



DRAFT
Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact
Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range
USDA Forest Service
Pacific Ranger District, Olympic National Forest
Jefferson, Grays Harbor, and Clallam County, Washington

Introduction

The Olympic National Forest received a special use permit (SUP) application from the U.S. Navy proposing to use National Forest System (NFS) roads for training exercises on the Pacific Ranger District in connection with aircraft activities conducting electronic warfare (EW) training. The project area is located on NFS lands within the counties of Jefferson, Grays Harbor, and Clallam, in the west portion of Washington's Olympic Peninsula (Appendix A). The legal description is as follows: T22N, R9W, Section 31; T22N, R10W, Sections 14, 24, 33; T23N, R10W, Section 1; T24N, R10W, Sections 2, 28; T24N, R9W, Section 31; T28N, R12W, Section 1; T29N, R11W, Section 30; T29N, R12W, Sections 14, 15.

The Navy prepared the 2014 *Pacific Northwest EW Range Environmental Assessment* (2014 EW Range EA) (Navy, 2014) that analyzes the potential impacts of actions associated with installation and operation of an EW range in the state of Washington. On August 28, 2014, the Navy signed a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the 2014 EW Range EA documenting that an environmental impact statement is not necessary.

The 2014 EW Range EA tiers to the Record of Decision (Navy, 2010) for the Navy's 2010 *Northwest Training Range Complex (NWTRC) Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS) and incorporates the EIS/OEIS by reference (Navy, 2010). The 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS analyzed a variety of Navy ship, submarine, and aircraft training activities that included EW training (referred to as Electronic Combat in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS). The 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS analyzed EW range training activities and the concept of a fixed emitter on the Olympic Peninsula with aircraft activities that are currently conducting EW training. However, at the time the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS was completed, details for the potential use of fixed and mobile signal transmitters were not available. The 2014 EW Range EA addresses the components of EW training that were not analyzed in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS. The nature and scope of the Proposed Action involving the use of NFS roads and Washington State Department of Natural Resources roads requires the participation of, and coordination with, both agencies.

The 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS, authorized in its Record of Decision (Navy, 2016), consolidates and updates the analyses of military readiness activities within the NWTRC EIS/OEIS (Navy, 2010), the 2010 Keyport Range Complex Extension EIS (Navy, 2010), and the 1988 Southeast Alaska Acoustic Measurement Facility EIS (Navy, 1988). Specifically, aircraft use associated with EW training over the Olympic Military Operations Areas was addressed in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS (Navy, 2010) and reanalyzed

in the Navy's 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS (Navy, 2015) which includes an airspace noise analysis for the Olympic Military Operations Areas.

Electronic warfare is any military action involving the use of electromagnetic and directed energy to control the electromagnetic spectrum or to attack the enemy. The purpose of EW is to deny the opponent the advantage of, and ensure unimpeded access to, the electromagnetic spectrum—the range of all possible frequencies of electromagnetic radiation (i.e., electromagnetic energy) for use in such applications as communication systems, navigation systems, and defense-related systems and components (Joint Chiefs of Staff Publication, 2012). An EW Range is a collection of resources across a large geographic area where EW training can be facilitated.

Effective EW training requires sources of electromagnetic energy that simulate systems operated by enemy combatants. Each of these threat systems (typically search or targeting radar systems) transmits energy within identifiable and recognizable parameters (e.g., frequency). These parameters can be simulated by EW emitters such as those proposed in the 2014 EW Range EA. To train sailors in locating the source, it is important that the EW emitters have some degree of mobility in order to present a cross threat axis training picture. For that reason, mobile EW emitters are required. The emitters would be frequently relocated among the selected sites, challenging crews in determining the emitter's location.

Decision

My decision adopts the Navy's 2014 EW Range EA in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations at 40 CFR 1506.3, which provide that an agency may adopt appropriate environmental documents prepared by another agency to eliminate duplication by federal agencies.

My decision also incorporates by reference analysis associated with the Navy's 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS (Navy, 2015) and Record of Decision (Navy, 2016).

My decision is to select Alternative 1 as described in the 2014 EW Range EA (Section 2.1.1.4, pp. 2-4 through 2-6; Section 2.2.3.2, p. 2-10) with modifications. Under Alternative 1, the Navy proposes: (1) installation and operation of a mission control center and debrief center in an existing facility at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island; (2) installation and operation of a fixed emitter at Naval Station Everett Annex Pacific Beach, including renovation of Building 104; (3) installation and operation of communication equipment on an existing tower in the Olympic Military Operations Area at Octopus Mountain; and (4) operation of Mobile Electronic Warfare Training System using vehicle-mounted emitters within the Olympic Military Operations Areas on the Olympic National Forest and Washington State lands. Authorization of activities not occurring on the Olympic National Forest are outside the scope of my authority. Items (1), (2), and (3) are not on the Olympic National Forest. Portions of item (4) are not on the Olympic National Forest, specifically four locations on Washington State lands (emitter sites: 3, 12, 13, and 14).

The entirety of my decision is reflected in the draft SUP in Appendix C of this document.

My modifications to Alternative 1 are as follows:

1. Not authorizing installation and operation of a mission control center and debrief center in an existing facility at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, because it is not within my jurisdiction.
2. Not authorizing installation and operation of a fixed emitter at Naval Station Everett Annex Pacific Beach, including renovation of Building 104, because it is not within my jurisdiction.
3. Not authorizing installation and operation of communication equipment on an existing tower in the Olympic Military Operations Area at Octopus Mountain, because it is not within my jurisdiction.
4. Not authorizing operation of Mobile Electronic Warfare Training System vehicle-mounted emitters within the Olympic Military Operations Areas on Washington State lands, because it is not within my jurisdiction.
5. Issuing a SUP for operation of a Mobile Electronic Warfare Training System consisting of vehicle-mounted emitters on the Olympic National Forest for up to five years at 11 designated emitter sites: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 15 (2014 EW Range EA Figures 1.3-2 and 1.3-3, and Table 1.3-1, pp. 1-3 through 1-5). Table 1, below, displays the locations and associated Forest Plan Management Allocations for the sites (Maps, Appendix A of this document).

Table 1. Location of 11 emitter sites authorized for use and their associated Olympic National Forest Plan Allocations (Appendix A).

Emitter Site #.	Latitude/Longitude Township, Range, Section*	Specific Road Location	Forest Plan Allocation: Northwest Forest Plan Amendment/1990 Land and Resource Management Plan
1	N 47°32'13.56" / W 123°56'51.18" T24N, R10W, Sec 28	NFS Rd NF-2140, MP 3.5	Late Successional Reserve/ Timber Management
2	N 47°31'40.80" / W 123°52'47.50" T24N, R9W, Sec 31	NFS Rd NF-2190, MP 11.5	Late Successional Reserve/ Timber Management
4	N 47°35'49.80" / W 124°02'39.80" T24N, R10W, Sec 2	NFS Rd NF-011, MP3.7	Adaptive Management Area, Riparian Reserve/ Timber Management
5	N 47°22'32.81" / W 123°53'12.87" T22N, R10W, Sec 33	NFS Rd NF-2258, MP 2.56	Late Successional Reserve/ Timber Management
6	N 47°24'20.50" / W 123°50'27.08" T22N, R10W, Sec 24	NFS Rd NF-2258, MP 0.01	Late Successional Reserve/ Timber Management
7	N 47°23'47.40" / W 123°54'52.80" T22N, R10W, Sec 14	NFS Rd 2257, MP2.35, pull off	Adaptive Management Area/ Timber Management
8	N 47°21'30.10" / W 123°51'56.40" T22N, R9W, Sec 31	NFS Rd 042; MP 0.269, pull off	Late Successional Reserve, Riparian Reserve/ Timber Management
9	N 47°57'58.00" / W 124°11'41.70" T28N, R12W, Sec 1	NFS Rd 2923 and NFS Rd 025, MP 0.005, pull off at intersection	Adaptive Management Area/ Timber Management
10	N 47°59'26.11" / W 124°09'59.78" T29N, R11W, Sec 30	NFS Rd 2923, MP 10.2, MP 7.4, pull off	Adaptive Management Area/ Timber Management
11	N 48°00'57.54" / W 124°13'26.13" T29N, R12W, Sec 14-15	NFS Rd 060 and NFS Rd 065, MP 1.6, pull off	Adaptive Management Area, Riparian Reserve/ General Level River Corridor
15	N 47°30'44.80" / W 123°53'20.20" T23N, R10W, Sec 1	NFS Rd NF-2190, MP 10.2	Late Successional Reserve/ Timber Management

Mobile emitter trucks are stationed at the Naval Station Everett Annex Pacific Beach. On a typical training day, three mobile-emitter trucks (2014 EW Range EA, Figures 2.1-3 through 2.1-5) will each drive to one of the 11 designated sites on the Olympic National Forest. They will be parked and operated at designated sites on pull-outs out of the way of traffic. These

sites are generally on a cliff or ridgeline, or otherwise provide an open area to the west of the pull-out enabling the mobile emitter a clear line of sight to the west (2014 EW Range EA, p. 2-4). The crews will set up the safety zones to include warning tape and removable “Electromagnetic Radiation Hazard” signage, which will warn people to not linger inside the taped area. Training operations will cease or move if people are in the area. When the supported aircraft are within the area (either airborne in W-237, an offshore warning area extending westward off the coast of northern Washington State, or in the Olympic Military Operations Areas) the crew within the mobile emitter will energize the emitter in accordance with the training scenario. The emitter systems transmit electromagnetic radiation within an identifiable and recognizable energy wave within the electromagnetic spectrum. Two types of vehicle-mounted mobile emitters are proposed for use. Traveling Wave Tube Amplifier mobile emitters are capable of generating an electromagnetic wave at frequencies ranging from 4 to 8 GHz; the Magnetron mobile emitters are capable of generating an electromagnetic wave at frequencies ranging from 6.7 to 7.4 GHz. The emitter may be energized for short periods of time throughout the training activity or continuously throughout the entire time the aircraft is airborne, depending upon the training scenario. While training operations are underway, each mobile-emitter truck will be in place for 8 to 16 hours, for an average of 12 hours each day, with electronic emissions occurring for about 45 minutes of every hour. Operations will be conducted from any of the designated sites for up to 250 days per year.

Public access and safety described in the 2014 EW Range EA are integral components of my decision (pp. 3.1-4 through 3.1-5). Health and safety Standard Operating Procedures will be implemented. These procedures from the 2014 EW Range EA are included as part of the Draft SUP (Appendix C, Exhibit B). Additional Project Design Features were developed by Forest Service resource specialists to ensure protection of forest resources and are also included as part of the Draft SUP (Appendix C, Exhibit B). Compliance with the SUP will be ensured through the permit administration process.

Decision Rationale

I considered several factors in making my decision to select Alternative 1 as described in the 2014 EW Range EA (Section 2.1.1.4) with modifications. I specifically considered: the 1988 Master Agreement with the Department of Defense; the relationship to the project’s Purpose and Need; consistency with the Forest Plan; previous operations; analysis disclosed in the 2014 EW Range EA and 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS¹; and external input consisting of comments received during and outside of the comment periods.

1988 Master Agreement with the Department of Defense

In making my decision, I considered the 1988 Master Agreement between the Department of Defense and the United States Department of Agriculture concerning the use of NFS lands for military activity. I determined that my decision is consistent with and supports the intent of the 1988 Master Agreement.

¹ The Study Area for the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS includes only at-sea components of the training and testing areas and facilities. The land resources affected by use of the Olympic Military Operating Areas A and B in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS were re-evaluated in the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS as they are directly impacted by overflights for at-sea activities.

Relationship to the Project's Purpose and Need

In making my decision, I considered its relationship to the project's purpose and need. This decision to select Alternative 1, modified as described above, meets the project's purposes and needs in the following ways:

To sustain and enhance the level and type of EW training currently being conducted as described in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS and authorized in its Record of Decision.

My decision supports required EW basic, intermediate, and sustainment training activities and certifications for air and surface, units in the NWTRC.

To provide the ability to accommodate growth in future training requirements and to maximize the ability of local units to achieve their training requirements on local ranges.

My decision accommodates anticipated future training requirements by expanding the current use and activity of the long-established Military Operations Areas in and around the Olympic Peninsula.

To maximize the ability of local Naval units to achieve their training requirements on local ranges.

My decision allows local Navy units to train in the local Olympic Military Operations Areas, as opposed to traveling longer distances to sites. Local training reduces training costs and reduces the use of fossil fuels. It also maximizes and balances the quality training with quality of life by reducing the time of Navy personnel away from home.

Other Alternatives Considered in Detail

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, limited EW training, without the enhanced capability of fixed and mobile emitters, would continue to be conducted in the NWTRC and intermediate-level EW training for certification would continue to occur at the Mountain Home Air Force Base approximately 400 nautical miles southeast of the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island. I did not select this alternative because it does not reasonably address the project's purpose and need by foregoing the opportunity to sustain, enhance, expand, and accommodate for growth of EW training on lands within my jurisdiction.

Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the Navy proposes: (1) installation and operation of a mission control center and debrief center in an existing facility at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island; (2) installation and operation of a fixed emitter at Naval Station Everett Annex Pacific Beach, including renovation of Building 104; (3) installation and operation of communication equipment on an existing tower in the Olympic Military Operations Area at Octopus Mountain; and (4) operation of Mobile Electronic Warfare Training System using vehicle-mounted emitters within the Olympic Military Operations Areas on the Olympic National Forest and Washington State lands. Authorization of activities not occurring on the Olympic

National Forest are outside the scope of my authority. Items (1), (2), and (3) are not on the Olympic National Forest. Portions of item (4) are not on the Olympic National Forest, specifically four locations on Washington State lands (emitter sites: 3, 12, 13, and 14).

Proposed Action / Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, the Navy proposes to undertake operations identified in Alternative 1 as well as operation of Mobile Electronic Warfare Training System using vehicle-mounted emitters on NFS lands within the Okanogan and Roosevelt Military Operations Areas. This alternative fully meets the project's Purpose and Need. I did not select this alternative because authorization of activities not occurring on the Olympic National Forest are outside the scope of my authority. The Okanogan and Roosevelt Military Operations Areas are not associated with the Olympic National Forest; they are associated with the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest and the Colville National Forest.

Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Further Study

The Navy also considered five additional alternatives that it eliminated from further study (see Appendix D). These alternatives were determined by the Navy as not feasible or unreasonable relative to their ability to meet all of the selection criteria for the Proposed Action.

I also considered having the sites located on the Olympic National Forest moved to behind gates on closed roads. I considered this as a way to reduce the potential interference with other public uses. I eliminated this from further consideration because it could undermine the intent of road closures.

Consistency with the Forest Plan

In making my decision, I considered the relationship to direction in the Forest Plan. My decision is consistent with the Forest Plan, see the Forest Plan Consistency Section, pp.18-21 of this document.

Previous Operations

In making my decision, I considered the four previously issued short-term SUPs authorizing this type of activity. These SUPs were for "conducting feasibility tests of an Integrated Air Defense System by use of a mobile emitter as a training device for Navy pilots. Aircraft will fly overhead in a manner consistent with heights and locations approved in the Olympic Military Operations Area, and a threat emitter will produce a simulation of hostile missiles and radar signals that will be monitored by the Aircraft Crew." On October 14, 2010, I signed SUP SOL142 that expired December 31, 2010; Navy reported conducting system checks for a total of 4 days during this permit period. On November 11, 2011, I signed SUP QUN345 that expired February 29, 2012; Navy reported conducting system checks for a total of 12 days during this permit period. On September 9, 2013, I signed SUP SOL185 that expired December 31, 2013; Navy reported conducting system checks for a total of 4 days during this permit period. On August 21, 2014, I signed SUP QUN387 that expired December 31, 2014;

Navy reported conducting system checks for a total of 4 days during this permit period. No environmental or public concerns were identified from these activities.

External Input

I considered external input received during the comment period (see ‘Public Involvement and Tribal Consultation’ and references to the National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and State Historic Preservation Office) and outside the formal comment period process. Input I considered outside of the formal comment period process includes, but is not limited to, letters to the Chief of the Forest Service and the Pacific Northwest Regional Forester. Those persons or organizations that submitted comments received outside of the formal comment periods do not have standing for filing an objection to this Draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact.

Public Involvement and Tribal Consultation

The Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range Environmental Assessment was listed on the Olympic National Forest’s *Schedule of Proposed Actions* (SOPA) October 1, 2013, and has remained on the SOPA throughout the planning, analysis, and decision process.

On April 28, 2014, the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest sent letters to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and Yakima Nation soliciting input on the project.

On May 19, 2014, I sent letters to the Quileute Tribe, Hoh Tribe, and Quinault Indian Nation to provide an invitation for government-to-government consultation and solicit input on the project. On June 26, 2014, I sent a scoping letters to citizens, organizations, and state, federal, and local government agencies that have expressed an interest in management activities on the Forest. The letters described the Proposed Action and requested comments. The Forest did not receive any responses as a result of these mailings.

On July 29, 2014, the Navy mailed postcards to 141 elected officials, government agencies, Native American Tribes, nongovernmental organizations, community and business groups, and individuals on their project mailing list. The postcards included project information, a description of the Proposed Action, information repository locations, and comment instructions.

On July 30, 2014, the Navy sent a two-page informational flyer to the Pacific Beach Conference Center and 20 local U.S. Post Offices. 17 U.S. Post Offices were located in the vicinity of the Olympic National Forest area, and 3 were located in the vicinity of the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville National Forests areas. Post Offices were located in the following cities and towns in Washington: Amanda Park, Beaver, Clallam Bay, Copalis Beach, Copalis Crossing, Forks, Humptulips, La Push, Matlock, McCleary, Moclips, Neah Bay, Neilton, Ocean Shores, Pacific Beach, Quinault, Taholah, Okanogan, Omak, and Republic. The fliers described the Proposed Action and alternatives, information repository locations, and comment instructions.

On July 31, 2014, the Navy sent letters to the Quileute Tribe, Hoh Tribe, Quinault Indian Nation, Makah Tribe, and Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. The letters provided notice of the availability of the Draft 2014 EW Range EA as well as to seek whether they wanted government-to-government consultation. Consultations were conducted between the Navy and the Quileute Tribe, Hoh Tribe, and Quinault Indian Nation, as well as with the Jamestown S’Kallam Tribe, Port Gamble S’Kallam Tribe, Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe, Suquamish Tribe, and Skokomish Tribe. The Navy responded to questions and request for additional information from the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

On August 1, 2014, the Navy posted the Draft 2014 EW Range EA on the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Northwest documents website (<http://go.usa.gov/kQ6e>). This website was included in the Navy’s aforementioned postcard mailers, informational fliers, and Tribal letters, and the newspaper display advertisements noted below. The Draft 2014 EW Range EA was also made available at the following information repository location of public libraries: Oak Harbor, Ocean Shores, Omak Municipal, Republic Community, Timberland Regional-Aberdeen, and Timberland Regional-Hoquiam.

From August 1, 2014, through August 14, 2014, display advertisements were published in the following newspapers: *The Olympian* (August 1, 2, 3, 2014); *The Seattle Times* (August 1, 2, 3, 2014); *The Daily World* (August 2, 5, 7, 2014); *The Montesano Vidette* (August 7, 14, 2014). All advertisements included the project information, a description of the Proposed Action, information repository locations, and comment instructions.

On August 4, 2014, I sent letters to interested parties providing them a 30-day opportunity to comment on the Proposed Action and Draft 2014 EW Range EA. On August 9, 2014, I published notice of the Forest Service 30-day comment period in *The Daily World*. Two responses were received by the Forest during this comment period. The comments were not specific, in that they did not introduce any new information or issues related to the proposed alternatives.

On August 15, 2014, the Navy’s 15-day public comment period on their Draft EW Range EA closed. The Navy received no comments in response to their Draft EW Range EA.

On September 12, 2014, I sent letters to interested parties informing them of my Draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, and 45-day pre-decisional objection period. On September 13, 2014, I published notice of my Draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact and 45-day pre-decisional objection period (per 36 CFR 218) in *The Daily World*.

On September 26, 2014, after public concerns indicated that the prior scoping and comment period notification may not have reached all interested and affected parties, by letter to interested parties I cancelled my Draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact that started the 45-day pre-decisional objection period. On September 26, 2014, I also sent additional letters to interested parties notifying them of the additional time to provide comments. On October 1, 2014, I published a notice of the cancellation of the objection period and additional opportunity to comment in *The Peninsula Daily News*. In order to fully

understand public concerns and interests, this additional opportunity to comment went through October 10, 2014.

On October 8, 2014, I issued a News Release and sent letters to interested parties that to ensure the public had adequate time to provide comment, I was providing additional time to comment through October 31, 2014, and that the Navy was hosting a question and answer session in Forks Washington on October 14, 2014. I participated in the Navy-hosted question and answer session. At this session, the Navy provided a brief with PowerPoint slides addressing the ongoing and proposed activities related to EW training activities, and provided written informational handouts. Follow on questions and comments were provided verbally by the public and varied greatly. Topics of discussion included electronic signal energy, aircraft activities and noise, airspace parameters, potential effects of Navy activities to the public and the environment, Navy safety procedures and mitigations, potential for interference with other electronic signal sources, the National Environmental Policy Act process, and the National Forest Service SUP process.

On October 31, 2014, I issued a News Release and sent letters to interested parties that to ensure the public has adequate time to provide comment, I was offering additional time for comments through November 28, 2014, and the Navy was hosting a question and answer session in Port Angeles Washington on November 6, 2014. I participated in the Navy-hosted question and answer session. This session was similar in format and in the nature of questions and comments posed by the public as noted for the session above.

Over 3,500 public comments were received by the Forest during its comment period. In addition, a petition of 126,000 signatures in opposition to the project was received by the Forest. Comments were thematically grouped by concern. Public input was considered in making my decision to select Alternative 1 with modifications. Responses on the received comments are included as Appendix B.

Finding of No Significant Impact

After considering comments from the public and the environmental effects described in the 2014 EW Range EA, I have determined that the actions of modified Alternative 1 will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

The following is a summary of the project analysis to determine significance, as defined by Forest Service Handbook 1909.15_05. "Significant" as used in National Environmental Policy Act requires consideration of both context and intensity of the expected project effects.

Context means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts (i.e. local regional, worldwide), and over short and long time frames. For site-specific actions, significance usually depends upon the effects in the local context rather than in the world as a whole.

Intensity refers to the severity of the expected project impacts and is defined by the following 10 points.

Context

The project is limited in scope and duration and is designed to minimize environmental effects through mitigation measures (2014 EW Range EA, Section 3.1.1.5; this document, Appendix C, Exhibit B). The Pacific Northwest EW range activities will be localized to specific sites within the Pacific Ranger District. Mobile Electronic Warfare Training System vehicles will utilize 11 pullout sites along NFS roads, using 3 sites per day, for 8 to 16 hours per day for approximately 250 days per year. The EW range activities will be authorized under a SUP for a duration of 5 years. Based on these factors, I believe the effects of this project will be localized, and will not contribute to significant environmental effects within or beyond the project area.

Intensity

The environmental effects of the actions are documented in Chapter 3 of the 2014 EW Range EA (2014 EW Range EA beginning on p. 3.0-1). I considered the beneficial and adverse impacts associated with modified Alternative 1 disclosed in the 2014 EW Range EA and supporting documentation in the project file. The analysis considered the direct and indirect effects of the project and their contribution to potential cumulative effects (2014 EW Range EA, p. 3.0-1). The key findings for potential effects are summarized below. Effects are expected to be low in intensity with implementation of Standard Operating Procedures and project design features (Appendix C, Exhibit B) included to eliminate or minimize effects.

1) Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on the balance the effects will be beneficial.

I considered the beneficial and adverse impacts associated with Alternative 1 disclosed in the 2014 EW Range EA. A full range of environmental issues were considered for evaluation at the outset of the process. Certain resources were eliminated from detailed study in the 2014 EW Range EA because research revealed that the proposed action and alternatives were unlikely to have any potential environmental impacts on these resources, or that impacts would be negligible (2014 EW Range EA, p. 3.0-2, Table 3.0-1). The analysis considered the direct and indirect impacts of the project and their contribution to potential cumulative impacts (2014 EW Range EA, p. 3.0-1). The key findings for potential impacts from vehicle noise, and mobile emitter generator noise, and electromagnetic radiation are summarized below.

Public Health and Safety

No significant health or safety impacts to the public would occur as a result of implementation of my decision because of the Standard Operating Procedures listed in Section 3.1.1.5 of the 2014 EW Range EA and included as requirements in the Draft SUP (Appendix C, Exhibit B). These include procedures that require emitter operators to adhere to specific safety precautions designed to prevent electromagnetic hazards to people. In addition, the response to comments, Appendix B, p. 61 states that “the frequency bands that the transmitters will operate within are within the radio wave part of the electromagnetic spectrum and include frequencies used in existing public equipment, such as cordless phones, Wi-Fi, and Bluetooth devices.”

Noise²

The 2014 EW Range EA addresses the potential impacts of noise on the human terrestrial environment in the vicinity of the EW range in Washington from the sound generated by the selected alternative on noise-sensitive areas (2014 EW Range EA, pp. 3.3-3 through 3.3-8). Noise sensitive areas are those areas where noise interferes with normal activities associated with its use (2014 EW Range EA, pg. 3.3-3). Noise-sensitive areas may include such sites in the immediate vicinity of operations, pursuant to the Noise Control Act of 1972 (49 USC 44715). Users of designated recreational areas are considered sensitive receptors (2014 EW Range EA, pg. 3.3-3). Potential impacts of sound on terrestrial biological resources are addressed in Section 3.2 of the 2014 EW Range EA, and summarized in this document under the Biological Resources section (below).

Noise from mobile transmitter vehicles and generators will only occur on established NFS roads within the Olympic National Forest. Existing noise levels in the project area are influenced by traffic on Highway 101 and local roads, adjacent transmission lines, local industries and other noise-generating activities. Ambient sounds levels vary by location in forested areas and is expected to range between 30 and 50 dBA on the Olympic Peninsula (2014 EW Range EA, pg. 3.3-4). The contribution of the intermittent transits by the mobile emitter vehicles to the overall noise environment will be no more than incremental and will not be considered a substantial source of sound. Generators selected to power the mobile emitters have specifications that state that they meet National Park Service sound level requirements (60dBA at 50 ft.) (2014 EW Range EA, pg. 3.3-6). Noise from the generators used to power the emitters will create a steady noise during the periods of operation. The sound level at 50 ft. (15.3 m) is estimated at or near ambient noise levels and the sound level at 100 ft. (30.5 m) is estimated to be below the expected ambient noise level. Sound impacts to community noise levels from training activities under Alternative 1 are negligible in areas outside the immediate vicinity of operations because the areas occur on NFS lands and very few members of the public would be exposed to sound from the mobile emitter sites. Overall, no impacts on the acoustic environment would occur under modified Alternative 1 as a result of operations noise.

Biological Resources

The impacts of project activities, including noise (discussed above) and electromagnetic radiation, on biological resources were disclosed in the 2014 EW Range EA (Section 3.2). Electromagnetic radiation from Mobile Electronic Warfare Training System is described in the 2014 EW Range EA (p. 3.2-28).

² Aircraft use associated with EW training over the Olympic Military Operations Areas was addressed in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS (Navy, 2010) and reanalyzed in the Navy's 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS (Navy, 2015) which includes an airspace noise analysis for the Olympic Military Operations Areas. The 2015 Northwest Training and Testing EIS (p. 3.0-37) notes that: "Based on the results of that study, sound exposure levels at the sea surface or on land from most air combat maneuver overflights are expected to be less than 85 dBA (based on an EA-18G aircraft flying at an altitude of 5,000 ft. [1,524 m] and at a subsonic airspeed [400 knots]). Exposure to fixed-wing aircraft noise would be brief (seconds) as an aircraft quickly passes overhead."

Impacts to Non-Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed Vegetation, Invertebrates, Amphibians, Reptiles, and Other Birds and Mammals

A list of species potentially found in the study area that were considered for potential impacts are listed in the 2014 EW Range EA, Table A-1, pp. A-1-A-8. To provide further clarification of the information in that table specific to species and habitat occurrence within the project area, a Forest Service biologist prepared a list of wildlife (invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, and bird) species or habitat occurring on the Olympic National Forest. Additional information on species, habitat and potential impacts was provided where necessary for clarification (summary table available on file at the Olympic National Forest Supervisor's Office). Effects to ESA listed species occurring in the project area are discussed separately below.

As summarized in the 2014 EW Range EA (2014 EW Range EA, p. 3.2-24, 3.2-27), under Alternative 1, the disturbances from vehicle noise, generator/emitter noise are expected to be minimal, short term, and recoverable based on: (1) relatively low intensity of the impacts, (2) localized nature of the impacts on pre-disturbed areas, (3) infrequent nature of the impacts due to the spread-out nature of the sites, and (4) the brief duration of the activities. For these reasons, long-term consequences to individual vegetation, invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, and other non-listed birds and mammals or their populations are not expected to result from proposed training activities. Modified Alternative 1 will have no direct or indirect changes that would have a considerable impact on species or their habitat.

As summarized in the 2014 EW Range EA (p. 3.2-26, 3.2-29) the effects of electromagnetic radiation on vegetation, invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, and non-listed birds and mammals can be expected to be minor for the following reasons: (1) the source of electromagnetic radiation does not expose wildlife species to constant radiation; in other words, no area of the project area is continuously saturated with electromagnetic fields because the three vehicle mounted emitters are mobile and not constantly running; (2) beams of electromagnetic radiation (e.g., from EW training) may expose birds in flight to increased levels of radiation; however, the birds in flight would be moving through the area and potentially out of the area of the main beam, once again keeping them from continuous or long-duration exposure (especially since non-soaring birds have relatively quick airspeeds); and (3) the beam pattern emitted is directional, which minimizes the area exposed to radiation. Electromagnetic radiation may have an impact on vegetation, invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, and non-listed birds and mammals under modified Alternative 1; however, it is unlikely that vegetation, invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, and non-listed birds and mammals would be constantly exposed to electromagnetic radiation, and therefore negative effects are less likely to occur.

The Regional Forester's Forest Service Interagency Special Status / Sensitive Species (ISSSS) with habitat within the project area include: pacific fisher, northern goshawk, Peregrine falcon, bald eagle, van Dyke's salamander, Olympic torrent salamander, Olympia pebblesnail, Malone jumping slug, keeled (Burrington) jumping-slug, Oregon megomphix, broadwhorl tightcoil, blue-gray tail-dropper, mottled tail-dropper, Western bumble bee, Johnson's hairstreak, Townsend's big-eared bat, Keen's myotis, little brown myotis, and Pacific marten. For these species a Forest Service biologist concluded that the actions may impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend toward federal listing or cause a loss of

viability to the population or species. The project would have no effect and will not contribute to a negative trend in viability to the Olympic National Forest Management Indicator Species: Pacific marten, primary cavity excavators (various species), pileated woodpecker, Roosevelt elk, or Columbia black-tailed deer. The project activity is not ground disturbing within habitat for Survey and Manage species, therefore mollusks are not further addressed.

Impacts to Fish Species

Impacts resulting from implementing this decision to listed fish species within the project area on the Olympic National Forest were evaluated by a Forest Service fish biologist. Bull trout is the only federally listed fish species and designated fish critical habitat within the project area. The potential impacts to this species and consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are discussed under intensity factor 9 in this document.

Impacts to ESA-Listed Species

Two ESA listed threatened species, marbled murrelets and Northern spotted owls, and their critical habitat occur within the project area. Formal and informal consultation was conducted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine effects to these species and their critical habitat. The findings of the Biological Opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are summarized under intensity factor 9 in this document.

Impacts on Air Quality and Climate Change

As shown in the 2014 EW Range EA (p. Table 3.4-6), emission estimates for Alternative 1 do not exceed *de minimis* levels established by the Clean Air Act in 40 C.F.R. §93.153(b). Annual criteria and precursor air pollutant emissions would be less than the corresponding federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration increments. In addition, estimated emissions would not be considered regionally significant as they would be approximately 0.0031 percent of the regional emissions.

Impacts on Visual Resources

For EW operations underlying the Olympic Military Operations Areas, activities will be conducted using mobile emitter trucks away from population centers and sensitive view sheds or receptors. The mobile emitter trucks will be temporarily parked at one of the 11 pre-selected training sites during training activities (using existing and cleared pull outs or turnarounds); these sites are along NFS roads that are open for public use. There will be no change to the visual character of these areas (2014 EW Range EA, p. 3.5-1) as a result of this use.

2) The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

The hazards associated with these actions and their potential effects on public health and safety are described in the 2014 EW Range EA (pp. 3.1-1 through 3.1-8) and addressed above under intensity factor 1. Implementation of modified Alternative 1 will comply with the electromagnetic safety standards already in place for EW training activities. During EW training, the Navy will ensure that all necessary safety precautions are adhered to in order to minimize the risk to the public. Standard operating procedures are requirement of the SUP to ensure health and safety (Appendix C, Exhibit B).

3) Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

As concurred by the State Historic Preservation Office, no historic or cultural resources will be affected with this proposal (2014 EW Range EA, Table 3.0-1, p. 3.0-2). Park lands are defined as lands reserved for a public park. The Olympic National Forest is adjacent to Olympic National Park. There will be no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to the National Park from this decision. Effects of noise from aircraft flights was analyzed in the 2010 NWTRC EIS and re-evaluated in the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS, to include an Airspace Noise Analysis (Navy, 2015; Appendix J) and a World Heritage Site Analysis (Navy, 2015; Appendix K).

Prime farmland is a designation assigned by U.S. Department of Agriculture defining land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and is also available for these land uses. The project sites are not located in proximity to prime farmlands.

The proposed activities will occur along existing NFS roads outside of wetlands. None of the sites designated for mobile emitter use occur within or in proximity to designated Wild and Scenic Rivers. As result there will be no effects to these areas. The activity is not in proximity to ecologically critical areas or special land management allocations (Forest Plan, as amended) on the Forest.

4) The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

As used in the Council on Environmental Quality's guidelines for implementing NEPA, the term "controversial" refers to whether substantial dispute exists as to the size, nature, or effects of the major federal action. A range of public comments both supporting and opposing various aspects of the proposed actions was received through scoping and comment periods. Comments received during the official comment periods stated general concerns on how electronic warfare activity would affect flora and fauna, noise, human safety, or concerns over use in certain areas which may restrict public access (Appendix B provides a response to many of these issues and concerns). The majority of the letters did not provide specific criticism of the proposal; and did not provide factual or scientific basis for their concerns.

5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The effects of this project are not highly uncertain, and do not involve unique or unknown risks. The Navy has extensive experience with EW range capabilities across the United States. In the Response to Comments Table, Appendix B, p. 37, the Navy states, "Similar to what is proposed for the Pacific Northwest, Navy ranges located at China Lake, El Centro, and San Clemente Island, CA; Yuma, AZ; Fallon, NV; Cherry Point, NC; and Pinecastle, FL, have been safely utilizing fixed and mobile transmitters for decades.

Mobile transmitters have operated safely on DoD-owned and other public lands such as U.S.FS and BLM lands without incident or adverse effect. Other examples include the EW range at Fallon Range Training Complex (FRTC) and at Whidbey Island. The FRTC is designed for advanced training with more complex training scenarios than those proposed for the Olympic Military Operating Area. The FRTC has safely provided advanced EW training for several decades with no documented effects on people, wildlife, or the environment. Additionally, a similar EW fixed transmitter facility located on Navy property on Whidbey Island has been in place for 32 years without any documented adverse effects to people, wildlife, or the environment. See sections 2.1.3, 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.1 of the EW-EA.” Similar commercial use electromagnetic signal equipment to what the Navy proposes to use, with both mobile and fixed site antennas have been located throughout federal, state and private lands of the Olympic Peninsula and all around the country for decades without documented adverse effects.

6) The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

This action does not establish a precedent for future EW range actions on the Olympic National Forest with significant effects, nor represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. The cumulative effects discussion (2014 EW Range EA, p. 4-3), states that “training levels would continue at present levels with regard to the Proposed Action.”

Any future requests by the Navy to undertake EW training operation authorized by a SUP would need to be considered in a separate analysis using relevant scientific and site-specific information available at that time.

7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

The current impacts of past and present actions and the potential impacts of reasonably foreseeable future impacts were analyzed, to the extent they may be additive to impacts of the Alternatives analyzed in the 2014 EW Range EA. I find the incremental effects of the modified Alternative 1 combined with the effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable military activities³ will not have any significant cumulative effects. Cumulative impacts are addressed in the 2014 EW Range EA (pp. 4-1 through 4-7). My review of the 2014 EW Range EA and supporting documents finds the analysis has adequately considered the cumulative effects to resources within the study area on the Olympic National Forest.

³ The actions proposed in the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS were considered in cumulative effects analysis in the EW Range EA (EW Range EA, p. 4-3). The Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS includes an airspace noise analysis for aircraft use associated with EW training over the Olympic Military Operations Areas originally addressed in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS. The 2015 Northwest Training and Testing EIS/OEIS does not propose significant increases in numbers of flights. Annual flight requirements and actual flight activities tend to fluctuate from year to year based on many variables. To allow flexibility of training in these areas, the Navy has estimated that a 10 percent increase in flights may occur related to electronic warfare training activities, averaging to less than one additional flight per day.

8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant cultural or historical resources.

I find the action will have no significant adverse effects on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places since all known cultural properties will be avoided during implementation. A letter dated May 22, 2014, from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), concurred with the Navy's findings that no historic properties would be affected by the Proposed Action. However, if an area used by a mobile emitter is required for use by local tribes, the mobile emitter will be relocated (2014 EW Range EA, p. 3.0-2).

9) The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act.

Consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service was not required because effects of the proposed action are discountable. As stated in the Response to Comments, Appendix B, Pg. 4: "The Navy and the USFS concluded that the Navy EW-EA's preferred alternative would have no effect on Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species or other trust resources of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (e.g., marine sanctuaries, marine mammals, essential fish habitat); therefore consultation with NMFS was not required. The Navy and USFS received no comments from NMFS during public scoping or during their respective comment periods on the EA. Though unrelated to the Navy's request for special use access to USFS lands for ground-based support activities during EW training, it should be noted that the EA was tiered off the Northwest Training Range Complex EIS of 2010 and the Navy did complete formal consultation with NMFS as part of the EIS process. Additionally, the Navy also consulted for the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS. NMFS was a cooperating agency for both EIS projects. Information on the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing EIS can be found at www.NWTTEIS.com, to include the Biological Opinion (BO) completed by NMFS for this project." Effects to listed fish species were reviewed by a Forest Service fish biologist and are summarized below.

In accordance with Section 7 of ESA consultation procedures, consultation for the 2010 NWTRC was completed upon receipt of concurrence and biological opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to the Navy on August 12, 2010. During the preparation of the 2014 EW Range EA, the Navy transmitted a letter to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service dated August 18, 2014 (2014 EW Range EA, Appendix B, Regulatory Compliance Communications) informing the USFWS of the updated information provided in the 2014 EW Range EA, and that this updated information did not require re-initiation of the Section 7 ESA consultation. The 2010 NWTRC BO expired in 2015. As a result, on April 1, 2015 the Navy requested including the Electronic Warfare Range signal emitter activities occurring in the Olympic Military Operations Area in the current 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS consultation. Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the 2014 EW Range EA was completed with concurrence and BO received by the Navy on July 21, 2016.

The effects of the proposed actions are covered in the *Navy's Northwest Training and Testing Activities Biological Opinion* received from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (July 21, 2016). The BO includes the analysis for the Olympic National Forest SUP for the Navy's EW range activities. The US Fish and Wildlife Service considered the inter-related activities, including aircraft use, from the 2014 EW Range EA and the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS in making its final effects determinations. No terms and conditions or reasonable and prudent measures related to my decision were identified in the BO. This Biological Opinion is posted on the Navy's project website at www.NWTTEIS.com.

Marbled Murrelet and Designated Critical Habitat

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determined that the project may affect, likely to adversely affect marbled murrelets due to noise from aircraft use and that the project will have no effect to marbled murrelet critical habitat.

Northern Spotted Owl and Designated Critical Habitat

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurred that the project may affect, not likely to adversely affect Northern spotted owl, and no effect on its critical habitat (6 acres of potential nesting, roosting and foraging habitat exposed to ground-based noise from the ground-based mobile emitters).

Fish Species

Bull trout is the only federally listed fish species or designated fish critical habitat within the project area. The proposed activities would occur on existing roads open to vehicle traffic. The closest emitter site would be greater than 1 mile from bull trout habitat. A Forest Service fish biologist determined that the implementation of my decision would have no effect on any listed fish species or their designated critical habitat (Project Consistency Evaluation form on file at the Olympic National Forest Supervisor's Office). The proposed project would not adversely affect essential fish habitat designated under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act (2014 EW Range EA, Table 5-1, p. 5-2).

10) Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

I find the action will not violate Federal, State, or local laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. Applicable laws and regulations were considered in the 2014 EW Range EA (Table 5-1, pp. 5-1 through 5-3). A Forest Service NEPA specialist reviewed that my decision is consistent with the Olympic National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (see the section below on Consistency with the Forest Plan).

Conclusion

After considering the environmental effects described in the 2014 EW Range EA and additional documentation provided by Forest Service specialists, I have determined that my decision will not have significant effects on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

National Forest Management Act (NFMA)

The National Forest Management Act directs that guidelines for land management plans provide for diversity of plant and animal communities based on the suitability and capability of the specific land area in order to meet overall multiple-use objectives [16USC 1604 Sec 6 (g)(3)(B)]. This decision to select Alternative 1, with modifications described in this document, is consistent with the intent and long-term goals and objectives of the Olympic National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (USDA, 1990).

Sensitive Species

The Regional Forester has designated a list of sensitive plants and animals for which population viability is a concern (FSM 2670-5). I have reviewed the analysis and projected effects on all Sensitive species listed as occurring or possibly occurring in the project area. Effects are described under intensity factor 1 beginning on p. 10 of this document.

I find that the my decision, modified Alternative 1, as described in this document and the accompanying 2014 EW Range EA is in compliance with the relevant management requirements set forth in the National Forest Management Act (36 CFR 219), including the management direction found in the Olympic National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) as amended. It is consistent with standards and guidelines specific to the relevant land allocations and it is consistent with the applicable Forest-wide standards and guidelines, as described below.

In making this decision, I examined the activities that will be conducted along NFS roads, the associated effects from these activities, and the related activities in relationship to the goals and objectives of the Forest Plan.

Consistency with the Forest Plan

The 1990 Forest Plan was amended, in part, by the April 1994 ROD for *Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl* (USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management 1994). The ROD and associated Standards and Guidelines, provides additional standards and guidelines (USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management, 1994b). These two documents are commonly referred to collectively as the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP). The 1994 ROD added land allocations that overlay many of the allocations in the 1990 Land and Resource Management Plan. The standards and guidelines it established for these new land allocations supersede management direction in the 1990 Forest Plan unless the 1990 Forest Plan is more restrictive or provides greater benefits to late-successional forest related species. The key elements of the Northwest Forest Plan are they system of Riparian and Late Successional Reserves, the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, and various standards and guidelines affecting each of the land allocations.

Survey and Manage Species

The NWFP included mitigation measures for management of known sites, site-specific pre-habitat disturbing surveys, and/or other landscape scale surveys for about 400 rare and/or

isolated species. These are species that due to rarity or lack of information it was uncertain as to whether they would be adequately protected by the other elements authorized in the 1994 NWFP ROD. The project is not a habitat-disturbing activity, therefore pre-disturbance surveys are not required for these species.

Forest Plan Management Areas

Table 1, p. 3 identifies the Forest Plan management areas associated with the mobile emitter sites: Adaptive Management Area, Late Successional Reserve, Riparian Reserves, Timber Management Area, General Level River Corridor, and Scenic.

Late Successional Reserve (NWFP, pp. A-4, C-19)

The Objectives of the Late Successional Reserves are to be managed to protect and enhance conditions of late-successional and old-growth forest ecosystems, which serve as habitat for late-successional and old-growth related species including the northern spotted owl. These reserves are designed to maintain a functional, interacting, late-successional and old-growth forest ecosystem. As a general guideline, non-silvicultural activities located inside Late-Successional Reserves that are neutral or beneficial to the creation and maintenance of late successional habitat are allowed. The use mobile emitters on existing, open, NFS roads, the use would be considered a neutral action. Therefore, modified Alternative 1 is consistent with the Forest Plan direction for this land management allocation.

Adaptive Management Area (NWFP pp.A-4, C-26)

A fundamental goal of AMAs is “to encourage the development and testing of technical and social approaches to achieving desired ecological, economic, and other social objectives” (ROD, page D-1). There are no standards and guidelines directly applicable for the proposed activities occurring along NFS roads in this management area. Therefore the proposed use is consistent with the Forest Plan direction for this management allocation.

Riparian Reserves (NWFP A-4, C-37)

Riparian Reserves provide an area along all stream, wetlands, ponds, lakes, and unstable and potentially unstable areas where riparian dependent resources receive primary emphasis. Three of the emitter sites are located in Riparian Reserves. All three sites are along existing roads open to motorized vehicles. No additional clearing or infrastructure development would be needed. No impacts to streams, fish habitat, or riparian reserves are anticipated. The existing condition would be maintained with the proposed use, and therefore would not prevent attainment of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives.

Scenic (1990 Forest Plan, p. IV-68)

The goal of the Scenic Management area is to manage specific landscapes in such a manner that their scenic values are protected, maintained, and/or enhanced as viewed from major travel routes, use areas, or water bodies. Landscapes are providing pleasing scenery as viewed from travel routes, use areas, and water bodies. These landscapes will accommodate management activities that are not evident, or are visually subordinate to the natural landscape, when viewed by casual forest visitors. Modified Alternative 1 is consistent with the Forest Plan for this land management allocation, no scenic values will be affected by use of the emitter sites.

General Management River Corridor (1990 Forest Plan, p. IV-78)

For planning purposes, a corridor is considered to extend a distance of one-eighth mile on each side of a river channel. There are no applicable standards and guidelines for the proposed activities occurring along NFS roads in this management area. Therefore the proposed use is consistent with the Forest Plan direction for this management allocation.

Timber Management (1990 Forest Plan, p. IV-95)

There are no applicable standards and guidelines related to the proposed activities occurring along NFS roads in this management area. Therefore the proposed use is consistent with the Forest Plan direction for this management allocation.

Forest-wide Standards and Guidelines

The following Forest-wide standards and guidelines are applicable to the modified Alternative 1 (inapplicable standards and guidelines are not included, therefore numbers may not be consecutive):

Special Uses (1990 Forest Plan, pp. IV-55-56)

1. Special use of National Forest land may be authorized when such use cannot reasonably be accommodated on private land. In considering special use applications, the interests and needs of the general public shall be given priority over those of the applicant. Use should be compatible, and in harmony with, the surrounding landscape.
2. When issued or renewed, special use permits should be consistent with the Goal and Desired Future Condition for each Management Prescription.
5. Applicants may be required to furnish necessary environmental analysis, surveys, plats, drawings, etc., and provide funds for the processing and administration of permits.
6. Special use authorizations for use or development of sites and facilities should emphasize:
 - c. Preparation of environmental analysis, master plans, site charters, surveys, and site development plans.
 - d. That land and other resources committed must be suitable for the proposed use.
 - e. That encumbrances on National Forest land should be kept to the minimum area and duration possible.

The mobile emitter use is consistent with the above standards and guidelines for Lands because: the Navy considered alternatives and determined that the actions cannot be accommodated on private lands; the actions are consistent with, or neutral to the Management Area goals and desired future conditions; the Navy completed and furnished the necessary environmental analysis; the actions qualify as suitable use for NFS roads as described above under Facilities; and the encumbrances affect minimum areas for limited duration.

Facilities (1990 Forest Plan, pp. IV-56-59)

9b. Roads shall not be used if their use causes damage to the road or unacceptable impacts to adjacent resources (36 CFR 261). Damage is exclusive of normal wear and tear correctable by maintenance activities.

This use is consistent with the above standards and guidelines for facilities because use is expected to be commiserate with normal vehicular activities already occurring on the NFS roads proposed for use, and this decision will authorize a permit for the Navy's use of the NFS roads.

Endangered Species Act (ESA)

The ESA established protection over and conservation of threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. Effects to endangered species and results of consultation are discussed above under intensity factor 9 in this document.

Clean Air Act (CAA)

The CAA is the comprehensive federal law that regulates air emissions from stationary and mobile sources. This decision will not conflict with attainment and maintenance goals established in State Implementation Plan. A CAA conformity determination will not be required because emissions attributable to the alternatives including the modified Alternative 1 will be below *de minimis* thresholds.

Clean Water Act (CWA)

The CWA is an act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes. The Act's objective is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters. Modified Alternative 1 will not conflict with goals established in state implementation plans. No permits are required under the CWA Sections 401, 402, or 404 (b)(1).

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)

My decision will not result in any negative impacts, change, or alter cultural resources of surrounding areas. In a letter from the SHPO dated May 22, 2014, the SHPO has concurred with the Navy's findings that no historic properties would be affected by the implementing modified Alternative 1.

Migratory Birds, Executive Order 13186

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) prohibits the taking, killing, or possessing of migratory birds or the parts, nests, or eggs of such birds, unless permitted by regulation. Implementation of modified Alternative 1 would cause no significant adverse effect on a population of migratory bird species. This decision will not have a significant impact on migratory birds and would comply with applicable requirements of the MBTA (2014 EW Range EA, Table 5-1, p. 5-2).

Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice

Implementation of modified Alternative 1 will not result in any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on children, minority, or low-income populations. No significant unavoidable impacts on traditional cultural resources are anticipated to result from the Alternatives (2014 EW Range EA p. 3.0-2).

Administrative Review and Objection Rights

This proposed decision is subject to pre-decisional objection pursuant to 36 CFR 218, Subparts A and B. Objections will only be accepted from those who submitted project-specific written comments during scoping (6/26/2014 through 7/10/2014) or other designated comment periods (8/4/2014 through 9/6/2014 and 9/26/2014 through 11/28/2014). Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted comments unless based on new information arising after these opportunities to comment.

Objections must be submitted within 45 days following the publication of the legal notice in *The Daily World* (Aberdeen, Washington) and *The Peninsula Daily News* (Port Angeles, Washington). The date of these legal notices is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an objection. Those wishing to file an objection should not rely upon dates or timeframes provided by any other source. It is the objector's responsibility to ensure evidence of timely receipt (36 CFR 218.9).

Objections must be submitted to Reviewing Officer Reta Laford. Electronic objections should be submitted to: <https://cara.ecosystem-management.org/Public/CommentInput?project=42759>. Objections may alternatively be submitted by FAX (360-956-2330) and by mail or in person (1835 Black Lake Blvd. SW, Olympia, WA 98512) during business hours (M-F 8:00am to 4:30pm). In all cases, the subject line should state "OBJECTION Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range".

Objections must include (36 CFR 218.8(d)): 1) the objector's name, address, and telephone; 2) the objector's signature or other verification of authorship; 3) identification of a single lead objector when applicable; 4) the project name (Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range), Responsible Official name (Dean Millett) and title (District Ranger), and name of affected National Forest (Olympic National Forest) and/or Ranger District (Pacific Ranger District); 5) reasons for, and suggested remedies to resolve, your objections; and, 6) description of the connection between your objections and your prior comments. Incorporation of documents by reference may occur only as provided for at 36 CFR 218.8(b).

Implementation

If no objections are filed within the 45-day time period, implementation of the decision may occur 5 days following the end of the objection period.

Contact

For additional information about this proposed decision or the Forest Service objection process, contact Olympic National Forest Environmental Coordinator Greg Wahl (Phone: 360-956-2375. Email: gtwahl@fs.fed.us. Address: 1835 Black Lake Blvd. SW, Olympia, WA 98512.)

Approved by:

DEAN R. MILLETT
District Ranger, Pacific Ranger District
Olympic National Forest

DATE

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.

References

- Joint Chiefs of Staff. 2012. Doctrine Update for JP3-13.1, *Electronic Warfare*.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. 2016. Record of Decision for the Northwest Training and Testing Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared by the U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. 2015. Northwest Training and Testing Activities: Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared by U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. 2014. Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range Final Environmental Assessment. Prepared by U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. 2014. Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range Finding of No Significant Impact. Prepared by U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. 2010. Northwest Training Range Complex Environmental Impact Statement. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Silverdale, WA.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. 2010. Northwest Training Range Complex Record of Decision. Prepared by U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. 2010. Naval Sea Systems Command Naval Undersea Warfare Center Keyport Range Complex Extension Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared by U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy. 1988. Southeast Alaska Acoustic Measurement Facility Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared by U.S. Department of the Navy.
- U.S. Department of the Navy and USDA Forest Service. Master Agreement Between the Department of Defense and Department of Defense and Department of Agriculture Concerning the Use of National Forest System Lands for Military Activity. Sept. 30, 1988.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2016. Biological Opinion for the Navy's Northwest Training and Testing Activities Offshore Waters of Northern California, Oregon, and Washington and the Inland Waters of Puget Sound, and Portions of the Olympic Peninsula. Prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Office, Lacey, WA.
- U.S.D.A. Forest Service. 1990. Land and Resource Management Plan. Olympic National Forest, Olympia, WA.
- U.S.D.A. Forest Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. Portland, OR.
- U.S.D.A. Forest Service and USDI, Bureau of Land Management. 2001. Record of Decision and Standards and Guideline for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines. Portland, OR.