and then it is then transported to a centralized treatment disposal facility by the defense mobilization and marketing organization. We will continue that process, and in addition, I think Wurtsmith Air Force Base is presently constructing a permanent reprocessing storage facility where these hazardous wastes could be consolidated or remain for longer than 90 days, but all of these processes will be done strictly in accordance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act Procedures.

':

"It is some, probably used crank case oil, in barrels that may be used in servicing the motor vehicles, these may be leaded gasoline that we take from vehicles, these kinds of things, We will dispose of them in accordance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act and hazardous waste is not being disposed at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, and presently what happens is in storage for less than 90 days, and then it is then transported to a centralized treatment disposal facility by the defense mobilization and marketing organization. We will continue that process, and in addition, I think Wurtsmith Air Force Base is presently constructing a permanent reprocessing storage facility where these hazardous wastes could be consolidated or remain for longer than 90 days, but all of these processes will be done strictly in accordance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act Procedures.

"It is some, probably used crank case oil, in barrels that may be used in servicing the motor vehicles, these may be leaded gasoline that we take from vehicles, these kinds of things, We will dispose of them in accordance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act and hazardous waste is not being disposed at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, and presently what happens is in storage for less than 90 days, and then it is then transported to a centralized treatment disposal facility by the defense mobilization and marketing organization. We will continue that process, and in addition, I think Wurtsmith Air Force Base is presently constructing a permanent reprocessing storage facility where these hazardous wastes could be consolidated or remain for longer than 90 days, but all of these processes will be done strictly in accordance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act Procedures.

"It is some, probably used crank case oil, in barrels that may be used in servicing the motor vehicles, these may be leaded gasoline that we take from vehicles, these kinds of things, We will dispose of them in accordance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act and hazardous waste is not being disposed at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, and presently what happens is in storage for less than 90 days, and then it is then transported to a centralized treatment disposal facility by the defense mobilization and marketing organization. We will continue that process, and in addition, I think Wurtsmith Air Force Base is presently constructing a permanent reprocessing storage facility where these hazardous wastes could be consolidated or remain for longer than 90 days, but all of these processes will be done strictly in accordance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act Procedures.
We shall be working with the MX missiles, so, that's the situation. I t's up to the people here. If you want to continue on this decline of the human kind, or if you will go together and turn it to an incline by back up each other for other worse than in the death trains. The power to pay your salary exists, so, do other kinds of work. U.S.A. truly needs to have a lot of work done. We can continue on the question of what and who do you defend, maybe your answer in freedom.

That could be freedom to speak, freedom to health care, freedom to high education, freedom to live, freedom to pay your salary, freedom to do other kinds of work. U.S.A. truly needs to have a lot of work done. We can continue on the question of what and who do you defend, maybe your answer in freedom.

I think it's very hard to break the economical wheel that you represent, but some do it, and I want you to know that we welcome you with open arms, real human arms, not your arms, which include MX missiles. You must know that you don't have to do this. Kids all over the world already have nightmares. I certainly hope that your fear that makes you place bases and weapons here in Michigan, and in Europe will fly away from you, because we don't want
people that live (sic) with the development of multilateral air
force bases are taking. I will now return around the world,
and I met wonderful people everywhere. And through
my traveling I know no persons-I have personal friends in
more than 20 countries all around the world, and I could see how
the awareness of people is rising everywhere. People are
beginning to understand what kind of disaster we have been
organizing for many years. For example, people in New Zealand
said me to nuclear missiles, and the government followed (sic);
the idea and made the whole island to make freep. The
majority of people in Australia also want to ride down all 14
of the US bases all over the large island. People in
Europe, Spain, and between here, for many years, tried to
take every military bases, but so far has the U.S. government
threatened them with sanctions and other tricks, but soon I
know the people will be heard, and U.S.A. will understand
that its bases are unwanted in Europe. U.S. Air Forces are
using an increase of job situation to remove the local
population here how possible the development of the Multinational
Base would be. That's true, the Air Force has a lot of money,
and jobs will be created, but what U.S.A. need is more jobs
created, and more money spent in fields like education and
health care, not another expense of development of terror.

Thanks.

(Applause)

---

you there, and you already told our kids that these nightmares
won't come true. Thank you.

(Applause)

COLONEL MSHORE: Henrik Gothenberg.

MR. HENRIK GOTHENBERG: Hello! My name is Henrik
Gothenberg, and I'm from Sweden. And first this name
peacekeeper, I think that's been actually more about the
Onwell novel (sic) in 1968, to let you know, living on the
truth is all (sic). Well, hello. I don't know it all of you
love where my country is, but anyway, I will tell you that you
will find it in the northern Europe between Norway, and
Finland, very close to 1 am on the land's country, so I hope I
should say the land's country. Yes, it's, maybe I
should say when the MS point will be launched from Michigan,
I could stand out on an island, and hearing that the situation
that are passing above my head will bring death and
destiny to people in the Soviet Union, and it will stop me
know that once we get the people that are disaster, responsible.
for preparing the launching of the missiles, the absence
of war in Soviet Union, Europe, and North America is a dream
that we live in peace, at least not. Instead, we live in,
situation where and terms that people are controlled, and
for every idea that governments around the world are taking
increase the threat of terrorism, we are losing close to nation
was. And it is exactly that kind of a step that people, the

---

(Applause)

MR. MATTHE McDADE: My name is Matt McDaide.
I'm from Harbor Springs, Michigan, and I'm going to try to
make a general statement this time than I did last time, since
many of the other speakers issues I raised last time were not
even to fall within the definition of the Environmental Impact
Statement.
I don't know how you can raise in these matters,
issues I've studied for seven years. During a test run in
college, studying in Oxford, England, in 1968, when mine and
pressure missiles were about to be built and deployed in
Europe, I was absolutely humiliated by my ignorance about U.S.
policy, and U.S. military plans. The average person in Britain
running a bed and breakfast, a woman who had barely completed
highschool knew much more than I did. I was so humiliated by
that, as an almost college graduate from the University of
Chicago, I resolved to educate myself after graduation when I
get home. There was a seminar that fall at the University of
Chicago on nuclear weapons. I heard the late Michael Novelli
speak. He was a high-ranking former CIA official now
depressed. He wrote a book which I have here, and should
encourage you all to read. It's called MS. Prescription for
Disaster. The title should tell you something. That seminar
opened my eyes permanently, and I've been very active since
then. I learned first about how the MS is a first strike

---

(Applause)
Force presentation, or in one of the many study groups I’ve lead or attended. If you’re serious about having an educational forum in Bacon on the 54, how many would come? How much support do you think we’d get? We must educate ourselves for democracy to work. When we educate ourselves, we see many problems. Weapons systems presented as for our defense and the untraded protection of democracy. But some of these weapons protect nothing but the profits of the defense contractors, and the growth of the arms industry. We who are committed to this program have the facts at hand, talked with American, non-expert organizers. Why, then, when we take the responsibilities of democrats seriously, educate ourselves, are we afraid to fight so evenly? This hearing is a farce, a milk done for the people. In your own sense, outcomes like this have a democracy and have participated in it. Think about it, the first two minutes were spent telling us on our mind and could not express ourselves, whether we should not stand, that our people’s remarks were not decisions, and respectfully, addressing ourselves to, what could and could not be asked, according to the restrictions of the Environmental Impact Statement, that’s freedom. Here is a limit on their minutes for each person allowed. This is unfair, that’s unfair. But it is what we want. We want the road of democracy, without the stumbling blocks. We don’t think people and budgeting, will be told what to do, and that in turn, non-serious and moral in what is public. What are we doing? Please think about it. What makes us afraid of the enemy of the “people” to the man of the “people.” Only if we educate ourselves will we be able to distinguish between good and bad.

[Mr. Richard: Please sit down.]

[Mr. Richard continues talking while being interrupted by the audience.]

[Mr. Richard: Please sit down.]

[Mr. Richard: I’m sorry. I had to do that.]

[Mr. Richard: The hearing will run at least 70 miles. We’ve got a number of people who have expressed a desire to speak. So, I’m going to have to move on.]

[Mr. Richard: Mr. Richard, you did a very good job.]

[Mr. Richard: Thank you.]

[Mr. Richard: Before I go, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I’d like to make two statements and ask two questions. First of all, I’d like to state my feelings that the $4 million system is designed to fight a nuclear war, and not for nuclear deterrence to prevent a nuclear war. I don’t think this is within our stated government nuclear deterrence. If this policy has been changed, I think the public should be made aware of that.]

[Second statement is that I feel it’s not sensible to choose a crowded area, for instance, the Hudson Bay city-landing area, with 250,000 people as a potential deployment site.]

[Third idea, I’d like to ask a question. Will the EPA hold a hearing on the Cats? What will happen to it? What will our next, and who will decide the alternatives? And fourth, the building of bridges, which I understand will be done across some streams to be removed. Can this be considered and provided for so that long-term sedimentation does not occur at these bridges that will be built?]
Washington say volunteer firefighters have little expertise in handling chemical accidents. It states that they are not prepared to deal with hazardous material accidents and that they have received little training in the past.

Fatigue, boredom, stress are common complaints of inexperienced firefighters. They are assigned tasks they don't like, such as washing trucks and cleaning engines. They work long hours and sometimes in dangerous situations. They are not given proper equipment or training.

In one incident, a chemical accident occurred in a factory. The firefighters were not informed about the dangers of the chemicals involved. They were not provided with proper protective gear. As a result, several firefighters were injured.

The government's General Accounting Office has called for better training and equipment for firefighters. They must be prepared to handle hazardous material accidents.

A report by the government's General Accounting Office shows that the number of chemical accidents has increased in recent years. The report recommends better training and equipment for firefighters.

The report also highlights the importance of proper planning and communication in handling chemical accidents. It calls for better coordination between emergency responders and industry.

The report recommends that the government develop a national chemical accident response plan. It calls for better coordination between federal and state agencies and for improved communication and training for responders.

The report also recommends that industry develop emergency response plans that are compatible with the national plan. It calls for better coordination between industry and emergency responders.

Washington has been considering new regulations to improve the safety of chemical plants. The regulations would require companies to better train their employees and to have emergency response plans in place.

The regulations would also require companies to report chemical accidents to the government. This information would be used to improve the national chemical accident response plan.

The regulations would also require companies to improve the safety of their plants. This would include better storage and handling of chemicals, better emergency response plans, and better training for employees.

The regulations would be a significant step forward in improving the safety of chemical plants. They would help to reduce the risk of chemical accidents and protect the public.

The regulations would also help to improve the safety of firefighters. They would be better trained and equipped to handle chemical accidents. This would help to protect both the firefighters and the public.

The regulations would also help to improve the safety of chemical plants. They would be better designed and built to withstand chemical accidents. This would help to reduce the risk of chemical accidents and protect the public.
There is no money. I accept parents who come to me who have no insurance and their children; I was in a court in this county three men, all for drunk driving, each had been unemployed for a year. They had not had the; had a clear record ten years prior to that. Alcoholism is connected to poverty, and what we're offering people is death instead of life. If we could afford the risk that you're presenting us today — I know that people have its risk, but I think we can afford the risk of peace, and that is what I urge us to take is to take that risk instead of the risk that you are presenting to us today. Thank you.

( Applause)

Colonel Kranke: Relate Treaster

Ms. Rosalyn Rosenthal, an assistant professor of English at the University of Michigan, I am here today as a private citizen. I have one comment, one suggestion, and one question. As a reading teacher and a technical writing teacher, I have a comment about the EIS. First, there is a difference, as I have all technical writing input, between generalization and basic concepts. Second, an amendment to Colonel Kranke's last comment: Doctor Anderson, economics, is not an important consideration, that the only consideration is defense, but, in my opinion, the Environmental Impact Statement, does address the points and place in the presentation we saw tonight. It suggests

that we hold environmental hearings in each site that its railroad to train will travel and travel, in addition to the environmental hearings which we had tonight at Mottith. My question goes along with the case safety question. If the railroad system has negligible danger of explosion while on the tracks, why is there a large safety area on the base where they will be housed? And I would like that question answered in the final Impact Statement. Thank you.

Colonel Kranke: Ulla Glowen

Ms. Glennie Glowen: Good evening. My name is Glennie Glowen, and I reside in Michigan. I have been here today because I have some urgent concerns about the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program, proposed by President Reagan in 1983, and now being studied by the United States Air Force for implementation by 1987.

As one of those people are not those of the person with background and training in science, but as I have read portions of the Environmental Impact Statement, and also a review issued by the House Armed Services Committee in March, 1985, plus other articles, as concerns grow. The range from the big picture, of huge, an area, 23,000 acres of farmland, and through our taxes on a regular basis for maintenance, to the very small picture of the destruction of Michigan Jack Pine Forests, habitat of

The endangered Michigan Jack Pine, and destruction of important wetland areas, and of the wildlife population inhabiting these areas.

I feel that the citizens of Michigan, as well as citizens of the entire United States need to hear our questions answered before any decisions on implementing the Peacemaker Rail Garrison Program are made.

Some of these are:

First, has it been shown that the 125,000 or more acres of commercial land, that is railroad land, is safe to handle these missile cars, which are stored here, than reported cars, and at 75 plus feet long, and a third longer than the usual 55 feet for a real car.

Next, has it been shown that a deployment time of three to six hours could take place, or a complete site, and not 75 micros minutes after launch.

Another question: From our sources, it appears that the Michigan Department of Natural Resources has not, to my eye, been contacted or notified about the Rail Garrison Project proposal, at least on a local or district level, even though its construction and implementation will damage and destroy some important forest, wetland, and habitat of endangered species in Michigan. Why not?

Now some questions about the future--second rail connector discussed on pages 113-134 to 144. Why would a...
I would also like to address the question as to the strategic warning aspect of operating a train. Where you talked about you know the hour to deploy in as much as the Soviet missiles could attack within 30 minutes prior to the 500 here to attack the question you need to do things called preparing for attack which we feel we have an extremely high confidence of wording about. We see this as a situation similar to the Cuban Missile Crisis, when world tensions escalate. The Soviets do not have a great deal of their forces in strategic readiness. We have an extremely high confidence that we would detect that in fact that probably takes days and days for their forces to be brought to readiness at which time we would have plenty of options opportunity to deploy an

38

a0

39

40

1. 

41

1. 

42

2.

43

2. 

44

1. 

Tox little has been said about the security

needed for rail garrisons. Nuclear missiles. They would be more

vulnerable to accidents, sabotage, terrorism, than solid-based

missiles. The railroad lines, themselves, are often poorly

maintained subjecting missile launch pads to desertions. If

radioactive isotopes were released locally due to an

accident, studies show that the medical system is woefully

unprepared to respond adequately.

Locally what is the psychological effect on

children who discover that nuclear missiles are in their

neighborhood. Perhaps some will see the program is partially

good bringing in needs jobs and money in their area. But

studies have shown again and again that area spending

generates far fewer and well then equal funds spent on

health care or education. Michigan has often been more on

taxes than it has gained in military spending in the state.

The MI should not be garrisoned at Kunkels

nor indeed anywhere. The risks and the costs are too great.

and my question is: What do studies show about the long-term

effect of present values when nuclear missiles are moved into an

area?

COLONEL HARMON: Colonel Walsh, is that a

question that you can answer at this time?

COLONEL WALSH: Yes sir. In our analysis of

this type of activity, we have found the additional demand for

an
Housing has either encouraged the—after the additional construction of the housing or has raised the prices of the houses, or it has been a beneficial impact by taking otherwise unoccupied or available houses. So, we have seen in our period of time in monitoring the effects of such activities, any adverse impact upon the value of homes in any area, and we have done significant monitoring on this, for instance, as in Charlevoix, housing, where we’ve just recently explored the feasibility in the Mobile Home Sales Program. Thank ..., COLONEL McKEE: Ladies and Gentlemen, we will conclude the proceedings at this time. Please remember that you have until 3 p.m. on August 26, to submit written materials to be included in the transcript of the hearing. Once again, oral and written statements, or comments will be afforded equal weight. Officials of the Air Force appreciate your efforts to come out tonight and contribute your views to this public hearing. We thank you for your attention. Please be assured the Air Force decision makers will carefully consider each viewpoint raised here tonight when deciding the ultimate course of action on this proposal.

This hearing is adjourned at three a.m.

Dated: August 9, 1988

[Signature]

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
This section includes documents postmarked and received after the 31 August 1988 public comment deadline. They are shown in the order they were received, four sheets to a page. Responses to the comments identified in these documents are provided following the documents. Relevant information contained in these documents has been incorporated, where appropriate, into the Final EIS test.
Dear Lt. Colonel Walsh:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact statement for the Passchendaele Rail Garrison Program. Consistent with the Department of Ecology's responsibilities, we evaluated the application under the Public Participation in Environmental Decisions Act and the Regulatory Review Act. We received responses from the Department of Wildlife, Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, and Ecology staff. A summary of their concerns is given below, and copies of their letters are attached for your information.

The Department of Wildlife is concerned about the impacts to wildlife habitat and to loss of wildlife at the Paschendaele Air Force Base. They are also concerned about the impact to burrowing owls which may be on the site. The Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation reserves the opportunity to comment until they receive a copy of the cultural resource survey report.

The Department of Ecology is concerned with wetlands issues, including loss of wetlands and possible mitigation. The Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation has no comments to offer at this time.

If you have any questions, please call the appropriate agency.

Sincerely,

Michelle Stevens, Ecology
Fred Mayhew, Wildlife
Robert Whitlark, Archaeology

July 29, 1988

The draft EIS indicates 6.4 acres of wetlands would be impacted at the Paschendaele Air Force Base. Spokane, Washington. Additional analysis is needed to evaluate the wetlands. This should include a delineation of the wetlands, evaluation of their flora and fauna, and assessment of their values and functions. Possible mitigation for loss of wetlands should also be considered.

If it is established through the 404(1)(ii) Guidelines that there are no practicable alternatives to loss of the wetlands, we will seek to evaluate wetland compensation through a detailed biological assessment during the public notice under the state's authority under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

We recommend setting up an interagency coordination meeting on this project. Please call Ms. Michelle Stevens of Ecology's Wetland Section at (206) 724-0733.
Dear Mr. Rickeba:

A staff review has been completed of your draft environmental impact statement. We would like to reserve comment until we have reviewed and reviewed the cultural resources survey report. We would like to request the cultural resources survey report.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Minton, Ph.D.
State Archaeologist
(206) 753-6409

cc: Barbara Rickebe, Department of Ecology
The State of Montana appreciates this opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), Peacemaker Rail Garrison, prepared by the United States Air Force.

State agencies have reviewed the Peacemaker Rail Garrison DEIS, and consider the 1976 State of Montana comments submitted to the United States Air Force regarding the proposed Small ICBM project to be appropriate for the proposed Peacemaker Rail Garrison project as well. The Montana Department of Family Services has, however, provided additional comments specific to the Peacemaker DEIS. These comments follow.

Montana Department of Family Services

The Montana Department of Family Services has recently been compiling data which is beginning to provide basic trend information pertinent to those services provided by the Department and related to military projects ongoing or proposed for Malmstrom Air Force Base. It is the Department's opinion that insufficient facts were available at the time of compilation of the Peacemaker DEIS for the Air Force to be able to project accurate impacts of a new project on the local human services system. The data that has recently been compiled indicates that there has been a significant impact to local services by military families, as well as former installation families, brought in by the prospect of new construction.

The Department is beginning to profile expenditures made by county and state governments that are a direct result of the close proximity to a military installation. The preliminary data indicates the far reaching effects on the local economy.

Military families are of particular interest because of the direct impact on the local resources in terms of crisis. These families often avail themselves of local resources because of the philosophical differences surrounding the issue of confidentiality between the entities.

Dysfunctional families require many costly supportive services; psychological evaluations, staff investigations and intervention, foster care, long and short-term, and in the case of an emotionally disturbed child, residential treatment. Families brought into the area by the prospect of employment in military installations may also increase the need for additional services.

EPA has a number of other serious concerns relating to the analysis of the proposed project. Some of these are general, while others relate to specific sites. These are discussed in our enclosed detailed comments. In keeping with EPA's procedures, we have rated this PEA E-1 for the Hardwick NAP alternative site and E-2 for all other sites.

These ratings are explained on the enclosed summary sheet. I have asked Dr. W. Alexander Williams (922-362-5600) to follow up with you concerning EPA's comments.
DOCUMENT 513

US. Environmental Protection Agency
Announcement on the Draft
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
U.S. Air Force Pendleton Hall Project Program

ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Section 2.4, page 2-14, and 5.0, page 5-2, should include the statement that the Department of Defense (DOD) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would respond by imposing fines especially tailored and equipped to deal with
any compliance...DOD teams would assess the existing local, state and federal agencies with those efforts. These two sections appear to indicate that the DOD will rely on the
local, state and federal agencies to conduct emergency response activities. In Section 5.3.1, Emergency Response, page 5-9, DOD is referred to as "...the relevant responsi-
ble authorities..." whereas the EPA is referred to as "...the responsible authorities...". This document is inconsistent in describing DOD's role in the event of an
incident. Clarification is necessary, keeping in mind that under the National Contingency Plan (NCP), DOD is required to assign its own On-Scene Coordinator.

Air Quality Modeling

The methodology applied is simplistic, based essentially on a proportional modeling technique. This is a procedure that assumes that the quality of air pollutants is constant over the
time period considered. This assumption would be theoretically invalid if the emissions trends of pollutants are not constant over the period. Therefore, the air quality modeling
that has been carried out should be considered as optimistic for site assessment purposes. The major problem is that the air quality monitors in this report are not located close enough to the Air Force Base to ensure
accurate data. Therefore, site assessment should reflect the DOD's modeling effort. Always,

short-term high concentrations from fugitive dust sources that may vary very close to ground level. Since such construction grading, relocation of facilities, and other activities will occur very close to the
areas of concern, all the Air Force Base studies, the necessary, but the reader may suspect the omission of important data or information.

4-5

The 404(b)(1) guidelines, published at 40 CFR Part 230 (1987), are
regulations containing the requirements for issuance a permit for
discharge of dredged or fill material. 40 CFR Part 230. This procedure assumes that the EPA must consider all aspects of the project,
including alternatives, before issuing a permit. The success of this effort depends on the ability of the applicant to demonstrate that
the proposed project will not cause significant adverse environmental impacts.

Therefore, the Air Force must demonstrate that the project will not cause significant adverse impacts, and the
Air Force must consider all aspects of the project, including alternatives, before issuing a
permit. The success of this effort depends on the ability of the applicant to demonstrate that
the proposed project will not cause significant adverse environmental impacts.

5-6

The Air Force must demonstrate that the project will not cause significant adverse impacts, and the
Air Force must consider all aspects of the project, including alternatives, before issuing a
permit. The success of this effort depends on the ability of the applicant to demonstrate that
the proposed project will not cause significant adverse environmental impacts.
If possible, an estimate of the present site runoff
The Railroad Commission notes locations of some boreholes which may have a regional significance due to the quality of water in the area. The Commission recommends that the boreholes be monitored to ensure that the quality of water remains consistent and that any potential impacts on flora and fauna are minimized.

Patrick, the regional contact for the oil and gas division, states that the boreholes are necessary for the construction of the Peacemaker Rall Garrison System. He assures the railroad commission that the boreholes will be conducted in a manner that minimizes any potential impacts on the environment.

The boreholes are proposed to be conducted in two phases: one for the Peacemaker Rall Garrison System and another for the Peacemaker Rall Garrison Program. The first phase of the boreholes will be conducted to confirm the presence of water at the proposed site, while the second phase will be conducted to confirm the presence of gas.

The boreholes will be conducted in a manner that minimizes any potential impacts on the environment. The railroad commission will monitor the boreholes to ensure that any potential impacts are minimized and that the quality of water remains consistent.

The boreholes are proposed to be conducted in two phases: one for the Peacemaker Rall Garrison System and another for the Peacemaker Rall Garrison Program. The first phase of the boreholes will be conducted to confirm the presence of water at the proposed site, while the second phase will be conducted to confirm the presence of gas.

The boreholes will be conducted in a manner that minimizes any potential impacts on the environment. The railroad commission will monitor the boreholes to ensure that any potential impacts are minimized and that the quality of water remains consistent.
INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Air Force is proposing to base 50 to 100 MX missiles on rail sites to be distributed to certain Air Force bases located in various parts of the country. One of these bases is located in Texas: Dyess AFB in Abilene. These comments will address issues concerning the safety record of Texas railroads and the general condition of Texas rail lines likely to be included in the missile trains' dispersal plans.

II. TEXAS RAIL ROUTES AFFECTED

No discussion was included in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) relating to the condition of the track, nor was mention made of local rail traffic densities.

In order to address these issues, the Railroad Commission of Texas (RCT) first attempted to identify probable rail routes to be used by missile trains operating from Dyess AFB. The attached map (Exhibit 1) is marked to illustrate the track routes over which trains could operate at selected running times. Current timetable operating speeds were used in deriving the maximum distance expected to be achieved in the time allowed. No allowance was made for delays encountered from meeting or passing other trains. The RCT assumed that the missile trains would operate on a high priority basis whereby all other rail traffic would be placed in the clear sufficiently in advance to avoid delays to the missile trains.

A. Track Conditions

Maximum authorized track speed of the various routes differ with the carrier and with status of the individual rail line. Main lines of the Union Pacific (UP) and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe (ATSF) railroads, two principal carriers proximate to Dyess AFB, generally allow trains to be operated at 80 mph. Indicative of a well-maintained track facility, ATSF track between Brownwood and Cleburne and between Lubbock and Canyon allow a maximum authorized speed of 80 mph while other branches allow speeds ranging from 10 mph to 30 mph. UP track west of Abilene is operated at speeds ranging from 40 mph down to 40 mph at the western end of the line. The "Ft. Worth & Dallas" railroad branch between Abilene and Wichita Falls operates up to a maximum speed of 30 mph.

Track maintenance is performed at a level consistent with traffic density over each line. The traffic density map (Exhibit 2) for 1988 gives a good representation of traffic flows in Texas. Exhibit 2 is scaled to net tons of freight hauled.
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The UP main track east and west from Dyess AFB (Abilene) is experiencing light traffic loadings (1.6 million net tons) and only supports up to two trains per day. West of Odessa, this level of train operations is reduced even further. The NS branch from Abilene to Wichita Falls is also a light density line. Peacekeeper train traffic operations would not be intrusive to commercial rail operations at these locations.

B. Rail Safety

The EIS at 5-45, and later in Section 3.2, discusses the fire mechanical attributes of the new missile trains and the fact that the occurrence of mechanical related accidents is expected to be extremely low. Track related accidents for rail operations emanating from Dyess AFB can also reasonably be expected to be extremely low. From 1983 through 1987, track caused accidents in Texas declined by 66% (Exhibit 34), an impressive improvement record.

The need for safe, high quality trackage is especially important to the operation of Peacekeeper trains because this is one variable in the proposed rail operation where the Department of Defense (DOD) cannot establish an absolute quality control effort. The track structure is privately owned and maintained whereas equipment reliability and the proficiency of operating personnel can be strictly monitored and controlled by DOD.

III. CONCLUSION

An extensive rail network and the quality of privately owned railroad track should be major considerations in selecting a
Transportation Div., AEC

August 10, 1988

Lyss AFB is an excellent candidate for a Peacekeeper Rail Garrison when evaluated by these two criteria.
Mr. T. C. Adams
State Single Point of Contact
Government's Office of Budget and Planning
P. O. Box 13139, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Pea Island Ball Garrison System;
EIS No. TX-49-97-04-0001-00-00

Dear Mr. Adams:

The staff of the Texas Water Commission has reviewed the above referenced EIS relative to the water quality implications of the proposed construction of the Pea Island Ball Garrison at Dyess Air Force Base near Abilene, Texas.

Little Elm Creek borders the site proposed for the construction of the rail garrison and drains into Lake Fort Phantom Hill (Abilene's potable water supply). Our primary concern is the protection of the water quality of Dell Creek and Lake Fort Phantom Hill. Extensive soil disturbances will be required during the construction phase of the project. The specific stormwater management and erosion control procedures should be developed and implemented to prevent excessive transport of disturbed soil during rainfall runoff events. Chemicals used by construction crews and fuels and lubricating oils required by heavy equipment should be stored and handled properly to prevent accidental contamination of surface and ground water in the area.

Following completion of the project, maintenance and routine operating activities should be conducted in a manner that will prevent accidental spills or accumulations of contaminated materials from being transported to Lake Phantom Hill by storm water runoff.

The map presented in Figure 4.4-71 (p. 4.4-27) of the EIS is partially incorrect and could cause some unnecessary concern.

Thank you for providing the information concerning the above referenced project. A review of available data concerning cultural resources indicates that an archaeological survey of areas to be disturbed would be appropriate. The purpose of the survey will be to identify any prehistoric or historic sites or features that may be eligible for inclusion within the National Register of Historic Places. The general area contains many known archeological sites, identified through both government and survey studies. Many sites are potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, ranging in date from as long as 8000 years to the present, and ranging in activity from small camps to large villages in time and space. An archeological survey undertaken by a qualified professional should be conducted for the proposed site of construction. Field examination should include shovel testing to identify any surface cultural resources. Collection of materials present in these areas is required. A report of investigation should be produced in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological and Historic Preservation.

Thank you for allowing us to participate in the review process. We will continue our efforts as indicated by our previously cited comments. We are not privy to the information under Sec 6800, the implementing regulations of the National Historic Preservation Act, upon receipt of the survey report. If you have any comments or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Deborah Smith of this office at 512-463-9006.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Deborah Smith
The State Agency for Historic Preservation

July 23, 1996

P.O. Box 13139
Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

[Signature]
The final decision on whether the 'Peacekeeper' Rail Testing Program will be made by the next President next spring.

It should be of interest that George Bush has been speaking out in support of the ME rail guidance program.

Sincerely,

Vince Sharkey, Jr., M.D.

5 Craig and McMonterosino also are located within the habitat range of the endangered black-footed ferret (Mustela nigripes). The final EIS should assess the potential effects of the proposed on this species and its habitat. Prairie dog colonies are considered potential habitat for the black-footed ferret. If prairie dog colonies occur within the proposed project areas, surveys that are coordinated with FWS should be conducted to determine the presence of the black-footed ferret.
In response to the Draft EIS for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program, this office, in consultation with various state agencies, offers the following comments:

**1.** While the Draft EIS discusses and commits to variations in land use, it does not provide a comprehensive examination of the potential impacts on economic development and the subsequent costs and benefits. These impacts should be monitored and reported to stakeholders.

**2.** The Draft EIS provides information on the potential land use changes. However, the Draft EIS should analyze the potential economic impacts of these changes more thoroughly.

**3.** The Draft EIS identifies the need for additional information on the potential economic impacts of the proposed project.

**4.** The Draft EIS should provide more detailed information on the potential economic impacts of the proposed project.

**5.** The Draft EIS should provide more detailed information on the potential economic impacts of the proposed project.

"Knowledge brings responsibility."

[Signature]

**Date:**

---

The Draft EIS, in analyzing wetland impacts for Grand Forks Air Force Base, states that it is difficult to assess a community's ability to effectively address the impacts unless potential revenue can be projected.

For both Grand Forks and Minot Air Force Bases, the Draft EIS is analyzing public finance associated with educational expenditures. State temporary revenue shortages could occur as state foundation program monies lag behind the additional enrollment associated with the proposed alternative. The Draft EIS does not fully consider the potential for school district reserve funds to cover potential shortages (p. 5-32).

The reliance on school district reserve funds at Grand Forks and Minot is questionable at this time. As a result of declining economic conditions in North Dakota, associated with a faltering oil industry and the current drought, state revenues are declining. This has caused reductions in state expenditures, including state foundation aid. This is placing strain on local school district budgets.

By the estimated dates of construction and deployment of the Rail Garrison Programs, finances may be such that the program impacts on school finances may be considerably greater than stated in the Draft EIS. In addition, a substantial reduction of this element may be associated with consideration given to DOE financial aid and loans.
Beyond the scope of the Draft EIS, we need to consider the issues of the benefits of widespread deployment of missile capabilities. This is important from the point of view of the vulnerability of U.S. ballistic missile forces and also from the point of view of future survivability by political and military leaders who will have to consider the vulnerability of the forces they man.

2. Another question involves the possible threat to public peace when the training raises come in contact with demonstrators from protest groups. What is USAF policy regarding protesters interfering with the training raises during the performance of their duties? What is the sharing of responsibility here between local, state and federal law enforcement agencies?

The above comments represent some of the major concerns raised by the Draft EIS in North Dakota. These comments, however, do not preclude the submission of comments from the individual agencies on specific points. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS. Your attention to local issues and concerns is appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

C. Adams
State Single Point of Contact

Charles O. Adams
State Natural Heritage Program

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

AUSTIN TEXAS 78711

September 1, 1980

Mr. Bob Davis
Governor's Office of Budget and Planning
P. O. Box 1176
Capital Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Attention: Mr. T. C. Adams, Director

Special Projects

SUBJECT: Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Taylor County

U.S. Department of the Air Force

Mr. T. C. Adams

Dear Mr. Davis:

A copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) - Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program and its associated attachments have been released for public review and environmental impact statements. The document was prepared by the U.S. Department of the Air Force; it is dated June 1980.

Based on information contained in the draft DEIS, no significant long-term adverse public or environmental health impacts are expected if the proposed activities are associated in accordance with good public and environmental health principles.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program and its associated attachments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

L. D. Turner, M.D., Acting

Associate Commissioner for Environmental and Consumer Health Protection

Mr. R. W. Baker

U.S. Department of Health

and Human Services

September 7, 1980

Mr. T. C. Adams

State Single Point of Contact

Governor's Office of Budget and Planning

P. O. Box 1176

Capital Station

Austin, Texas 78711

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program

Dear Mr. Adams:

A search of the Texas Natural Heritage Program Information System revealed no presently known occurrences of special species or natural communities in the general vicinity of the proposed project. The Heritage Program Information included here is based on the best data currently available to the state regarding threatened, endangered, or otherwise sensitive species. However, the data does not provide a definitive statement as to the presence or absence of special species or natural communities because the information may not be sufficient for an evaluation by qualified biologists. It is intended to assist you in avoiding harm to species that occur on your site. Please contact the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department's Heritage Program before publishing or otherwise disseminating any specific locality information.

Because proposed construction of the facility will be on the Texas Air Force Base and existing railroad tracks would be used, with some modifications and additions, no apparent significant adverse impacts upon fish and wildlife are anticipated.

I appreciate the opportunity to review this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles O. Adams

Executive Director

CIT: HWI-190
This project involves the deployment of Peacekeeper silos at several existing air bases including Dyess AFB, Abilene, Texas. Such the proposed action of deploying 50 silos on 25 trains or the alternative of 100 silos on 50 trains would have similar impacts on state water resources.

Currently Dyess AFB obtains its potable water from the City of Abilene. Since approximately 62% of AFB personnel live off of the base, the city also provides for these domestic users. The 1987 water demand for the City of Abilene was 16.3 million gallons per day (MGD), according to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The city currently obtains its water supplies from Fort Phantom Hill, Elm Creek, and Hubbard Creek areas, and additionally has an interest in the East Reserve Project which is currently under construction. We note that there is an uncertainty between the value of 1.02 MGD for Dyess AFB's potable water demand as presented on page 4.4.15, and the value of 1.3 MGD presented on page 4.4.18. These should be the same value. The correct value appears to be 1.3 MGD, which is the value presented in the environmental statement on page 4.4.18.

Dyess AFB's maximum go to the City of Abilene. The city requires an activated carbon treatment plant with design capacity of 13.4 MGD. Presently the plant is at or above capacity (13.4 MGD, 1987). Dyess AFB estimates its hydraulic load at 0.5 MGD (40% of its potable demand of 1.02 MGD, 4.35 of the total hydraulic load to the plant, but with the correct demand value of 1.3 MGD, the ADD's contribution to the total hydraulic load is 1.35). No information is given about bioremediation oxygen demand (BOD), total suspended solids (TSS), or other loads attributable. The EIS states that plant capacity can be expanded to 15 MGD by 1989, although there is no indication that construction has begun or has been scheduled.

LOCATION
Abilene, Texas

CURRENT STUDENT
U.S. AIR FORCE POLITICAL REAL GARRISON PROGRAM

Thank you for attending this hearing. Our purpose for holding this hearing is to encourage you the environmental consequences we have determined—may occur if the Peacekeeper Ball Systems program proceeds, and offer you an opportunity to express your views in our deliberations. We have prepared a draft Environmental Impact Statement.

1. What is your opinion on the long term effects of this action?
2. What is your opinion on the potential environmental impacts associated with this action?
3. What is your opinion on the existing air bases that the facility will be used to support?
4. What is your opinion on the existing air bases that the facility will be expanded to support?
5. What is your opinion on the existing air bases that the facility will be expanded to support?
6. What is your opinion on the existing air bases that the facility will be expanded to support?
7. What is your opinion on the existing air bases that the facility will be expanded to support?
Does MX help protect our country, or does it destabilize, increase our state's danger as a nuclear target, give the USA some encouragement to start a nuclear war?

My belief is that MX and any nuclear weapons consume many resources and leave our country worse off than we started.

I don't expect you to agree with me, but I hope you will make sure these issues get consideration.

Thank you

Deborah D. Blank
4.1 Responses to Post 31 August 1988 Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 511     | 1 Response: Field surveys were conducted on Fairchild AFB in 1988 to fully evaluate the wetlands that would be affected by the program. The wetlands were delineated as per the U.S. EPA wetland delineation methods. A detailed analysis was conducted based upon the results of the field delineation. If Fairchild AFB is chosen for Rail Garrison deployment, a detailed wetland mitigation plan would be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington Department of Ecology, and other interested agencies.
|         | 2 Response: If Fairchild AFB is chosen for Rail Garrison deployment, a detailed mitigation plan would be prepared in order to minimize impacts on wetlands. Potential relocation of facilities would be addressed in the mitigation plan. The plan would be prepared as per the requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington Department of Ecology, and other interested agencies. Impacts on nonwetland habitats would be minimized as much as possible.
|         | 3 Response: Section 4.6.6.3 of the Final EIS has been changed to reflect these comments.
|         | 4 Response: Due to page limitations, the specific classifications for all of the wetlands that would be affected by the program could not be included in the EIS. The National Wetland Inventory Maps were consulted during the preliminary photointerpretation phase. Findings of this preliminary determination were checked in the field in the spring of 1988. The text represents a much condensed version of our analysis.
|         | 5 Response: See response to Document 511, Comment 2.
|         | 6 Response: The burrowing owl may occur in the area that would be disturbed by construction activities. If Fairchild AFB is chosen for Rail Garrison deployment, the Spokane office of the Washington Department of Ecology would be contacted before any construction activities begin. Joint site inspections would be conducted, where necessary.
|         | 7 Response: The report detailing the results of cultural resources investigations at Fairchild AFB has been transmitted to the SHPO in accordance with standard reporting procedures. The SHPO has reviewed the report and concurred with the finding that no resources eligible for the NRHP would be affected.
| 512     | 1 Response: All of the data and information provided by various departments and agencies of the State of Montana have been considered in the environmental impact analysis for the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program. Since the program is considerably smaller than the Small ICBM program, the presentation of analysis in this Final EIS for Peacekeeper
Rail Garrison is at a lesser level of detail than that presented in the Draft EIS for the Small ICBM program.

RESPONSE: Monitoring of the social services demands of immigrating military personnel and dependents was conducted at F.E. Warren AFB for a defense program of similar size to the Proposed Action. No significant increases in service demands were identified.

RESPONSE: The Air Force will comply with Section 404 permit requirements and will prepare wetland mitigation plans, as required, for those bases where wetlands will be affected by program activities. See Final EIS, Sections 4.3.6.3, 4.6.6.3, 4.11.6.3, and 4.12.6.3 for detailed discussions of potential wetland impacts at Barksdale AFB, Fairchild AFB, Whiteman AFB, and Wurtsmith AFB, respectively. Mitigation cost estimates were included in site analyses, but were never a significant determinant compared to overall costs of system deployment.

RESPONSE: A statement of the Air Force's responsibilities under Executive Order No. 12580 will be included in the Final EIS. A clarification of DOD's role in providing emergency response activities related to the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program has been included in Section 5.5 of the Final EIS. A clarification of the notification procedures that would be used to inform the EPA and other federal, state, and local agencies of emergency incidents is also provided in Section 5.5 of the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: The Final EIS Section 3.10.5 has been modified in response to this comment. Additional air quality modeling was performed to evaluate the short-term impacts of fugitive dust on PM$_{10}$ concentrations at the base property lines.

RESPONSE: Table 5.3.1-3 has been modified with atmospheric stability E defined as slightly stable. The reference to mixing layer depth was eliminated and replaced with surface inversion. Section 5.4.2.1 was rewritten and a figure showing the dispersion of MMH downwind with distance was added (Figure 5.4.2-1). The reference to distance in the text was deleted. The use of English units and metric units inside or outside parentheses was eliminated. English or metric units were used individually in the revised version of Chapter 5.

RESPONSE: If Barksdale AFB is chosen for Rail Garrison deployment, a detailed wetland mitigation plan would be prepared per Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and in cooperation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and other interested agencies. Furthermore, the Air Force has continued the siting redesign efforts to reduce or avoid impacts on wetlands on Barksdale AFB as much as possible. The potential for impacts on wetlands at Barksdale AFB and other candidate installations would be taken into consideration during the base selection process. Alternative siting analysis is described in Final EIS Section 4.3.6.3.

RESPONSE: A potential loss of 3.2 acres of wetlands is indicated for Wurtsmith AFB in the Final EIS, Section 4.12.6.3 if this base is selected for deployment. All of this loss is due to the Peacekeeper project and
does not include any potential loss due to the potential addition of a second rail spur. If a second spur is added to the system in the future, additional environmental analysis and documentation would be prepared for that action. The document has been revised (Section 4.12.6.3) to clarify the discussion on replacement of lost habitat. Unless otherwise suggested by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, the Air Force will follow a policy of "in kind" wetland creation or enhancement.

513 7 RESPONSE: Michigan has chosen to administer its own permit program for the discharge of dredged or fill material into wetlands within its jurisdiction. Michigan's program, as such, meets the requirements of Section 404. An analysis of feasible alternatives was conducted and is described in the Final EIS, Section 4.12.6.3. Further wetlands and mitigation analysis will be presented through the permit process if Wurtsmith AFB is chosen for deployment of Rail Garrison.

513 8 RESPONSE: If Wurtsmith AFB is chosen for deployment of the Rail Garrison program, a detailed mitigation plan would be prepared in consultation with appropriate state and federal agencies and would include a discussion of replacement or enhancement requirements (See Final EIS, Section 4.12.6.3). The mitigations referenced in the Draft EIS were meant to be inclusive of wetland and nonwetland habitats. Some of these have been reworded in the Final EIS, Appendix and Chapter 4.

513 9 RESPONSE: If Wurtsmith AFB is chosen for deployment of the Rail Garrison program, a detailed wetland mitigation plan would be prepared which would include a discussion of monitoring requirements.

513 10 RESPONSE: Final EIS Section 4.12.10.3 has been modified to include an analysis of the noise impacts resulting from relocation of the grenade range at Wurtsmith AFB.

513 11 RESPONSE: The base is currently reviewing a regional water supply plan which would use Lake Huron water to supply several towns in Osceola County, Michigan and Wurtsmith AFB. In addition, the feasibility of an alternate, local groundwater supply to meet the needs of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is also being investigated. These are mentioned as potential mitigation measures in the Final EIS, Section 4.12.7.3.

513 12 RESPONSE: Noted.

513 13 RESPONSE: Inmigrating population were incorporated into the utilities and transportation analyses and the impacts were identified in Sections 4.3 and 4.4.

513 14 RESPONSE: Locating the Rail Garrison program at Wurtsmith AFB may cause additional development in the region. The proponents of these various developments would be responsible for complying with all appropriate local, state, and federal laws and regulations and preparing any wetland mitigation plans that may be required.

513 15 RESPONSE: If Fairchild AFB is chosen for deployment of the Rail Garrison program a detailed wetland mitigation plan would be prepared per the requirements in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in cooperation
with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and other interested local, state, and federal agencies (See Final EIS Section 4.6.6.3).

**RESPONSE:** Two siting options are identified for the garrison at Malmstrom AFB. Potential impacts for each of these options are discussed under each environmental resource. The only difference documented in the Draft EIS was in Land Use. The impacts reported for Biology in the Draft EIS have been revised and appear in Section 4.9.6 of the Final EIS. With concurrent deployment of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison and Small ICBM programs, the east site option would not be considered because of facility siting and operational requirements of the Small ICBM program in that area. Therefore, cumulative impacts resulting from the concurrent deployment of the two programs were analyzed for only the south site option.

**RESPONSE:** Detailed analyses and field delineations of wetlands were conducted at Malmstrom AFB. Due to page limitations, the results of these surveys are presented in condensed form in the Final EIS, Section 4.9.6.3.

**RESPONSE:** Discussions with agricultural agencies and irrigation districts in the area in 1987 indicated that no major new agricultural irrigation projects would occur in the foreseeable future. Statistics on irrigated acreage in Cascade County from 1979 to 1985 show substantial variation but no increasing trend. As stated in the Final EIS, Section 4.9.7.3, the City of Great Falls (which also supplies water to Malmstrom AFB) has water rights to over 73,000 acre-ft/yr of Missouri River water, far in excess of the city's projected needs.

**RESPONSE:** As now stated in the Final EIS, Section 3.8.5, the water use numbers used in the text have generally been rounded to the nearest 10 acre-ft. This appears justifiable due to the inherent uncertainty in both baseline water use and program water estimates. Table 4.9.7-1 shows only the program-induced water figures and is correct.

**RESPONSE:** The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program, as currently scheduled, would be initiated in 1990 with construction activity at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming. Garrison base construction and deployment at selected locations could begin at any time between 1990 and 1992. The currently described Small ICBM program at Malmstrom AFB is for planning purposes, scheduled to be constructed and deployed between 1990 and 1996. Sensitivity analyses varying the start date of Rail Garrison activities over the years 1990 through 1992 suggest no considerable differences in cumulative impacts.

**RESPONSE:** The impact of the Proposed Action rail traffic was considered to be negligible because the increase in rail use by the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program is very small. If a second rail connection is considered for adoption at a later date, specific proposed routes and their alternatives will be determined and appropriate environmental analysis will be accomplished.
RESPONSE: Revised figures for the capacity of the lagoon and overland flow system have been incorporated into Section 4.11.2.2 of the Final EIS. Revisions to the projected population of Knob Noster have reduced the 1994 projected average daily flow to 0.24 MGD. It appears that no additional land will be required to treat the projected flow.

RESPONSE: The 0.38-MGD figure was erroneous and has been corrected to 6.0 MGD in the Final EIS, Section 4.11.2.2.

RESPONSE: This water quality problem is now discussed in the Final EIS, Section 4.11.7.2.

RESPONSE: An estimate of program-induced sedimentation from the garrison site is now included in the impact assessment. Also, it is expected that herbicides would be used to maintain a minimum level of brush clearance and visibility in this high security area. Only EPA-registered herbicides would be used and they would be applied in accordance with proper application procedures. Their use is not expected to appreciably change local water quality conditions. No substantial quantities of additional pollutants are expected to occur in stormwater runoff from the garrison site.

RESPONSE: The analysis of program water use in the Warrensburg area (Final EIS Section 4.11.7.3) indicates that program-induced pumpage in the town's wells would be about 50 acre-ft/yr, or less than two percent of baseline pumpage. It is doubtful whether any groundwater model would be sensitive enough to accurately determine changes in groundwater flow patterns attributable to such a small increase in pumpage, and no modeling has been carried out. An official with the Warrensburg Water Company stated that the last salinity problems the company had were in 1962 and resulted in the abandonment of several wells. There have been no indications of salt water intrusion in any of the current supply wells.

RESPONSE: As stated in Final EIS Sections 4.11.2.2 and 4.11.7.2, the water system at Whiteman AFB is being expanded to meet the increased water demands expected from the deployment of the B-2 bomber mission at the base in the early 1990s. Three new wells have recently been drilled at the base to supply the expected increased water use. The base worked closely with the State of Missouri to assure proper well protection. This resulted in the addition of extra casing for the upper 60 feet of one of the wells. No additional wells would be drilled to meet the needs of the Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program should it be deployed at the base. The Missouri Division of Environmental Quality was contacted regarding the status of its Wellhead Protection program. The state program is still in the early stages of formation and no specific guidance regarding future activities at Whiteman AFB was forthcoming.

RESPONSE: Section 4.11.9.2 of the Final EIS has been modified to clarify the fact that the boiler to be added to the Whiteman AFB heating plant is for the B-2 bomber program and all of the air quality impacts will be evaluated when the construction permit is obtained.
If Whiteman AFB is chosen for deployment of the Rail Garrison program, a detailed wetland mitigation plan would be prepared per the requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in cooperation with the U.S. EPA, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and other interested local, state, and federal agencies (Final EIS Section 4.11.6.3).

Siting of the Rail Garrison facilities at the north site option has carefully avoided constructing program facilities near the location of the wellbore. The location of the wellbore would also be clearly marked and visible during the construction phase.

Concerns for soil erosion sedimentation and erosion control practices have been addressed in Final EIS Sections 3.9.5, 4.4.7.3, and 4.4.8.3. Standard construction practices to minimize erosion and sedimentation will be required. These practices will be implemented at the site via an environmental protection plan prepared by each contractor selected to construct program components at the military base. Soil erosion is considered a short-duration problem related to the construction phase. Following construction, stabilization and revegetation measures should reduce long-term erosion to near-baseline levels.

During the construction phase, crews will use appropriate management practices to protect public water supplies and maintain stream quality. In compliance with federal regulations, each base has a Hazardous Waste Management Plan and a Spill Prevention and Response Plan. These plans identify the process of collecting, storing, and shipping hazardous wastes. The plans also outline the procedures necessary to respond to unplanned releases of hazardous materials during the operations phase. Each of these plans will be updated to incorporate Peacekeeper Rail Garrison facilities and program-related wastes.

This error has been corrected on Figure 4.4.7-1 in the Final EIS.

See Document 16.

The Final EIS thoroughly discusses the No Action Alternative as well as the alternative of 100 missiles on 50 trains. Predictions for conditions for the No Action Alternative are discussed under baseline conditions of each chapter. There are no other reasonable alternatives. See response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

See response to Document 34, Comment 11.

Issues of nuclear war are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

Issues of strategic policy and enemy threat are beyond the scope of this EIS. See response to Document 3, Comment 1.
RESPONSE: Aggregate demand for the program is expected to be less than 400,000 tons per installation. Producers were contacted near each installation and it was determined that aggregate is available from existing producers in the area and the program demand would not cause any shortage.

RESPONSE: The EIS does not imply that "minerals do not exist" due to a lack of existing leases for mineral resource deployment. The Region of Influence (ROI) for the program was limited to a 1-mile radius for each installation due to the limited nature of the proposed program. Critical and strategic minerals were not identified in the ROI at any installation. We acknowledge that mineral resources do occur near several installations but these localities were not within the ROI. Regional investigations to identify critical and strategic mineral resources were not conducted because they were not considered to be within the scope of this study.

RESPONSE: An analysis of the regional recreation demands was not included in the EIS due to the small size of the program-related population changes relative to baseline levels. However, local recreation demands in terms of the additional personnel required to meet these demands were included in the public services analysis.

RESPONSE: Alternative sites were considered at those bases where it was determined that wetlands would be affected. In order to properly locate program facilities within existing facilities and meet engineering, safety, and operational constraints, it was determined that there would be no practical alternative to the proposed construction of some facilities in wetlands. Site-specific mitigation plans will be prepared for those bases that are chosen for program implementation. These plans will be prepared per the requirements in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Executive Order 11990, appropriate state, federal, and local laws and regulations, and in cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. EPA.

RESPONSE: Data regarding regional and site-specific distributions, abundance, population status, and habitat requirements for federal threatened and endangered species were obtained from various U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regional offices, state game departments, natural heritage programs, and various other sources. Field surveys were also conducted at all 11 bases to evaluate habitats onbase and to determine if any federally listed species or their habitats would be affected by the proposed program. Following the analysis of all available data, it was determined that no federally listed threatened or endangered species would be affected by the proposed program. A biological assessment must be prepared for a major construction project if it is determined that a project may affect a federally listed threatened or endangered species. It was determined that the proposed program was not in a "may affect" category and no biological assessments were prepared.

RESPONSE: Surveys were conducted on F.E. Warren AFB (both north and south sites) and Malmstrom AFB (both south and east sites). No prairie dog towns were identified on any of the sites; therefore, no impacts on black-footed ferrets are expected to occur. Table 4.9.6-1 has been revised to include the historical presence of black-footed ferrets in the ROI for Malmstrom AFB. See the Final EIS, Sections 4.2.6.3 and 4.9.6.3.
RESPONSE: In the course of fulfilling the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Air Force has received correspondence from State Historic Preservation Offices in nine states. Because of the volume of correspondence, these documents are not included in the Final EIS. They will be maintained on file by the Air Force and will be made available through the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia, 22161, Attention Order Control.

RESPONSE: The federal status of the swift fox has been corrected in the Final EIS from federal endangered to federal candidate, Category 2. See the Final EIS, Tables 4.2.6-1 and 4.9.6.1.

RESPONSE: It was determined that no federally listed threatened or endangered species would be affected by the program; therefore, no biological assessment was prepared. The Colorado butterfly plant occurs on F.E. Warren AFB in the riparian habitats along Crow and Diamond creeks. These riparian habitats are not located in the direct impact area and would not be affected by program implementation at the north site. A detailed survey was conducted in August 1988 on the proposed south site to determine if the Colorado butterfly plant was present. No plants were found; therefore, no impacts on the plant are expected. See the Final EIS, Section 4.2.6.3.

RESPONSE: The black-footed ferret has been added to Table 4.9.6-1. See the Final EIS, Section 4.9.6.3, Table 4.9.6-1.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

RESPONSE: Production of nuclear warheads is beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

RESPONSE: Issues relating to the development of the missile are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 63.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

RESPONSE: See Document 424.

RESPONSE: Concerns for soil erosion and erosion control practices have been addressed in the Final EIS, Section 3.9.5. Soil erosion is considered a short-duration problem related to the construction phase and has also been covered under mitigation sections related to construction.

RESPONSE: Noted.

RESPONSE: Noted.

RESPONSE: Over the next few years, Dyess AFB is expected to experience a small increase over its current water use. The figure
of 1.02 MGD given on Draft EIS page 4.4-14 is the 1987 water use for the base. The figure of 1.2 MGD given on Draft EIS page 4.4-28 is the estimated baseline water use by the base at a time corresponding to the operations phase of the program, that is 1993 and onward.

RESPONSE: The estimated value of Dyess AFB's current wastewater flow to the Abilene plant is 0.61 MGD. Contacts with the city indicated no problems with the effluent quality from Dyess AFB, therefore data concerning the quality of the flow are not included in the EIS. The city will begin construction of its expanded wastewater treatment facility in 1989 with completion scheduled for October 1990.

RESPONSE: Figures 4.4-1 and 4.4.7-1 illustrate the base drainage to Little Elm Creek, as does the text in the Final EIS, Section 4.4.7.2. A detailed storm drainage map of Dyess AFB was reviewed as part of the impact analysis. A stormwater analysis performed for the south site indicated that peak runoff from the site to Little Elm Creek, resulting from a 2-year, 24-hour storm, could increase by about 55 cfs, depending upon actual drainage design for the site.

RESPONSE: The only out-of-channel flooding of Little Elm Creek at Dyess AFB is in the vicinity of the base housing area at the eastern side of the base, 1.5 miles downstream of the south site, and well outside of the explosive safety zone. The rail spur bridge will be designed to pass the 100-year flood, identified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as being 20,500 cfs at Dyess AFB.

RESPONSE: To deal with accidental spills, Dyess AFB has a Hazardous Waste Management Plan and a Spill Prevention and Response Plan. These plans identify the process of collecting, storing, and shipping hazardous materials and also outline the procedures necessary to respond to unplanned releases of hazardous materials. The Peacekeeper Rail Garrison program will add one fuel storage tank and use the existing hazardous materials storage facilities for the materials generated by the maintenance of the Rail Garrison program. Each of the base plans will be updated to incorporate Peacekeeper Rail Garrison facilities and program-related hazardous materials.

RESPONSE: See responses to Document 6, Comment 1 and Document 33, Comment 74.

RESPONSE: Off-limit areas are presented on maps in the Final EIS, Chapter 4 which describes impacts on each candidate base. Also see response to Document 6, Comment 2.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 506, Comment 66.

RESPONSE: Military and civilian personnel required for operations at Little Rock AFB are 363 and 63, respectively. Personnel requirements for all phases of the program at Little Rock AFB are presented in Table 4.8.1-1 in the Final EIS, Section 4.8.1.3.

RESPONSE: See response to Document 33, Comment 30.
RESPONSE: See responses to Document 33, Comment 12 and Document 6, Comment 2.

RESPONSE: Issues of nuclear war and enemy attack are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

RESPONSE: During the construction phase, impacts on railroads would occur as a result of rail track extension and spur construction and/or rehabilitation. Most of the installations would require new rail spurs to connect the garrison and associated facilities with a railroad main line. The connector rail spurs would require construction of wyes at the main line. Because most of the construction would occur off the railroad main lines, minimal interference from normal commercial train traffic would occur. Construction of the wyes at the main lines could be completed without causing delays to normal commercial train traffic. Also see response to Document 33, Comment 76.

RESPONSE: The likelihood and consequence of such accidents are discussed in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the Final EIS.

RESPONSE: Issues of budgetary priorities are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.

RESPONSE: Issues of strategic policy are beyond the scope of this EIS. Also see response to Document 3, Comment 1.