Center for Security Forces Detachment Kittery Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape (SERE East) Training Center, Redington Township, Maine
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Hello;
Please find attached a statement of the High Peaks Alliance, a local group in the region of the proposed Missile Defense Project.
For more information about the High Peaks Alliance, please refer to our website www.highpeaks.alliance.org.
You can reach Milt Baston the President at or our Vice-President Lloyd Griscom at

Thank you.
Betsy Squibb, Board Member
High Peaks Alliance
September 10, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in reference to the Missile Defense project proposed for the Redington Region of Franklin County, Maine.

The High Peaks Alliance is a volunteer, non-profit organization made up of local hunters, hikers, birders, loggers, fishermen, snowmobile and ATV riders, Maine Guides, x-country skiers, mountain bikers, and others working together since 2007 to ensure continuing public access to Maine’s High Peaks Region for residents as well as visitors.

The Alliance recognizes that the region, home to 10 of Maine’s 14 mountains over 4,000 feet, thousands of acres of working forests, hundreds of miles of motorized and non-motorized back country trails, and rich wildlife habitat, is too special and too important to let it be gradually posted, subdivided, gated and eventually lost for its forest production and traditional back country recreation uses. The idea of a defensive site with up to 60 missile silos in the middle of these unique natural resources works counter to and will undo countless months and years of work of this local organization and its partners.

This defensive missile project is in direct conflict with the mission of the High Peaks Alliance which is to ensure access and enhance public recreational access and opportunities in Maine’s High Peaks.

This idea simply does not make sense environmentally or economically for the future of the region and for these reasons we are vehemently opposed to it.

Sincerely,

Milt Baston, President
High Peaks Alliance
I’m sorry to say I missed the public hearings (my fault). But I was wondering if you have started any of the surveying/soils/environmental analysis portions of your site investigations yet? We are the closest site/civil/surveying company to that site, and we have a familiarity of the area.

We are also involved with an on-going project there at this time, subbing for ABT of Farmington, ME.

If you are still considering the site investigations portions of the project, and would like to consider us for that work, please reply to me at your convenience. Thank you.

Bob<

Main-Land Development Consultants, Inc.
Robert (Bob) L. Berry III, P.E.
Owner/President
PO Box Q
42 Church Street
Livermore Falls, ME 04254
Tel: 207-897-6752
Cel: 207-931-9931
Fax: 207-897-5404
www.main-landdci.com

Main-Land helps people add value to their land: to understand it, develop it, and protect it.
To Whom it May Concern:

I wanted to express my deep reservations concerning the proposed anti-ICBM site at Reddington Township, in Rangeley, Maine.

I feel strongly that given the rural nature of this site, as well as the region's strong dependence on clean air, clean water and tourism, that this massive installation would gravely affect the whole western Maine region. Not only the widening of the roads of egress, Routes 4 and 17, but also the doubling of the size of the population in the region would definitively change, for the worse, the area.

The Rangeley Lakes region is one of the last generally pristine regions on the East Coast of the United States. As such, it is a legacy for all of us, and represents an irreplaceable aspect of the American outdoors. This installation would degrade this wilderness area, one in which the Appalachian Trail (a central national wilderness landmark), hunting, fishing and other outdoors activities takes place.

I hope that this project will never come to fruition in this currently untouched land.

Many thanks,

Tom Block
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 5-13-2014

Please come to Rangeley! The impact will be most on public education, we have to feed K-12. 190 people will double our year round size. We are 55 miles one way to hospital services + we want. We are close to Canada & New Hampshire. The economic impact will bring great value. You will not bother the environment. Put a fence around to keep out moose!

Name: [Signature]
Affiliation: [Signature]
Street Address: [Signature]
City, State, Zip Code: [Signature]
Email: [Signature]
Yes - Bring project to Rangeley!

1. Rangeley needs more people and children for our school. Rangeley is a great place to bring up children.
2. The project would create good jobs during construction and once completed. Rangeley would grow to accommodate new residents but there wouldn't be so much growth that it would change what Rangeley is today.
3. I would be proud to have the project in Rangeley. The country needs to be prepared in our changing military needs, Russia, Middle East, and China.

Name: [Signature]
Affiliation: Resident
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email: 
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
Attn: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211

Or
Email: MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
FAX: 913-456-1091

Date: AUG 13 2014

Name:
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:

K-97
I live in Maine and my comments are as follows.

To spend millions of taxpayer dollars in order to bring this project called "Missile Defense" to a small community of peaceful people, creating military jobs in order to construct an enormous project that cannot possibly work -- namely, to intercept a missile traveling at 15,000 miles per hour -- and in the process which would destroy the environmental quality of a whole section of Northwestern Maine, ruin the peace and quiet of a rural lake community and pollute the water with imported undesirable chemicals.....

This makes no sense whatsoever and I am opposed. If you consider me part of the environment, the impact would be NEGATIVE.

I fail to comprehend how hydrazine and perchlorate will help stop this speeding enemy missile.

The better way to protect the citizens of this country -- "defense"? -- would be to stop the aggressive, militant actions in which the United States increasingly engages.

Thank you -- Do not construct this thing.

Grace Braley
I write to dissuade you from even attempting to build such an offensive installation in the beautiful state of Maine. Not only will the installation despoil our natural habitat, but:
1) Such weapons will further destabilize our relations with China and Russia, already on the decline as I write.
2) The past trials of such weapons have not proven to be effective--nay, they have proven to be a very expensive and wasteful use of our taxpayer money.
3) How much wiser to spend that same amount of money on building fast rail service, on helping fund alternatives to the internal combustion engine, and on wind, solar, tidal power. The onslaught of climate change has only begun to bring its destruction to our very doorsteps. Any further delay in addressing the threats of Earth's warming will only bring about financial and societal disruption not seen in history.

Don't built this system in Maine. Don't build it in Michigan. Don't build it in New York. Don't build it in Ohio. Don't build it!

Sally Breen

"Wheresoever you go, go with all your heart "- Confucius
To Whom It May Concern:

THE REASONS NOT TO BUILD A MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM IN REDDINGTON TOWNSHIP NEAR RANGELEY MAINE FAR OUT WEIGH ANY BENEFITS THAT WOULD BE GAINED.

FIRST, PROTECTING THE HOMELAND IS HOG WASH – NEITHER IRAN OR NORTH KOREA DO NOT HAVE WEAPONS SYSTEMS THAT WOULD REACH THE U.S.

SECOND, THE AREA OF THE POTENTIAL SITE IS VERY ENVIRONMENTALLY FRAGILE, TOURISM (SKI SLOPE AREAS) AND AGRICULTURE WOULD BE VERY NEGATIVELY IMPACTED.

WITH THE MANY ECONOMIC PROBLEMS THAT CONFRONT THIS COUNTRY, CAUSING MOST OF THE MIDDLE CLASS TO FALL INTO THE ABYSS OF POVERTY, NO FUNDS FOR EDUCATION, INFRASTRUCTURE THAT IS CRUMBLING – PAYING OVER A BILLION DOLLARS FOR THIS PROJECT DOES NOT MAKE ANY SENSE. THERE IS NO GUARANTEE, AFTER ALL THE DESTRUCTION OF WILDLIFE, DISPLACEMENT OF PEOPLE DUE TO THE UPHEAVAL OF CONSTRUCTION AND DESTABILIZATION OF OUR BEAUTIFUL RANGELEY AREA, THAT A SYSTEM OF THIS MAGNITUDE WOULD EVEN WORK. IS IT EVEN POSSIBLE TO TEST SUCH A SYSTEM?


A THOUSAND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES WILL NEVER MAKE THIS OR ANY AREA, ANYWHERE, FEASIBLE FOR THIS KIND OF DESTRUCTIVE SYSTEM.....

SUBMITTED BY:

PHYLLIS COELHO,
Greetings,
I did attend the Tues. evening session of your meeting in Rangeley and I did leave a comment, but there is another issue regarding the aquifer used by both Rangeley Water District and Poland Springs. At present, the Water District has a historic school house in that area under contract. It is likely that building should be preserved and moved to a different location out of the aquifer.

I can see a bit of a 'quid pro quo' developing regarding the moving of that building.

Rose Collins
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
Attn: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211

Or
Email: MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
Fax: 913-458-1091

Date: 8-12-14

Only concern is that you examine the effects on the aquifer in Redhills that serves the Tecumseh Water District.

Name: Rose Collins
Affiliation: ［Handwritten］
Street Address:  ［Handwritten］
City, State, Zip Code:  ［Handwritten］
Email:  ［Handwritten］
I am writing to express serious concerns about the contemplated missile defense interceptor site in Redington Township, ME.

This is a bad idea for a variety of reasons:

1. Tourism is Maine's no. 1 industry. Our wild lands are a significant part of this attraction. These lands continue to be targeted for commercial development to generate profits for a few corporations (or military use) while destroying their value for wild country tourism and recreation. Each time a section of wild land is converted to commercial/military use the people of the State lose. The State increasingly loses its draw and recreational value. It is like bleeding to death by a million paper cuts.

   Maine is unique with the largest area of undeveloped wild lands east of the Mississippi. The value of this expanse of land for tourism and recreation will only increase for decades to come IF it is not checkered with military/commercial developments.

2. The proposed site in Redington Township is within 2-3 miles of the Appalachian Trail and Poplar Ridge Hut. Who wants to hike a trail where you can look at a missile site and industrial windmills?

3. The proposed site is also within 5 miles of the Town of Rangeley and Rangeley Lake, both high tourist areas.

I urge you to not locate such an interceptor site in Maine.

Keith Cook
From: drsally
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 12:43 PM
To: MDA.CIS.EIS
Subject: missile project

I am a property owner in Rangeley, Maine, and I am writing to express my concern for the negative impact that would occur to the area, if a missile defense system were to be constructed in the area. I am sorry that I was not able to attend one of the public forums in town. I am a physician, and, I see day to day how the spectacular and unique environment of Franklin County is necessary for the sustenance of the community. Rangeley, and its surrounding towns and lakes, is truly one of the most pristine and unique areas in our beautiful country. The businesses of logging, hunting, fishing, and associated recreational activities provide the livelihood for many of the county's inhabitants. If there were to be a large influx of military construction equipment, it would most certainly eradicate the unspoiled quality that is fundamental to the area's attractiveness.

I understand and appreciate the fact that we must protect our country. I hope that you will consider protecting the unique nature of the beautiful Rangeley Lakes, and locate missile sites elsewhere, if necessary.

Thank you.
Sally Cooper, M.D.
TO: MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

FROM: LINDA DEXTER, RANGELEY, MAINE

DATE: September 15, 2014

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING PROPOSED CONUS INTERCEPTOR SITE, SERE EAST

I am a resident in Dallas Plantation and a business owner in Rangeley, Maine. The following are my comments regarding the Missile Site proposed in our area.

I will leave the technical specifics of environmental impact to local biologists and engineers in hopes that their opinions will be given serious weight. I say with confidence that the local people care deeply about the impact that any big development has on our wilderness. Maintaining the wilderness in these high peaks of Maine is a priority and we work hard to protect our mountains and lakes. Development by MDA will forever change the wild nature of this area of Maine. While the silos will not be highly visible from a distance, the associated infrastructure and influx of personnel will effectively create a small town where presently few structures exist.

The Community Resources identified in your presentation will change the flavor of our small mountain community to a military town. To me this is beyond comprehension. In as much as there is technically a military base in our neighborhood, it is one that has virtually no impact on the surrounding community because of its use as a wilderness survival training camp. The proposed project doubles the population of our town in one swoop.

The town of Rangeley earns much of its income through recreational visitors. Changing the nature of the town will, in my opinion, be detrimental to our present economy. It will be a trade-off of one type of living over an economy that has a military base as its center. I fail to see any benefit. Rangeley enjoys the confluence of two well-noted trail systems, the Appalachian Trail and the Northern Forest Canoe Trail. I fear a missile base will take away from the peaceful state of mind people come to Rangeley to experience.

In the hopes that these comments really do get presented to our elected officials I will say one last thing. I am extremely disturbed by the thought that our government will consider spending the absurd amount of money it will take to build up SERE East. Building roads from Augusta to Redington, building a school, medical facility, and housing not to mention the silos is ridiculous money when there are 3 other options that would cost much less to implement. This I will make known to my elected officials but I do hope that cost and efficiency of implementation is a top consideration by MDA in selecting a site.

With three alternative sites that require little or no infrastructure for the housing of personnel, new roads etc., I don’t quite get why SERE East is still being considered.

Respectfully,

Linda M Dexter
Date: 13 Aug 2014

Comments:

1) Impact to blueberry growth in area
2) Border issues with our Canadian neighbors - how secure and safety
3) Dogs run all over the area - can you help stop?
4) School system - can't support
5) Local vacation and visitors will be scared off once the mountain no longer visible to us in the area - what will we do?
6) Impact to ski areas and the business - are usable when on top of mountain
7) Not effective to build on a site that already has the infrastructural and building on one that does not

Name: N. Douglas
Affiliation: Full time resident
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:  
Email:
Please find a comment letter attached,

Mark Dubois, C.G.
Natural Resource Manager
Poland Spring Water Co./NWNA
:
Poland Spring, ME 04274

Fax: (207) 998-5181
September 15, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL (to MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com)

Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
Attn: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS  66211

Re:    Continental United States Interceptor Site Environmental Impact Statement
       79 Fed. Reg. 41,539 (July 16, 2014)

Dear Sir or Ma’am:

I am writing on behalf of Nestlé Waters North America Inc. to comment on the
Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
We have significant concerns about the impact of siting the CIS in Redington
Township, Maine at the Center for Security Forces Detachment Kittery Survival,
Evasion, Resistance, and Escape Facility (SERE East), as the CIS project is described in
the Federal Register.

This location directly abuts a large parcel owned by Nestlé Waters for a spring site,
known as White Cedar Spring, in Dallas Plantation, which provides spring water and
related recharge protection for our Poland Spring brand. Nestlé Waters is the leading
provider of bottled water in the United States, and Poland Spring is one of our most
important and iconic brands. High quality spring sources that meet our exacting
requirements are difficult to find, and thus White Cedar Spring is an important part of
the network of springs that supply Poland Spring with a sustainable water supply to
meet demands at their bottling facilities located in Kingfield, Hollis, and Poland Spring,
Maine.

Concerns that must be addressed include but are not limited to the following:

- As shown on the attached plan, the SERE East facility is located directly in the
  recharge area for White Cedar Spring. The recharge area also serves the public
  water supply for the Rangeley Water District. Any activity (and the associated
  infrastructure) that involves the siting, storage, testing, or firing of missiles has
  the potential to contaminate this important groundwater resource.
- To reach the SERE facility, one must cross over our property via the Redington
  Road, which is currently a narrow, gravel road that runs through a significant
wetland and is located directly adjacent to our spring site. We understand that the CIS project would likely include widening and paving that road, thus bringing the roadway closer to our spring site and risking discharge of pollutants, both from paving and from traffic, to the aquifer. This would also likely involve a taking of our property.

- Also, pursuant to agreement with the SERE East facility personnel, Nestle Waters maintains the portion of Redington Road that crosses over our property during the winter without the use of salt. Any change in that practice would also threaten the health of the aquifer.

In sum, given the location of the SERE facility in the recharge area for both White Cedar Spring and the public water supply for the region, we are concerned that siting the CIS in Redington Township will cause undue harm to groundwater resources. Thus, in addition to a review of the adequacy of the four sites identified for review, we request that the EIS include a review of other potential sites, including, as appropriate, other lands owned by the federal government in Maine.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance in identifying the potential impacts on the aquifer.

Sincerely,

Mark Dubois
Natural Resources Manager

cc: Senator Susan Collins
    Rich Houghton, MLA
    Senator Angus King
    Steve Smith, MLA
    Representative Michael Michaud
    Peter Chandler, Chief of Staff
    Charles Broll, Nestle Waters
    Brian Flaherty, Nestle Waters
Environmental Impact Statement

Rangeley, Maine  --  August 12, 2014

Questions or Comments
by

Bernard Dugan, Local Resident:

I have a question. Talking about using Route 24 and Route 27 for access team Redington, now, Route 27 goes from Farmington to Canada, Route 4 goes from Farmington to Rangeley. Why would anybody be using Route 27 to go to Redington, unless they're coming out of Canada?

That's my question.
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine —— August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
Dr. Tom Eastler, Professor, UMF:

This is Dr. Tom Eastler, Professor of Geology at the University of Maine Farmington. Also retired, Full Colonel from US Air Force, reserves, in 1996, that's when I retired.

I've come here today to look at the information related to the placement of a system, an interceptor site if you will, for missiles that might be aimed at the US, and this placement would take, be placed in one of four locations, possibly. And one of them of interest, would be here in Redington Township, in Maine, where there's already a facility for survival and, oh SERE! (Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape) It's surviving being captured as an individual, and there's lots of room in the 13,000 acres there to place interceptor site. And by looking at all of the information that I had a chance to see this morning, on posters and also on handouts, the work looks absolutely excellent, as proposed, for the Redington Township site.

And so I would just kind of finish up these comments, by suggesting that my mentor, many, many, many, years ago, Robert Frost, now deceased, was working on the early ballistic missile early warning system, and the Distant Early Warning system, line, the DEW line. These were produced some where in the 1950s, like 1957 or so, and the DEW line was operational until the late 1980s. And these are lines of radars, that go east-west, up in the Arctic. That was the DEW line. And then in mid Canada, that was called the "Mid Canada" line, and then on the pine tree line, which was the connection between the US and Canada. These were basically radar sites, there were no capabilities there for us to fire any type of missile, and at that time, there were not sufficient types of advanced missiles to do much of anything. So these three lines still exist in one fashion or another, to give warning about missiles coming from somewhere, the North, possibly the former Soviet Union.

It turns out of course, that satellites have taken over that job, and satellites can very easily pick up the launching of missiles of anywhere in the world, and track it immediately and predict where they're going to come to.
Well we really ought to have interceptor sites that are going north-south, that is on the East Coast, so that we can in essence, have a shorter range to fire, if we are firing out over the ocean so if something coming to us from the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. That same north-south line would be nice on the West Coast, if it were looking West to see something coming from Asia.

But, within the scope of the various four sites, and the consideration, it appears that the one that would be the least costly, most efficient, and probably the most accepted by individuals such as myself, who live in Maine, but I don’t know that for sure, would be the one at Redington Township, and therefore if I had a vote on this issue, I would vote clearly for the State of Maine location, to put in an interceptor site.

And I guess that’s all I have.
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8/12/14

My concerns are light pollution, traffic and most importantly population increase. Twelve hundred people live here, this is a tourist based economy.

Name: Patrick Egan
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code
Email:
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine — August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments

by

Catherine Erdman,

I'm Catherine Erdman, from , and we live in the , six months of the year.

I think this whole study of the Environmental Impact is a waste of money, because it's a treasured environment in Maine, and the whole area would be changed drastically. And I'm really not in favor of the MDA building an interceptor site anywhere, because it takes so much of our taxpayer dollars that would be better spent on our educational system, and energy, alternative energy.

And I just hope that Congress disbands the whole effort, once they realize how much taxpayer dollars are being spent for something that's not even likely to work. Plus we already have a defense system in Alaska, to do what is required. And the tests that they run, they often have failures.

I just think it's a total waste of our money.

Thank you.
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine — August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
John Erdman,

My name is John Erdman. I live in __________, and I summer up here in the __________ area, for almost six months every year.

I came because I thought we were going to have some, I didn't know exactly what the topic was tonight. I knew it had something to do with the missile defense system, and proposals for expanding it.

Seems like the people you have on this project, seem to be very knowledgeable, know what they're doing.

My objection to this whole thing is, we were never asked, the population was never asked up here, whether we ought to do this project in the first place, and spend all the money that we’re spending today, in order to prepare for a possible future, and working in an area that’s very environmentally sensitive. So I guess I mainly want to register my disappointment that we were not even invited to comment on whether or not we ought to do this job, and as I read the instructions coming out of Congress, I am extraordinarily disappointed with the scope of which they've done, without having any public input. And John public is me, my wife, and the people that live down the street, and all that. So that’s basically, I don’t have any real comments about the EIS. It looks like you've got a bunch of good people working on that.

The very fundamental premise that's behind all this, is very shaky.

Thank you.
PO Box 8087  
Bangor, Maine 04402-8087  
September 15, 2014

Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp  
ATTN: MDA CIS EIS  
6601 College Boulevard  
Overland Park, KS 66211-1504

Comments on the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS) in Redington Township, Maine.

The Appalachian Trail (AT) is a 2,185-mile footpath extending from Maine to Georgia through 14 states, following the ridgelines and major valleys of the Appalachian Mountain range, and annually visited by over two million Americans. Initiated in the 1920’s and completed in 1937, the trail was planned, constructed, and is still maintained by cooperative associations of private individuals and organizations, in a remarkable and unique public/private partnership. The Appalachian Trail received Federal recognition in 1968 under the National Trails System Act as the nation’s first National Scenic Trail. Designated by Congress as the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (ANST), it is administered by the Secretary of Interior. A unit of the National Park System, the AT is operated, maintained, and cared for through formal agreements with Appalachian Trail Conservancy (ATC) and its network of affiliated trail clubs.

The Maine Appalachian Trail Club (MATC) is the trail club charged with the operation and maintenance of the northernmost 287 miles of the AT from Grafton Notch to Katahdin, and among the founding members of the ATC. Founded in 1935, it remains as it has always been: a small, volunteer-run, charitable organization, dedicated to the care and conservation of one of America’s national treasures. MATC’s segment of the AT is widely regarded as including the most remote, scenic, challenging, and wild terrain on the entire trail. A prime example of this is found between the town of Rangeley and Bigelow Mountain — a 35 mile segment of exquisite, remote, and rugged terrain without parallel in the eastern US. Right in the middle of this special place, sharing a 5-mile-long boundary with the AT corridor, is the Navy’s Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape Facility (SERE East) in Redington Township.

MATC volunteers were alarmed to learn in August of the plans underway by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to evaluate the SERE East property for potential development as a Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS). The SERE facility has long been appreciated as a friendly and quite compatible neighbor to this most remote and prized segment of our trail. As we learned more about the proposed CIS development, we became alarmed at the potential impacts. The MDA project would turn a quiet and largely pristine, 5000-acre mountain valley, directly adjacent to and overlooked by the AT, into the largest military installation in the region. Steep, forested mountain slopes would be cleared, blasted,
and excavated to allow installation of missile silos. Support and logistics infrastructure, covering many hundreds of acres, would be required to support a brand-new military community that could be 3 times that size of the nearest town. Utility service (largely lacking in this remote country), lighting, and traffic would entirely transform the site. The project would even require the overhaul and widening of the state highway serving the area. The scope of potential impact to the AT and surrounding landscape may exceed anything contemplated in its 76-year history.

Please note MATC's grave concerns regarding this proposed development and recognize our status as a key stakeholder in the project. We hope to be accorded the opportunity to provide further comment as the EIS process proceeds.

Michael Ewing, Vice President
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8/18/14

Please provide a copy of all economic impact studies including projected FTE from CIS.

Also provide scoring criteria to contractors.

Local contractors with the same apparatus should get points so as to keep dollars earned in local economy.

Please provide a large formatted digital copy of Site East Site Plan and Environmental Area Map (email listed below).

Light Pollution is an important factor, please provide clear studies that pressure the dark skies off the premises.

Analyse of effect on Bickwell Threash and water aquifers should be looked at.

Name: Christopher C Farmer, Esq.
Affiliation: Seabrook St. Resort
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code: Pawling, NY 12564
Email:
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine —— August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
Richard Fecteau, Builder:

My name is Richard Fecteau. I live in __________.

I think this missile-defense system is a ridiculous "pork barrel" project that is a gift to the military industrial complex. It seems to be very political, somehow the brilliant minds in Congress think this is a great idea. This is a "wet dream" of an idea. Our money should not be spent on missile-defense. It only is making the world a more instable place. This country needs more piece, this country needs to get out of world affairs. We've caused more trouble over the past 80 decades, maybe even 180 decades. We really need a change in focus in this country, not from giving everything to the military, but how about promoting a little peace around the world. So this missile-defense system should be put away back on the shelf. Congress should, well actually I think all Congress should resign. So, I'm very much against this project, I hope it never happens, and I will be in contact with my congressional delegation, and they had best be opposed to this project.

Thank you.

Again my name is Richard Fecteau. I live in
September 13, 2014

I’m writing to express my opposition to the consideration of the SERE East facility in Redington Township, Maine, as a potential CONUS interceptor site. The facility at SERE East in Redington would be particularly ill suited to such an installation. One could not possibly “minimize the impact of construction” of such a project enough to achieve an acceptable level of change to this area/region -- the impact and scope of the project are too great.

On every parameter among the environmental resources and community resources to be analyzed for the EIS, this location makes no sense whatsoever. From Bangor International Airport, from which point GBIs would have to be transported, it is more than 120 miles to the SERE East proposed site. In addition, information provided at the public meetings notes: “SIV/SILO transportation may require road upgrades from Augusta to Rangeley (i.e., Route 27 and Route 4)” – really? Has anyone at the MDA driven either of these roads in this area?! No question these roads as they currently exist could not serve, and the magnitude of the change and the negative end result should rule this location out of consideration for this reason alone.

But there are more reasons to drop this site from consideration, including what would be unacceptable levels of air and noise pollution. The volume of truck traffic involved in making the large upgrades to the aforementioned two roads over the distances involved, in transporting materials and workers to the site during construction of the facilities, in the ongoing resupplying of the “mission” in perpetuity, plus the increase in local traffic in town with the influx of people to support the installation would mean an incredible – and unacceptable -- amount of air and noise pollution that would never end.

Then there are the impacts on the community resources. Tourism is a large part of the local economy, and in Rangeley it depends on the natural features of the region – the pristine lakes, the clear air, the woods, the lack of highway traffic – you know, peaceful natural beauty. Dark night skies where one can still see the Milky Way and hundreds of constellations that are invisible in areas with more light in the night sky – as there would no doubt be with this CIS site. This area capitalizes on its remoteness and unspoiled natural beauty; an interceptor site at SERE East would destroy these attributes.

Whatever the ultimate decision is on building another interceptor site, the SERE East location in the Rangeley area should never have been identified as a possible site; it could not be less suited.

Diane Fredrick
September 13, 2014

I would like to express my opposition to the use of the SERE facility in Redington Township for a missile defense interceptor site on the grounds that the local infrastructure is inadequate to support such a facility and on environmental/esthetic considerations.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Few would argue that the Rangeley region doesn’t want jobs. What the area needs are jobs from a mix of small- to medium-size businesses developed over a period of time to allow local resources to adapt. What a town of a little over 1,300 people doesn’t need is an influx of between 1,200 and 1,800 new residents over a short period of time. This staffing figure, provided during the MDA public meeting, may or may not include local employees, but a large number will presumably be military personnel responsible for the operation of the site itself and therefore an addition to the local population.

While the slide entitled “SERE East Proposed Site” from the MDA.mil web page suggests all living and working facilities will be constructed onsite, the construction phase of this project (“Proposed Action to be Analyzed,” same web site) will be evaluated for availability of “Temporary housing and other facilities for construction workers.” This suggests that this phase may in fact anticipate the use of local infrastructure. This infrastructure in a town of Rangeley’s size is not available for a construction project of this size and duration.

The current use of the SERE facility is for training, and there appear to be few if any military personnel permanently stationed there. Since the proposed use anticipates both the continued use for SERE training as well as the CIS facility, the total population would be between 1,000 and 2,000. This figure may or may not include spouses and dependents. Even assuming that these individuals and families are all housed onsite (something that runs counter to the general trend in military housing and appears only as an options in the EIS), a facility of this size is unlikely to be self-sufficient in most basic necessities. Thus the town of Rangeley within the space of five years(?) doubles in size. While this increase will likely bring better medical facilities and perhaps better shopping choices, it may also bring fast-food, traffic, and crime. A small school system will certainly increase in size, and with a population that is far more transient. One has only to look to North and South Dakota to reflect on the comment “be careful what you wish for . . .,” for while we like energy self-sufficiency as much as anyone else, I think there are many in the Dakota’s who wonder, “At what cost?”

ENVIRONMENTAL

Upgrades to Routes 27 and 4 are anticipated. These roads are currently quite adequate to support current traffic, and any upgrade would be for the sole purpose of accommodating the large transport vehicles to be used to construct and support the CIS installation. It should be noted that parts of Route 4 are classified as a national scenic highway.

While this facility would be presumably self-sufficient with respect to water supply and sewage disposal, it would require significant amounts of electricity. I would anticipate significant upgrades to the only two feeder lines into town: one coming from Rumford crossing Route 4 at the south end of Rangeley Lake, and the other from Stratton paralleling Route 16. Both traverse areas that are quite scenic and that would be adversely affected by any increase in size.

Lastly, the main missile site is within a mile of the Appalachian Trail. The future expansion site is half that distance. I’m sure that civilization is evident on the trail at many points, but most are preexisting from a different era. To propose constructing as massive a project on the very edge of the trail corridor makes one wonder if anyone involved with this project has hiked any part of the trail or even looked a map.

Hugh Fredrick
Environmental Impact Statement

-- August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
Ridgely Fuller, Local Resident:

Hi, my name is Ridgely Fuller. I'm from ____________, and I'm very much opposed to this supposed defense system, the ballistic missile system.

I don't think we need it. It says that there is a threat from Iran, which is preposterous. Iran doesn't have any nuclear weapons. And it's ridiculous.

What we need defense from is our own military that keep starting wars, or the politicians that keep starting wars, but then we have to end up creating more weapons to defend ourselves against.

This is not helping us, as a society. It's investing money in war, which we know does not help local economies. In Maine, we need money invested in education, jobs, and health care, and especially jobs. Maine has contributed way too much in terms of war, to the detriment of all of our families.

And I'm very appalled, I assumed that I would come in here and make a public comment in front of a group, that I'd be able to address a panel, and instead there is an incredibly well-funded PR system. I'd like to know how much of our taxpayer money has gone into funding, probably, the 30 people here, who have tags on, that they're from Public Relations, PR. It even says PR, and they have these glossy posters all over, stating their point of view. The only way I can address my concern is by myself to this recorder, and who knows whatever happens to that. I think that this is a sham, this public meeting, an absolute sham.

And I'm here to promote Maine Walk for Peace and a sustainable future, that's being organized by Veterans for Peace. And it's because there's too much of our state economy is based on the military. We know that doesn't help our families stay strong, or jobs for kids, so that they can stay together in Maine. So I'm appalled, I'm ashamed, and I'm disgusted that our military, our tax money is being spent on this.

We know, we know what a missile "defense system" will do in Rangeley. We know that it will destroy the environment, we know there's an incredible amount of pollution and environmental degradation caused by the rocket fuels all over the country.
We don't need this in Maine, for our economy is heavily based on tourism, and we appreciate people coming in and enjoying our wonderful, beautiful state. And this will destroy a huge section of it.

Thank you.
I think this would be very beneficial to the Rangeley Lakes area. There is a very good school (K-12) here with room for 100 more students. It would be necessary to hire more teachers as well as building more housing for employees and families. There are many skilled workers in the area who could be hired for building as well as maintaining the site.

Name: Margaret Fine
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
Environmental Impact Statement

Rangeley, Maine — August 13, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
Bruce Gagnon, Veterans for Peace:

My name is Bruce Gagnon. I live in Maine Veterans for Peace. I'm not yet ready to file my formal comments on this, because I still have a lingering question, and no one here seems to be able to answer this question. So, I would like an answer to this question, and I would like for someone to provide me with an answer. You can e-mail me at:

My question is, "the silos, which I'm told are about 50 feet long, and would be trucked to this proposed area, here in Rangeley from the Bangor airport. My question is, what is the weight displacement of that truck carrying the silos? How much does that weigh?" And people here don't seem to know the answer to that question. So I would appreciate hearing that answer. Also I would want to know, what is the weight displacement of the trucks carrying the interceptor missiles. I understand that they would be in pieces, when they were trucked, and so I want to know what is the weight displacement of the trucks when they are carrying those. I would appreciate that information so that I could complete my formal comments.

Thank you very much.
Comments to Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Continental United States Interceptor Site

Our organization is opposed to any of the four proposed interceptor sites in Maine, Ohio, Michigan or New York.

First reason is because of enormous cost, especially at the time of severe economic hardship for people across the nation.

Secondly, the proposed GMD program is severely underperforming in its testing phase and has long suffered from corruption.

Thirdly, development of the interceptor base at any of these proposed sites would have severe environmental consequences.

In particular I want to address the proposal for Rangeley, Maine since I live and work in this state.

**Culture:** The proposal to put the base in Rangeley would have enormous negative impact on the local culture by essentially doubling the size of the existing community. Local schools and other human resources would be overwhelmed by the influx of personnel estimated to work at the proposed base. There would be an obvious detrimental impact on tourist haven Rangeley area and against Maine's life giving tourist industry.

**Environment:** The ridiculous notion of driving interceptor silos and missiles on already bad Maine roads would further destroy these roads that the state already cannot keep in good condition. The idea of widening these roads in some places to make it possible to transport silos and missiles would have severe negative impact on the environment. The state would not be able to maintain even wider roads since they can’t already handles their existing road network. Blasting mountain areas to place the silos underground would also have severe impact on wildlife, native vegetation and water quality would be impacted. It is my understanding that Poland Springs has a 1,000 acre water well near this area that would certainly be negatively impacted. Where's the enormous amount of gravel needed for this project going to be mined?

**Liquid rocket fuels:** The toxic liquid fuels to be used in the interceptor missiles would have to be transported, stored, and then placed inside missiles. This process would allow many opportunities for toxic spills in the area contaminating local water sources. Liquid Hydrazines...
are most commonly known for their use in rocket fuels. They are highly toxic, colorless, flammable liquids with an ammonia-like odor. There are several types of hydrazines, including hydrazine, monomethylhydrazine (MMH) and 1,1-dimethyl-hydrazine, also known as unsymmetrical dimeth-ylhydrazine (UDMH). Hydrazine is unstable and is usually handled as an aqueous solution for safety reasons. Exposure to hydrazines can cause central nervous system effects as well as kidney and liver damage. Hydrazine and UDMH are listed as probable human carcinogens and classified under Group B2 by the U.S. EPA.

Solid rocket fuels: An analysis of data from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control indicates that a toxic chemical in solid rocket fuel has severely contaminated the nation's food and water supply - read the Environmental Working Group study http://www.organicconsumers.org/articles/article_3250.cfm. Scientists warn that the chemical, known as perchlorate, could cause thyroid deficiency in more than 2.2 million women of childbearing age. This thyroid deficiency could damage the fetus of pregnant women, if left untreated. Perchlorate, the explosive ingredient in solid rocket fuel, has leaked from military bases and defense and aerospace contractors' plants in at least 22 states, contaminating drinking water for millions of Americans. Despite massive complaints, defense contractors have done little or nothing to clean up the pollution. Perchlorate has also been widely detected in milk, lettuce, produce and other foods. In an alarming study, the CDC found perchlorate in the urine of every person tested. The Organic Consumers Association has mobilized thousands of consumers to pressure the EPA and government officials to begin a massive clean up of perchlorate. The Environmental Working Group report is an analysis of data originally released in 2005, when the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) released its long anticipated report on the human health effects of perchlorates. Perchlorates have been found in 93% of lettuce and milk....97% of breast milk samples taken randomly from around the U.S. have tested positive for perchlorates. The government funded NAS report reveals that perchlorates are roughly ten times more toxic to humans than the Department of Defense has been claiming. Perchlorates can inhibit thyroid function, cause birth defects and lower IQs, and are considered particularly dangerous to children. The NAS report recommends human exposure at no more than .0007 milligrams per kilogram of body weight. The EPA has responded to the report by recommending a water standard reference dose of 24.5 ppb for perchlorate. This is bad news for military sites and rocket fuel plants around the country, including Henderson, Nevada, where EPA well monitoring has found perchlorates at a level 30,000 times higher than that. There are over 12,000 military sites in the U.S. that are used for training with live explosives.

GMD Program: The Ground-based Midcourse missile defense system has been riddled with failure and corruption since its inception. In early 2000, the GAO received a request from former Rep. Howard Berman of California to review certain allegations of fraud in the missile defense program. Dr. Nira Schwartz, an Israeli-born scientist made the allegations while working at TRW - a defense contractor based in Los Angeles. TRW was a subcontractor to the defense behemoth Boeing Company. She was promptly fired from her job after she made the allegations. She alleged that a key component in the missile defense system - software to process signals collected by an infrared sensor - did not perform as advertised by TRW and Boeing. She was intimately involved in the development of the software, which was used in a crucial test of the missile defense program in 1997 at a cost of $100 million. The contractors Boeing and TRW falsely claimed it was a total success. Many of the so-called “successful” tests over the years
have been what scientists call “strap down rabbit” tests as they placed a beacon on the dummy missiles so that the interceptors could identify them in deep space at 15,000 mph. For all these reasons and more this program should not be building any permanent deployment installations anywhere. It is a huge waste of taxpayers dollars.

**Public Hearings:** I attended one of the two “public meetings” that were held in Rangeley and spoke to others who attended them in Farmington. In every case people who attended complained to me that the nature of the meetings had nothing to do with “public”. The poster sessions, where people were swarmed with MDA and contractor personnel, were not very informative. Many of my questions were not answered by those staffing the event. (Such as what is the weight displacement on a road of a truck hauling silos or interceptor missiles. I was told I’d be informed but I never heard from anyone with an answer. This is why I’ve waited until the last minute to send in my comments.) In most real public hearings there is a formal time when testimony can be taken from the public and citizens can listen and learn from one another. The average citizen is not able to go into such a “hearing” like these and understand the many technical variables involved. A real public hearing would allow citizens to learn from one another. That is how true democracy works. It was clear to me, and others that I spoke with who attended these events, that the MDA and its contractors intentionally and effectively limited the public participation process. For that reason alone this public comment period should be extended and the hearings should be redone in a proper way.

**No Decision:** Our organization thus opposes the selection of any of the four sites and proposes that no selection be made.

September 13, 2014

Bruce K. Gagnon
Coordinator
Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space
PO Box 652
Brunswick, ME 04011
(207) 443-9502

Thank God men cannot fly, and lay waste the sky as well as the earth. - Henry David Thoreau
I am concerned for humanity as a whole when we discuss the possibility of more military armament and I would like to add my comment to the environmental impact statement because humanity as a whole is not separate from the environment and as we change it, we also will be changed.

We come out of the environment, we are sustained by the environment, and what we do to it is reflected back on us in various ways that we can see and others that we are unaware of.

Certainly, nature and the whole of our environment is much beyond our complete comprehension. There are mechanisms and laws at work that we can't see, and we also don't fully know the consequences of our actions when we decide to manipulate the environment for our use, especially military use.

Also, do not forget that "Missile Defense" implies the very real existence of its opposite, "Missile Offense."

Furthermore, what will be the final consequence of putting so much energy, money, and time, and people's lives, into the manufacturing of weapons?

What is the final result of making so many weapons?

Obviously, they will be used. Other will be hurt and we will be hurt. All of this is a fatality.

We must all realize that we are putting energy into the weapons of our own demise when in fact we could be putting this energy and more into more practical, life-affirming endeavors.

When we arm more and more, our perceived "enemies" will arm more and more. More arms means more violence is possible and will happen. Money is wasted, lives are wasted building more arms, and all of this results in supreme failure.

The cruel reality is that this humanity knows more about weapons than it does about its own soul, and even less about its spirit.

The consequence of making weapons is that they will be used. It is better to invest in life-affirming projects than life-taking projects.

The environment will respond to what we do to it; for this world, this Earth, is a conscious, living organism, and it knows how we treat it, and it does act towards us when we we act towards it in wrong ways. The Earth also knows how we treat each other.

These projects are wrong ways of using human energy and environmental energy. It is better to befriend "Iran and North Korea" and leave the environment alone.

Do not go through with these projects and instead invest in life-affirming projects that preserve nature as it is instead of making it into a weapon.

Thank you,
Michael Gibson
I messed up my e-mail previously and did not finish. Very unprofessional but have amazing location in Rangeley that cannot be duplicated. Because we have held it for so long, we are trying to sell it below our cost. I will now send a copy of the listing and thank you for taking a look at this. I am one of the owners, Mary Glick

Thanks

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mary Glick
Date: August 11, 2014 at 2:37:10 PM EDT
To: "MDA.CIS.EIS@BV.com" <MDA.CIS.EIS@BV.com>
Subject: Rangeley Maine

As an owner of 375 acres in Rangeley Maine, I was alerted about the investigation of locating in Rangeley. Possibly, to make this site more attractive, we have some amazing land available-for-sale, 4 miles away from Saddleback ski area. It is totally secluded around a large pond, with some rugged terrain. We have been contacted by some security firms as it would make a wonderful encampment and training facility. There are some cabins on the land that would accommodate over 20 people The rest of the land is cleared, has wiring for electricity and all utilities. It is a perfect spot for training and

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mary Glick
Date: August 11, 2014 at 2:29:13 PM EDT
To: "MDA.CIS.EIS@BV.com" <MDA.CIS.EIS@BV.com>
Subject: Cr
From: Mary Glick <
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 1:42 PM
To: MDA.CIS.EIS
Subject: Land available in Rangeley Maine

Please contact Mary Glick.
My name is Grace. I am a caretaker and Ridge Runner on the Appalachian Trail, just outside of Rangeley. The area that I work on, runs from Route 4 to Route 27, right through the area where the training facility is located. Today I am very concerned about maintaining the wilderness area, that is the Appalachian Trail in this area. Maine, and this specific area, is known to be one of the most wild, remote, parts of the entire trail from Georgia to Maine. And this is a wilderness experience that, that is why people come here to hike, is for this wilderness experience. And that will absolutely be compromised by this development. Whether it's by no eyes, or lights, having soldiers patrolling the area immediately in the facility on the trail, is definitely a concern for me. That really changes the experience of hikers, something that I have already heard from hikers, who have run into military personnel patrolling the area, walking the trails. And that's not something I want to see, hikers running into soldiers in the middle of the woods. And, as someone who works on Saddleback Mountain, and spends a lot of time on that summit, I'm up there nearly every day, and I would really hate to see that view be marred by a lot of clear cutting, a lot of new buildings and facilities, because every road that's built, I can see from the summit. Every road is a scar, and this would be much more than a road.
Date: 8/13/14

I am very concerned for the integrity of the wilderness experience in the Saddleback Mountain region. As a hiker on the Appalachian Trail from Rt 4 to Rt 27, I am certain that the wild, pristine nature of the area surrounding the trail would be aggravated by development of a CIS in Ridgway Township—views would be marred, ecological systems disturbed and the wilderness hiking experience compromised by noise, light, road development and disturbing levels of military presence.

The quiet, quiet nature of Rangeley, the very nature which attracts the tourists powering its economy—would be entirely compromised by CIS development, which would double the town's winter population. Please consider the subsequent deleterious effects on this culturally unique town.

Name: Grace Glynn
Affiliation: Maine Appalachian Trail Club
Street Address: ........................................
City, State, Zip Code: ....................................
Email: ......................................................
From: Fran and Guy Grant
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2014 7:27 PM
To: MDA.CiS.EI5
Subject: Silos

We are very much in favor of the missile interceptor site being located at Redington Township. Our Canadian friends speak highly in favor of it as well.

Sincerely,
Guy & Fran Grant
One of my concerns is about the environment. There aren't enough places like this left where the water and air are clean and the environment in general is unspoiled. Are there any toxins in the weapons which could affect the environment?

Another concern is that we are close to the border so that someone could slip in from Canada and target the system which could affect Kansas.

Name: 
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email: 

Date: 8/12/14

Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp. 
Attn: MDA CIS EIS 
6601 College Boulevard 
Overland Park, KS 66211 

Or Email: MDACIS.EIS@bv.com 
FAX: 913-458-1091
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine — August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments

by

Lloyd Griscom, Appalachian Trail:

Good morning, my name is Lloyd Griscom. I am a property holder in the area. With my brother, we own land that abuts the Navy land to the south, where the Orebeton Stream comes in.

And I have been involved in conservation through the Maine AT Land Trust, The Sandy River Land Trust, and I have been, or have co-founded The High Peaks Alliance, which is a grass roots organization that is interested in, it's actually the local voice in conservation, and is interested in public access. And that organization has developed support that has resulted in conservation through Forest Legacy 2012. And there are two parcels, that are the Crocker Mountains, and then the Linkletter/Orebeton parcel is around 6000 acres, which is connected to the Orebeton. And the Orebeton which starts at the Navy, is actually a watershed, if you see this (pointing to map). The watershed of the Sandy River runs all the way to the North East of the Navy SERE base.

And that is a very sensitive watershed, it has had a successful restoration of an Atlantic Salmon project, and so Atlantic Salmon have actually been bred in that watershed, and swum out and come back. And so it’s important that the EIS would consider the ecological impact on the watershed, of the kind of digging activity that would be involved at the base, the missile base.

And I will send some mapping that shows more details of what I'm talking about. One of the things that I want to enter into the record is, that if you look at the Bigelow Preserve to the North, and you look at this High Peaks area, and then the map Blue Tumbledown, to the south, they’re connected by a common watershed. They are not three separate State wildlife action plans, which they are on paper. And so, what the EIS needs to consider is the, all the way from the Bigelows to Mount Blue Tumbledown, not just the area in the south, and to look at the watershed.

And then the, I’m involved in another organization called the Mountain Conservancy. It's working on an idea to create a climate wildlife corridor, from New Hampshire to Moosehead. And it turns out that the Appalachian Trail is very important because there's a very wide regional connectivity corridor that
surrounds it, whereas it's a narrow footpath. It's miles wide, and so I've been involved in studies that started with the Maine AT Land Trust, ecological studies of the High Peaks region of Maine's western mountains, done in 2007 by Pete McKinley.

Then there's another more recent study that was done for US Fish and Wildlife, who would like to come create a high altitude wildlife refuge for this area. And I want to make sure that the information from that study is available, and is taken into consideration with the EIS, because of its existing studies of natural resources of the area, and the reasons why they would like to create a high altitude wildlife refuge, if the grass root support of the High Peaks Alliance would find that that was something that local people would like to do.

So that's mostly what I would like to say, and then I guess two other concerns, I'm a property owner at the headwaters of the Orebeton, and I would like to see my land values go up not down.

And there would be concern that the installation might create the area as a target. And I think people would be concerned about that, and it has an impact also.

So thank you for your time, and I filled out a card, my e-mail is my name, Lloyd.Griscom@Gmail.com, and I've appreciated the time today to get to know who to communicate with, as I can send more information electronically and will be reachable electronically.

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard.
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8/14/14

Attached maps
Watershed corridor

Name: Lloyd G. Jones
Affiliation:  
Street Address:  
City, State, Zip Code:  
Email:  

Or
Email: MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
Fax: 913-458-1091
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Good morning. My name is Rufus Griscom. I have a home at

I own a number of different pieces of property, one of which borders the southeastern corner across the Appalachian Trail, of the Redington facility.

My comments and questions are primarily addressed to the issue of adverse impact to property owners, adjoining as well as nearby, because this is pristine wilderness. It has a high value, and I believe myself, putting in a facility of this magnitude, and for this purpose, will have a negative impact on land values. That’s my particular comment.

I have another question which relates to ingress and egress. I’m assuming that the property, the Redington property is going to be accessed as it has been, but I’m certainly, because a good deal of the property I own is off of E. Madrid Road, and there is timber roads, the old railroad bed, parts of which we own, parts of which we have access rights relating to.

So I’m very interested in how they, what the plan is for accessing the facility from the Southeast. I’m hoping that there is no plan to do that. I am also available, and you have my computer, my e-mail, and my phone number is 207-639-2781, if you have any questions of me.

Those are my comments and questions here.
Thank you
The Greater Franklin Development Corporation (GFDC) is pleased to offer comments regarding the potential for a Continental United States (CONUS) Interceptor Site (CIS) and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The goal of the GFDC is to create and retain quality employment opportunities in Franklin County by attracting new businesses, assisting local employers, and encouraging entrepreneurship.

Both the Executive Director of GFDC, Alison Hagerstrom and its Chairman, Darryl Brown attended one of the public meetings held by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and were pleased have the opportunity to visit the various exhibits and ask questions. After consultation with the Board of GFDC, it was agreed to offer the following comments that we hope will be helpful to the agency in its development of the Environmental Impact Study:

**QUALITY OF LIFE**

The entire western Maine area is home to one of the finest natural environments in the nation. There are numerous lakes and ponds in the region as well as two major ski resorts in and near to Rangeley. Additional outdoor activities including hiking snowmobiling, hunting and fishing make up a large portion of the residents’ recreational needs. It is also important to note that the Appalachian Trail is in close proximity to Rangeley. The work force that will be required to develop this facility along with their families will find the area to be warm, friendly and inviting. With the necessary emphasis on protecting the environmental quality of the region’s natural resources, this project could enhance the quality of life by bringing responsible development to the area.

**ACCESS TO SERVICES**

Franklin County is fortunate to have an award winning health care facility in Farmington, the Franklin Memorial Hospital along with its parent, the Franklin Community Health Network where the emphasis is on keeping people healthy. Along with a first class health care facility, the county is home to the University of Maine at Farmington which was recently selected as one of the top 10 colleges in the nation by U.S. News and World Report. Workers, who may find themselves re-locating to western Maine should this project become reality, will be able to participate in and take advantage of these outstanding services.

**NON-MISSION FACILITIES**

Because of its rural nature and relatively low population base, the greater Rangeley area lacks an abundance of office space, warehouses and other facilities that could support the development of an interceptor base. However, there is an abundance of available undeveloped real estate along with a capable population of craft personnel who could facilitate
the needs that would be associated with all of the ancillary requirements. Clearly, the facilities are not currently in place but could easily become an important part of the landscape.

TRANSPORTATION ROUTES

The major state routes coming into the greater Rangeley area include Routes 4 and 17 from the east and south, and Route 16 from Route 27, a northern route from the Canadian border. Of the three, Route 4 would be the main access point to the rest of the country. From Interstate 95 in Augusta, it is approximately 75 miles to the Rangeley area. While much of Route 4 has been improved in recent years, there will need to be additional improvements to selected areas of the roadway to accommodate a development of the scale represented by the development of an interceptor site.

LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Should the Maine site under consideration become reality, the community that would be most affected will be Rangeley. Currently, there is a public water system as well as a public sewer system that serves the more built up portions of the community. Additional residential housing would be required that could place pressures on both systems that may require increased capacity. The same could be implied for the local roads and streets within the community. All of those improvements could be carried out in response to additional tax revenues resulting from the ancillary activities that would be required as support services to the project. The GFDC views these challenges positively because of the increased job creation necessary to make these infrastructure improvements that would result from the interceptor base.

LAND USE ISSUES

The site under consideration is currently a federal military site and while the existing proposal would significantly modify the use of the property, it is conceivable that further development of the magnitude required would fall within the scope of the current land uses already in place.

SUMMARY

Clearly, the Rangeley area is a very special place. The GFDC believes that a development of the scope and scale outlined by the Missile Defense Agency will be more significant in size than anything that the region has ever witnessed. The GFDC further believes that any development, large or small, should be approached and executed with the highest of environmental standards which will not only protect but also enhance the opportunities to which the citizens of the region have become accustomed. The Greater Franklin Development Corporation stands ready to assist in any way possible to assure a quality product.
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From: Norma J F Harrison  
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 1:44 PM  
To: MDA.CIS.EIS  
Subject: Fw: New 'Missile Defense' Base Public Hearings in Four States

I am **AGAINST WEAPONS & NUCLEAR POWER IN SPACE.**

Norma J F Harrison  
1312 Cornell  
Berkeley, CA 94702  
1-510-526-3968  
www.peaceandfreedom.org on the ballot in California

----- Original Message -----  
**From:** Global Network **To:** GN List Serve **Sent:** Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:18 AM  
**Subject:** New 'Missile Defense' Base Public Hearings in Four States

**NEW MISSILE DEFENSE BASE PUBLIC HEARINGS IN FOUR STATES**

Ground-based mid-course 'missile defense' systems are now deployed in Alaska and California. Congress has called for studies to determine where an east coast deployment site could be located.

There are various kinds of 'missile defense' (MD) systems now being tested. The one with the very worst testing record is the Ground-based Mid-course program. It is very likely the most expensive of the MD programs because of the sheer difficulty of trying to have a bullet-hit-a-bullet in deep space at more than 15,000 mph. In the end the program is incredibly destabilizing as the entire MD program is all about being the shield to take out Russian or Chinese retaliatory response after a Pentagon first-strike attack on them. This stuff ain't theoretical either as the Space Command annually holds a computer war game to practice this very kind of an attack. We see the miniature version it being carried out by Israel in Gaza right now. You might call the Gaza attack by Israel as a field test of the Israel-US MD program.

The military industrial complex, and in particular the MD lobby, has been pushing Congress hard to deploy a US east coast interceptor site. The already bought-and-paid-for bunch in Washington has mandated that the Pentagon do a feasibility study to determine which of four states (Maine, New York, Michigan, Ohio) would be the best place to host the interceptor missile facility. Public hearings to work on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) have been announced. They are listed below.

In the old days they'd have a public meeting where people were allowed to speak and hear from one another in the community. Now things have changed and they just do an information seminar with displays and pick people off one by one for feedback reducing the ability of citizens to communicate with one another. We could call it drowning democracy.
Missile Defense Agency: Continental United States Interceptor Site

Environmental Impact Statement

The 2013 National Defense Authorization Act requires the MDA to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate possible additional locations in the U.S. best suited for future deployment of a Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS) capable of protecting the homeland against threats from nations, such as North Korea and Iran. The existing Ballistic Missile Defense System provides protection of the U.S. from a limited ballistic missile attack, and the Department of Defense has not made a decision to deploy or construct the CIS.

If deployed, the CIS would be at one of the following four locations:

1. Fort Custer Training Center – Michigan Army National Guard, Augusta, Mich.;
2. Camp Ravenna Joint Military Training Center – Ohio Army National Guard, Portage and Trumbull Counties, Ohio;
3. Fort Drum, Fort Drum, N.Y.; and

The MDA encourages all interested members of the public, as well as federal, state, and local agencies to participate in the scoping process for the preparation of this EIS. The scoping process assists in determining the scope of issues to be addressed and helps identify significant environmental issues to be analyzed in depth in the EIS.

MDA will host scoping meetings in the local communities of Ravenna, Ohio; Galesburg and Battle Creek, Mich.; Carthage, N.Y.; and Rangeley and Farmington, Maine, to share information about the EIS process, gather feedback and solicit comments. A Notice of Intent has been published in the Federal Register at http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2014-07-16/pdf/2014-16629.pdf.

The meeting dates are as follows:

- **Tuesday, Aug. 5, 2014:** Ravenna High School, Ravenna, Ohio (6 – 9 p.m.)
- **Tuesday, Aug. 12, 2014:** Rangeley Lakes Regional School, Rangeley, Maine (6 – 9 p.m.)
- **Wednesday, Aug. 13, 2014:** Rangeley Lakes Regional School, Rangeley, Maine (9 a.m. – Noon)
- **Thursday, Aug. 14, 2014:** University of Maine, Farmington, Maine (9 a.m. – Noon and 6 – 9 p.m.)
- **Tuesday, Aug. 19, 2014:** Carthage High School, Carthage, N.Y. (6 – 9 p.m.)
The public meetings will be in an open house format, which provides attendees with the opportunity to talk with and ask questions of representatives from the MDA and local installation. Additionally, you will have the opportunity to provide verbal and written official comments on the proposed project.

Your input is important to ensure significant environmental issues, other areas of concern, and alternatives are considered early in the EIS process.

As this EIS process moves forward, please continue to check back on this site for updates, handouts, news releases and official reports.

To submit a comment, send an e-mail to: MDA.CIS.EIS@BV.com

*Public comments on the scope of the EIS and environmental issues that should be studied are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. All written comments received during the comment period will become part of the public record and will be considered during the preparation of the Draft EIS. Providing private address information with your comment is voluntary and such personal information will be kept confidential unless release is required by law. Your address will be used to compile a mailing list so that you may be notified of any future public meetings, and release of the Draft EIS and Final EIS in the Federal Register. Failure to provide your address will result in your name not being included on the list, and you will not receive notifications about this project.*

Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space
PO Box 652
Brunswick, ME 04011
(207) 443-9502
globalnet@mindspring.com
www.space4peace.org
http://space4peace.blogspot.com/ (blog)
The idea that the U.S. is spending resources on preparing for a missile war that is very unlikely to happen is ridiculous!

The last decade has demonstrated how poorly our “defense” establishment has understood global politics.

This effort should be de-funded as soon as possible.

Robert Hayes, D.O.
Continental United States/Interceptor Site/Environmental Impact Statement
MDA CIS EIS

Comments on “Scoping meeting” for Redington, Maine (SERE East) missile site proposal
Farmington, Maine 6-9pm 14 August 14.
sent via FAX 913-458-1091 TOTAL 1 page 15 September 14

First, a comment about the format of the scoping meeting. It was unlike other scoping or EIS meetings
I have experienced, for such things as low-level flying, radioactive waste disposal, powerlines, etc.
Usually there would be a panel of presenters and the audience could ask questions or make comments.
This was set up as a poster session with multiple stations around a large room and people making
presentations at each one. The thinking may have been that this format would allow one-on-one
interactions with knowledgeable presenters, but the effect was one of being outnumbered 20 – 1.

It was clear the individual presenters knew their stuff, or at least had the military’s answers down pat.
They were eager and enthusiastic. We were so worn out by just the first presentation that as we were
headed off to the next station and looking towards the next dozen or so we just stood there pondering
whether we could go through the same experience over and over. Eventually we skipped way ahead
where we saw someone we knew talking to a presenter & decided to listen in there.

We noticed that none of the presenters at the stations were taking notes of any of our or other people’s
comments. So one would have to try to remember everything for a final “microphone in your face”
opportunity to comment on the record. In a normal hearing format, one often thinks of questions while
listening to other people’s comments, can get a sense of a range of opinion, and may even rethink one’s
own opinion. This poster format precludes that entirely. You’re on your own. By the time one had
completely run the gauntlet, one would be totally worn out. And unlikely to remember the questions or
objections one might have thought of. We decided that since all the posters were in the written packet
we would look at that instead of going through the high pressure technique over and over.

The proposed missile installation has been compared to building a factory. Setting aside questions as to
whether LURC or LUPC (or whatever incarnation of land use planning body has jurisdiction) would
approve a factory in a wilderness setting, or whether the Federal Government would preempt local or
state regulation, what really would be built is a target. Not just for other missiles, but conceivably for
backpack, shoe, underwear, or whatever the current NSA obsession for bombers is. So there is a
question as to what security measures would be imposed in the region.

But it is not just a factory or a target, but, with 1200+ people, a town, and a town larger than any other
in the northern 2/3 of Franklin County. The equivalent of 4% of the county’s current population would
be plunked down in the wilderness. Would, or should, a new town be approved in this area? With only
one way in and out of the site? Right up against the Appalachian Trail and other conserved land in an
area with a significant sense of wildness? How self-contained would the entire complex be? What
interaction could be expected with the surrounding area?

It was not entirely clear whether the military wants or feels it needs to do this project, or whether it is
one of Congress’ current obsessions. The money would be better put towards education and housing,
or our roads and bridges, rail and other infrastructure.

Conrad Heeschen

cc Congressional delegation via fax
I would prefer a CIS to **NOT** be located at The Center for Security Forces Detachment Kittery Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape Facility (SERE East), Redington Township, Maine.

Please take my opinion into consideration.

--

Amanda J. Hoag
I am very concerned about the environmental impact of this proposed missile site in Rangely, Maine. This area is being considered for a protected wilderness site. Do you have any idea of what you may be destroying. And from my reading the information on the effectiveness of these anti-missles is questionable. How much of this is another corporation pay off -government spending to the inner circle of military profiteers.? Sincerely, Mair Honan
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: August 13, 2014

Excellent presentations at each station; very well informed personnel. Certainly informed me about existing sites would intercept. I feel the country needs this type of facility for future defense. My concern seemed to have been addressed by the study committee.

1. Impact on schools.
2. Impact on economy.
3. Concern about good for increase in services but less increase in tax base.
4. Environmental impact.

This is such a big part of our country, it seems to me.

Name: Veronica Heiman
Affiliation: Resident
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email: 

K-152
PRIVACY ADVISORY

Public comments on the scope of the EIS and environmental issues that should be studied are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. All written comments received during the comment period will become part of the public record and will be considered during the preparation of the Draft EIS. Providing private address information with your comment is voluntary and such personal information will be kept confidential unless release is required by law. Your address will be used to compile a mailing list so that you may be notified of any future public meetings, and release of the Draft EIS and Final EIS in the Federal Register. Failure to provide your address will result in your name not being included on the list, and you will not receive notifications about this project.

the feature, it would not impact tourism. Once it is built, I don't think the tourists would even know it was there.

Big project - let's hope Congress sees the need!
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8/13/14

Please don't create this site anywhere in the U.S. It won't make us more secure. Let's get away from our "policeman of the world" mentality.

Real security will come from getting away from our addiction to fossil fuels and strengthening the health, education and general well-being of our citizens. Spend the $3.4B on things that will truly benefit us.

Name: Valerie Huelaner

Affiliation:

Street Address:

City, State, Zip Code:

Email:
Hello,

I grew up 15 miles north of Redington Township in Eustis Maine. I still go up there for hunting, hiking and skiing.

I have a few questions about the Environmental Impact Statement for the new CIS site proposed for Maine.

There are 4 sites that are being looked at, in Michigan, Ohio, New York and Maine. Right now there are 6 scoping meetings scheduled and 4 of them are in Maine. Is this because the site in Maine is considered a less developed and more environmentally sensitive site?

What is the potential for truck and other construction traffic during construction and after completion?

What is the potential for light and noise pollution during construction and after completion?

How thorough will the EIS be? Will there be biologists living on site? Will they use radar to track birds and bats?

Will the findings of the EIS be available to the public? I would love to know what you guys find up there.

Thank you for your time,

Andrew Jones
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: Sept 8, 2014

In addition to its negative impact on local efforts to draw tourist-hikers to our adjacent heritage-recreation trails, the proposed object is "doomed" according to the experts quoted in this article.

See attached.

P.S. We need money for our schools and roads.

Name: Marilyn "Jo" Josephson
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:

K-156
The unsheltering sky

Missile defences: Even with new technology, America’s multi-billion-dollar efforts to build a shield against long-range ballistic missiles looks doomed

As tests go, FTG-06b was a dazzling affair. The mission was part of a programme called Ground-based Mid-course Defence (GMD), which is supposed to provide America’s main shield against intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) with a range beyond 5,000km (3,100 miles). FTG-06b involved the launch (pictured opposite) on June 22nd from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California of a hypersonic interceptor. It successfully annihilated an unarmed warhead which had been fired into space from a US Army site on Kwajalein Atoll in the western Pacific Ocean.

The warhead was tracked by two American naval vessels: a destroyer equipped with an Aegis anti-missile system and a $900m floating offshore oil-rig, which had been kitted out with a highly sophisticated active phased-array X-band radar. Far more powerful than conventional radar, the X-band system can calculate—with the help of some big computers in Colorado Springs—the size, shape and trajectory of a baseball-sized object 4,000km away travelling at 32,000kph.

Twelve years ago the United States withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, a 1972 deal that limited the testing and deployment of anti-ICBM weapons by America, the former Soviet Union and, later, Russia and some ex-Soviet republics. Since then, most technological advances in such systems have been in America, where the Missile Defence Agency (MDA) has spent some $98 billion on various projects since 2002. Although China appears to be working on an anti-ICBM system, Russia is the only other country with such a programme—and it is far less capable, says Jeffrey Caton, a former US Air Force colonel and space-warfare specialist.

Meanwhile, the threat grows as potential attackers continue to acquire “more complex, survivable, reliable and accurate” ICBMs equipped with countermeasures, Vice-Admiral James Syring, the MDA’s boss, told Senate lawmakers in June. Next year Iran could have a ballistic missile able to reach America, he added. But others think that is at least several years away. North Korea is also testing rockets and satellite systems which could carry a nuclear warhead. Arun Prakash, a former chairman of India’s Chiefs of Staff Committee, sees the one-upmanship between offence and defence systems as “a ding-dong battle” with the defender at a perpetual disadvantage because it is far easier to build a missile than shoot it down.

Despite the success of FTG-06b the prospects for a truly effective defence against ICBMs appear as far away as ever. GMD alone has already cost America more than $40 billion. Yet until June it had failed all five intercept tests conducted since 2008, even though each was meticulously “scripted for success”, in the words of Philip Coyle, a former White House science adviser to Barack Obama.

When things go wrong
The GMD system consists of an “exoatmospheric kill vehicle” with steering rockets and its own X-band radar system. The kill vehicle is made by Raytheon, a big American defence contractor. Other companies involved in the project include Boeing, Orbital Sciences and Northrop Grumman. The kill vehicle was used in two of the failed tests. On two other occasions, not counted as “tests”, a GMD interceptor failed to leave its silo.

With such a record, FTG-06b was something of “a make or break for the programme”, says Riki Ellison, chairman of the Missile Defence Advocacy Alliance, a lobby group based in Washington, D.C. When he addressed the Senate Subcommittee on Strategic Forces in April, Vice-Admiral Syring admitted as much when he said that a failure of FTG-06b would force a reassessment of plans that are under way to expand the programme.

So far, there are 30 interceptors at Vandenberg Air Force Base and Fort Greely in Alaska. The MDA has begun work at Fort Greely to prepare for a field of silos that will contain an extra 14 interceptors by 2017. Even though the June test went well, GMD remains so unreliable that the expansion plans should be scrapped, says Fred...
It is far easier to build a missile than shoot it down

> erick Lamb of the University of Illinois and a consultant to the Pentagon. In combat conditions seven or 10 ICBMs interceptors would probably be needed to smash even a single rudimentary North Korean ballistic missile, reckons Mr Coyle, now with the Centre for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, also a Washington lobby group.

Money is being poured into developing new radar systems that could improve the accuracy of anti-missile technology. But salvaging one, some experts believe, might require an entirely new and larger kill vehicle. The MD would like one, but the project would take years. It took four years (and $1 billion) just to tweak the vibration frequency of the current vehicle's four thruster rockets because they were interfering with its inertial measurement unit, says George Lewis, a researcher at Cornell University.

There are other missile defences. So far, 30 of America's warships carry Aegis anti-missile systems, but these were designed to strike shorter-range missiles. With recent upgrades, Aegis is thought to be capable of intercepting warheads in space, in limited circumstances. With additional radar near America's east coast, Aegis destroyers in the Atlantic could theoretically intercept ICBMs coming from Europe and Asia, says Henry Cooper, who was President Reagan's missile-defence negotiator. Japan has purchased the necessary kit for its warships and a land variant, Aegis Ashore, is due to be sited next year in Romania and, in 2018, in Poland.

Shielding America from ICBMs will remain impossible for the foreseeable future, reckons William Cohen, a former American secretary of defence. A missile assault from China or Russia would overwhelm even flawlessly performing US defences. And defending against a limited attack from a sophisticated opponent would, he adds, suffer from unresolved problems.

Among those problems are decoys. After leaving the atmosphere a big ballistic missile can release, along with ten or so warheads, dozens of decoys. In the vacuum of space the decoys will travel at the same speed as a warhead. Decoys can be generated by discharging infra-red-emitting aerosols or clouds of thin wafers or tinfoil strips known as chaff. A defender's radar will register many incoming objects but only a fraction contain a warhead, says Theodore Postol, a missile expert at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Even if decoys can be identified, each radar blip may require several seconds or more of analysis. But time is short. With a closing speed of more than 10 km a second, an intercepter must typically commit to attacking a single object at least 50 seconds before hitting it, says Dr Postol.

Among the most dangerous decoys are shiny Mylar balloons, similar to those sold by party shops, says Thomas Reed, a former secretary of the US Air Force. Made from plastic with a metallic coating, the material reflects radar. Dozens can be released in one go and inflated to look on radar just like cone shaped warheads, adds Mr Reed. Worryingly, a warhead could be concealed in a Mylar balloon.

It is possible that nuke-carrying balloons can be detected by heat sensors because they would be warmer as a result of the slowly decaying plutonium inside the warhead. But it would not be difficult to foil such sensors on interceptors (or satellites) by fitting each decoy balloon with a small battery-powered heater.

Multiplying the problem

Decoys can also be generated by explosive "cutting cord" on the inner wall of the final booster stage of the warhead. Upon separation in space, the explosive breaks up the metal casing of the booster. "Now you've got 20 objects coming towards you" so good luck identifying the warhead, says Cornell University's Dr Lewis.

America's National Intelligence Council said in 1999 that China and Russia had devised numerous countermeasures to protect offensive missiles and were probably willing to sell the technology. A statement in May by the office of the assistant secretary of defence for research and engineering noted that the proliferation of such advanced countermeasures was rendering America's missile defences "no longer practical or cost-effective".

Nevertheless, many proponents of missile defence believe more research could make even the most sophisticated decoys recognisable. Decoys were used in the June FTO-06b test, but the GMD engineers knew what to expect. Multiple interceptors could be launched, one after the other, for each warhead thought to be on its way. As the first interceptor draws closer to a flock of decoys, it could relay increasingly accurate data to a following interceptor to hit a warhead that has been identified as real.

For now, though, no country has come close to defeating decoys, says Kingston Reif, also of the Centre for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation. This view is widely shared. Even if the hurdles are overcome, others would arise. Warheads in space could fire steel balls out in front of them to clear the way of interceptors, says Mr Coyle. An interceptor's radar might be jammed by electronic-warfare measures or a nuclear warhead could be programmed to detonate upon detection of an approaching interceptor. A detonation in space would generate a powerful electromagnetic pulse (EMP) which could knock out electrical circuits and power grids across a continent. America's EMP Commission, a body assembled by Congress to study such a threat, reckoned in 2008 that two-thirds of Americans might perish in the first year of a societal collapse.
THAADs let rip

> that would follow a nuclear blast in space above the central United States.

Among nuclear powers, neither North Korea nor Pakistan is presently capable of building a ballistic-missile triggering system that is able to detonate a nuclear payload if an interceptor were downing one, reckons Mr Reed, the former US Air Force secretary who has also designed nuclear warheads for the Pentagon. With time and enough effort, this could change. At least one type of nuclear device detonated by North Korea “is not inconsistent” with efforts to build a bomb designed for an EMP attack, says James Woolsey, a former director of America’s Central Intelligence Agency. (What is needed is not necessarily a large blast, but lots of gamma rays.)

Such an attack might not even require a ballistic missile. In December 2022 North Korea launched a satellite on a southerly track. Although it may have malfunctioned, the launch reveals another vulnerability in missile defences which could be exploited for an EMP attack, reckons Mr Woolsey. If a nuclear device was fitted into a subsequent southerly launched satellite, it would circumvent America’s defences against long-range weapons because these are positioned to hit warheads flying from over the North Pole, not those coming from the south. Moreover, a nuke concealed in a satellite in an orbit used by many civilian satellites could be detonated on a flyover above America. There is no point in having a missile-defence system that cannot prevent such an attack, says Mr Woolsey.

It might, however, be possible to shoot down missiles or rockets before they reach space and eject decoys or place a nuke-carrying satellite in orbit. Proponents of “boost phase” defence, as it is called, point out that during its ascent a nuke is easier to hit because it travels slowly and presents a large, easier-to-pinpoint target thanks to un-jettisoned fuel tanks and the heat from its exhaust plume. Another plus is that if it is hit by an interceptor soon after launch, the missile’s payload and debris may fall back on the country that launched it.

The tricky bit is placing interceptors close enough to reach the missile before it leaves the atmosphere. Ronald Reagan hoped to put them into low orbit, but the “Star Wars” scheme, as it was known, would have required legions of satellites costing many billions of dollars. Another problem with the Strategic Defence Initiative, to use its formal name, is that satellites can be shot up or blinded with Earth-based lasers. There is also a danger that the lasers might “fall into radical hands”, says a military adviser to a European head of state. The adviser, who insisted on anonymity, added that there was concern about debris from destroyed anti-missile satellites knocking out other satellites. In a 2007 test China shot up one of its defunct weather satellites, creating a huge increase in the space debris threatening satellites today.

The notion of arming satellites for boost-phase defence now has “very mainstream adherents”, says Brian Weeden, a former ICBM launch officer who spent four years, as he puts it, “on alert in Montana waiting for the end of the world”.

There is another technology taking to the sky in increasing numbers that could play a role: using drones to launch interceptors. Dale Tietz, a former senior Star Wars official, says that North Korean missiles could be prevented from reaching space by just three interceptor-armed Global Hawk drones flying above international waters near the hermit kingdom.

David Trachtenberg, a deputy assistant secretary of defence for missile defence under George W Bush, believes that America should spend more on developing interceptor-armed drones. But flying drones close enough to launch sites without penetrating enemy airspace could be difficult. Iran is probably too big for drones to patrol successfully because launch sites could be located deep inside the country. Even in places that could be patrolled, drones would need fast reactions. Last year America’s National Air and Space Intelligence Centre reported that the North Korean regime was developing a solid-fuel missile. Replacing its present liquid propellants with solid-fuel would greatly reduce North Korea’s launch preparation time as well as the time—roughly five minutes—which its missiles take to reach space.

Might aircraft-mounted anti-missile lasers work? A few years back the Pentagon cancelled a Boeing-led airborne-laser programme, in part because the modified 747 airliner’s bulky chemically generated laser had a limited range. Solid-state lasers may perform better. The MDA believes that drones carrying lasers will “play a crucial role” in defeating ICBMs during the boost phase. Experiments have begun with General Atomics’ Reaper and Boeing’s PhantomEye drones.

Sitting ducks

But slow-moving aircraft would be “sitting ducks”, as Dr Lamb puts it, for anti-aircraft systems like the Russian Buk that downed Malaysian Airlines flight MH17 over Ukraine in July. Recent decades are “littered with the wreckage” of failed boost-phase shoot-down schemes, says David Montague, a former head of missile technology at Lockheed (now Lockheed Martin). He co-authored a National Research Council report two years ago that advised the Pentagon to give up on the idea.

A different approach could be the US Army’s Terminal High-Altitude Area Defence system (THAAD), which became operational last year in Guam, home to American troops in the western Pacific Ocean. THAAD will also be exported; the first will go to the United Arab Emirates by the end of the year. But THAAD, like America’s Patriot missile batteries and other missile defences systems outside of the United States and Russia, such as Israel’s Iron Dome air-defence system, were developed to hit shorter-range threats and cannot intercept ICBMs in space. A THAAD might score a hit during the final approach of an ICBM, but the launcher would need to be very close to the targeted area.

Tellingly, in the remarks he made to lawmakers in June, Vice-Admiral Syring referred to the MDA’s “overriding goal” as defending American troops and military sites. That comment, together with the present state of the technology, suggests, for now at least, the prospects for protecting much of the United States from ICBMs or satellites secretly armed with nuclear weapons look doomed.
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: **AUG 13, 14**

**DETAILED INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS**

**WILL HELP US UNDERSTAND THE IMPACT ON OUR COMMUNITY**

**UPGRADING ROADS, SCHOOL, FIRE AND AIRPORT WILL BE NECESSARY.**

**CONSERVATION EASEMENTS AND ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS NEED TO BE PART OF THE PLAN.**

Name: **ED KIFOURY**

Affiliation: **PRES. RANGELEY LAKES HERITAL TRUST**

Street Address:

City, State, Zip Code:

Email: __________
Appalachian Mountain Club NEPA Scoping Comments on the CONUS EIS – SERE Site
August 12, 2014 Public Meeting, Rangeley, Maine

The AMC is the nation’s oldest conservation, and recreation organization with more than 100,000 members, volunteers and supporters, including over 5,000 members of our Maine chapter. AMC maintains over 300 miles of the 2,184 mile long Appalachian National Scenic Trail (AT), a unit of the National Park System. AMC owns and manages over 66,000 acres of forest lands in ME.

The AMC appreciates the public outreach by the Department of Defenses (DOD) Missile Defense Agency (MDA) as required by NEPA as it undertakes a search for a potential Continental United States Interceptor Site (CONUS).

AMC expresses its concern about the potential location of a CONUS facility of this scale at the Portsmouth (Redington) SERE site, one of the four CONUS sites under consideration in this NEPA analysis. We do not have experience with nor will comment on the other three alternative sites, except to note that their existing infrastructure and access appear more amenable for a CONUS site, should the decision to deploy such a facility be made.

To date the SERE base’s mission as a wilderness training site and its management and footprint have been most compatible with the exceptional value of this region’s landscape and ecosystem. However, conversion of the SERE’s base to a CONUS facility would represent a very significant and negative alteration to the natural and recreational resources of this region.

For context the SERE property lies within a 230,000 acre region known as the Western Maine High Peaks Region, which is one of the more ecologically and recreationally significant regions in the northeast. It is the largest contiguous mountain ecoregion in Maine and contains 40% more land above 2700 feet elevation than Baxter State Park.

The SERE base abuts one of the most remote and spectacular stretches of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (AT). Conversion of the SERE’s base to a CONUS site with its buildings, supporting infrastructure and road complex would severely degrade the AT experience, changing the view shed from a natural like to a human dominated landscape. Landscapes not dominated by human development are becoming a rare resource along the AT and United States in general.

The Longfellow Mountain claim (traversed by the AT from the Mahoosuc to the Western High Mountains and beyond to Baxter State Park) has been identified by The Nature Conservancy as an extended but relatively narrow corridor of “concentrated regional flow”, providing an important route for species migration and dispersal from the White Mountains to northern Maine. A significant area of new concentrated development within this corridor could impede the ability of species to move along it in response to future climate change1.

This ecoregion has been identified by a number of organizations for its high adaptation value to climate change because of its undeveloped state, lack of fragmentation, varied topography and rich diversity of ecological communities and high proportion of rare plants and animals. The proposed development lies in close proximity to subalpine forest documented to be occupied by Bicknell’s thrush – one of the nation’s rarest migratory songbirds and a candidate for T&E listing by USFWS.

Currently the SERE’s base encompasses nearly 60% of a 17,000-acre unroaded and unfragmented forest block – one of the largest in Maine. The proposed CONUS development would reduce the size of this unfragmented block by nearly 20%.

Much of the proposed CONUS development would take place on steep slopes (20% or more), requiring extensive blasting, earth moving and terrain alteration and creating significant potential for erosion into the valley bottom wetlands and stream corridor.

Not only would the identified climate adaptation value of this ecosystem be negatively impacted, but the conversion of forest to a human dominated landscape in the development of a CONUS site could result in the loss of significant areas of (likely) mature high-carbon forest. The climate change impact of development must be considered.

Considerable public and private funds have been expended on land conservation in this remote and largely undeveloped region, including properties abutting the base. Additional land protection projects abutting the base (one of which has received Forest Legacy funding) are in progress. Development of a CONUS missile facility likely would adversely affect ongoing and future conservation management of the property and its surrounding lands.

In summary continued use of the SERE property as a wilderness training facility by DOD is very much compatible with the character and uses of the surrounding area. Proposed large scale development such as a CONUS site would be highly incompatible.

AMC appreciates your time and consideration and will be submitting further written testimony as part of this NEPA Scoping process. Thank you.

Dr. Kenneth D. Kimball  
Director of Research  
Appalachian Mountain Club  
PO Box 298  
Gorham, NH 03581

---

2 Proposed development areas does not overlap subalpine/Bicknell Thrush habitat but its proximity impacts should be considered.
Dear Sir/Ms;

Please find attached the Appalachian Mountain Club’s EIS scoping comments on the CONUS-CIS Project. Thank you for your consideration and if you have any questions please contact me.

Sincerely, Kenneth Kimball

Kenneth D. Kimball
Director of Research
Appalachian Mountain Club
PO Box 298
Gorham, NH 03581

Appalachian Mountain Club
Website | Facebook | Twitter | YouTube

Your Connection to the Outdoors
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp
Attn: MDACIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211-1504


Dear Sir/Ms:

A. Introduction
The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) submits the following comments on the scope of the U.S. Department of Defense (“DOD”) Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) in connection with the Missile Defense Agency’s (MDA) proposed CONUS-CIS Project. AMC’s interest and expertise are primarily limited to one of the four alternative sites under consideration – the so called “SERE East Proposed Site in Redington, ME” (SERE). AMC’s scoping document comments are offered without prejudice to any and all legal rights in this process AMC may have, which are hereby expressly reserved. AMC reserves its rights to submit additional comments and information.

B. Appalachian Mountain Club’s Standing
The AMC is the nation’s oldest conservation and recreation organization with over 150,000 members, volunteers and supporters, including over 5,000 members of our Maine chapter. AMC maintains over 300 miles of the 2,184 mile long Appalachian National Scenic Trail (ANST), a unit of the National Park System. AMC owns and manages over 66,000 acres of forest lands in ME. The SERE site, one of the four proposed alternative sites for the CONUS-CIS project lies in the heart of the Western Maine High Peaks region. This region is well known for its high quality ecological and backcountry recreation resources and a popular segment of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (ANST). This region’s resources are used by AMC members and the general public for high quality backcountry experiences. AMC, with partner environmental organizations, has invested considerable time and resources in protecting this valuable mountainous region.

AMC expresses its concern about the potential location of a CONUS-CIS facility of this scale at the SERE site. AMC does not have experience or expertise with the other three alternative sites, but will note that their existing infrastructure and access appear more amenable for a CONUS-CIS site, and likely at considerably less expensive because they would not require additional off site infrastructure development, which are already identified as additional needs for the Maine location, should the decision to deploy such a facility be made.
C. Scoping Document Comments
AMC offers comments on both procedural and project elements of this EIS.

1. Procedural:

a. Intervention status: The EIS process to date appears to be very controlled and also is minus some elements normally experienced within a typical EIS processes. The Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS) in the Federal Register dated July 16, 2014 is unclear if there is intervener status in this EIS process, and if so when interventions are due. AMC requests clarity on this issue. If intervention status is necessary for party status as part of this EIS process, consider this filing to also be AMC’s request for intervention status.

b. Public access to comments and documentation filed: It is unclear if access to any comments filed or the data collected on natural resources’ will be made available for public review and comment prior to the issuance of a draft EIS. The public scoping document hearings in Maine had no venue to understand or learn from other parties’ questions, comments or knowledge. Rather these meetings were designed to have questions focused on a handful of previously web accessible generic power point slides, each at an identified staffed station. It is unclear following the scoping process what and how future studies and analysis will actually take place or be publicly available. AMC requests that a Project EIS web site be created and publicly notified that will make publicly accessible information on schedule, future study designs, data collected, public comments filed and other materials relevant to an EIS. This should include responses to scoping and other comments.

2. Project Elements:

a. Identify the recreational and ecological context of this special region: For appropriate context the SERE property lies within a 230,000 acre region known as the Western Maine High Peaks Region, which is one of the more ecologically¹ and recreationally significant regions in the northeast. It is the largest contiguous mountain ecoregion in Maine and contains 40% more land above 2700 feet elevation than Baxter State Park. It has also been identified for its climate change adaptation values due to the low degree of fragmentation, high connectivity with other high ecological value areas and varied topography.² It is visible from and abuts one of the most remote and spectacular stretches of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (ANST), a unit of the National Park system.

The EIS should identify that the SERE base’s mission as a wilderness training site and its management and footprint have been most compatible with the exceptional value of this region’s landscape and ecosystem and backcountry recreational activities. A conversion of the SERE’s

² https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/edc/reportsdata/terrestrial/resilience/ne/Pages/default.aspx
base to a CONUS-CIS facility would represent a very significant and negative alteration to the natural and recreational resources of this region. The EIS specifically should address in detail the following components:

b. Visual Impact. Visual impacts to the ANST in this location have been subject to considerable recent controversy from two proposed wind farms (Redington and Black Knubble). These wind farms were not permitted by Maine’s Land Use Regulatory Commission\(^3\). Conversion of the SERE’s base to a CONUS-CIS site with its buildings, supporting infrastructure and road complex would severely degrade the same ANST experience and viewpoints, changing the viewshed from a natural-like to a human dominated landscape. Landscapes not dominated by human development are becoming a rare resource along the ANST and United States in general. The proposed CONUS-CIS development would impact extensive acreage and contain missile silos, associated support facilities and residential housing to host the military staff, all which would be incongruent with this special region’s natural appearing visual landscape. The EIS should conduct a full visual analysis of this project from viewpoints from but not limited to the ANST, including both photo simulations and a regional ‘zone of visual impact’ analysis using standard visual analysis techniques.

c. Alteration of terrain and erosion potential: Due to the steep slopes at the SERE location, it would require extensive alteration of terrain on steep slopes (20% or more) and require extensive blasting, earth moving and create significant potential for erosion into the valley bottom wetlands and stream corridor. The EIS should identify the degree of terrain alteration, slope terracing and other topographic changes that would be necessary to fit a facility of this type at this location. It should quantify the amount of overburden that would need to be removed and/or be imported on site, how and where it would need to be located, and the risk of soil erosion and sediment runoff on water quality.

If and when the site was decommissioned, the EIS should also identify the needed actions and costs necessary to restore the SERE site.

d. Ecological Impacts: The Longfellow Mountain chain that includes this mountain region has been identified by The Nature Conservancy as an extended but relatively narrow corridor of “concentrated regional flow”, providing an important route for species migration and dispersal from the White Mountains to northern Maine. The proposed development lies in close proximity to subalpine forest documented to be occupied by Bicknell’s thrush – one of the nation’s rarest migratory songbirds and a candidate for T&E listing by USFWS\(^4\). It has been under consideration for a New England Acadian Forest upland National Wildlife Refuge unit. Currently the SERE base encompasses nearly 60% of a 17,000-acre unroaded and unfragmented forest block – one of the largest in Maine. The proposed CONUS development would reduce the size of this unfragmented block by nearly 20%.

e. climate change adaptation value of this region: This ecoregion has been identified by a number of organizations for its high adaptation value to climate change because of its

\(^3\) http://www.macalester.edu/windenergy/casestudies/redington/Redington2p.pdf

\(^4\) Proposed development areas does not overlap subalpine/Bicknell Thrush habitat but its proximity impacts should be considered.
undevolved state, lack of fragmentation, varied topography and rich diversity of ecological communities and high proportion of rare plants and animals. A significant area of new concentrated development from a CONUS-CIS facility within this corridor could impede the ability of species to move along it in response to future climate change⁵.

Not only would the identified climate adaptation value of this ecosystem be negatively impacted, but the conversion of forest to a human dominated landscape from a CONUS-CIS facility could result in the loss of significant areas of mature high-carbon forest. The climate change impact of development should be considered.

e. Ongoing land protection in Maine high Peaks: The EIS should examine and acknowledge the extensive recent and ongoing efforts to protect lands in this invaluable region⁶. This includes millions of dollars from federal and state funding sources. Examples include but are not limited to the recent Crocker acquisition⁷ and ongoing Orbeton project⁸. Development of a CONUS-CIS missile facility at the SERE site could adversely affect ongoing and future conservation protection efforts and funding of this high value region due to the landscape transformation required for construction of a CONUS-CIS facility at this location. The EIS should examine how development of a CONUS-CIS facility at the SERE location could adversely affect ongoing and future conservation management of the Western Maine High Peaks region.

D. Summary
Continued use of the SERE property as a wilderness training facility by DOD is very much compatible with the character and uses of the surrounding area. Proposed large scale development such as a CONUS site would be highly incompatible.

AMC appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments on the proper scope of the EIS for the CONUS-CIS project.

Dr. Kenneth D. Kimball
Director of Research
Appalachian Mountain Club
PO Box 298
Gorham, NH 03581

---

⁶ http://matl.t.org/high-peaks-initiative/
⁷ https://www.tpl.org/media-room/crocker-mountain-property-protected
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8-14-14

Protecting our country and its citizens is extremely important. While there are two current sites that have never been used, a new site with 20-60 missiles with each missile costing a $50 million more than the others and then constructing the base, making it so.

First if absolutely necessary (and I don't believe it is), use a more developed site. Remove Loring or have it at Fort Drum. This is an absolute waste of money when we have children going to bed hungry, an education system that needs improving, and a pathetic national infrastructure with more bridges of roads leaking fairly grades than ever before.

Use our tax money better - please!

Name: James J. Landheer
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email: 

K-168
I respectfully submit these comments for your consideration. I totally and vehemently oppose the establishment of a missile interceptor site in Rangely or anywhere else in Maine. The so-called missile defense system does not work in spite of years of testing. It is a complete and very disturbing waste of money especially for a nation in such deep debt as ours. This site will wreak severe destruction on the local environment and will facilitate the kind of "growth" we do not need here in Maine. I do not want my tax money wasted on such futile projects which accomplish nothing but provide more profits and continued fuel to a military-industrial complex which is harmful to this nation. So please put this system back on a dusty shelf where it belongs, but at the very least stay out of Maine!

David Larsen

========================================================

May the farce be with you.

========================================================

Sent from my iPad
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: Aug 13, 2014

I fully understand and appreciate the need for future missile defense installations, unless due consideration is given to the impact of such a facility upon the historic recreation and scenic aspects of the Rangeley region. I cannot in good conscience support the construction of such a facility in this area.

Provided that steps are taken to mitigate the impact of such a facility upon the region, particularly in terms of light pollution, impact upon local infrastructure without adequate improvement or funding, and quality of life, I would consider such a facility a positive in some regards. But if there is an excessive negative impact on the environment and support on my part would vanish rapidly.

Name: Nick Leacy
Affiliation: Dateline Register Mgmt.
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
Rick Lehner  
Spokesman for the Missile Defense Agency

Re: Comment on Redington, Maine SERE study

Dear Mr. Lehner,

An affiliate of my company owns two mountains of the SERE facility in Redington Township, Maine. We attempted to develop Maine’s first wind farm on the site several years ago but were not issued permits. After the permit rejection, Maine’s wind farm permitting rules were updated to make wind farm permitting more predictable.

Redington Mountain Wind power, LLC continues to own the site and is looking for opportunities to develop a 90 MW wind farm on the site. There are at least two elements of this project that might be useful for your efforts:

1. **Power:** A newspaper article said you would be evaluating the availability of power at the site. I believe there is an existing 34kV power line at the site. If the new facility needed a bigger, more reliable line, connecting to the Bigelow substation—about 8 miles from our mountains—might be an option. Having that line cross our property could be in both of our interests. We also might be able to sell power to the missile facility. The wind farm as planned would generate about 260,000,000 kWh a year. An energy storage system might also benefit both facilities.

2. **Environmental studies:** We invested several hundred thousand dollars in environmental studies. These might be helpful in your work. They are in the public record. Let me know if you would like to see them.

My contact information is below. Thanks for your interest.

Best regards,
Harley

Harley Lee  
Endless Energy Corporation 
44 Spanker St. 
Jamestown, RI 02835

www.endlessenergy.com
The goal of the walk is to connect various communities that have become reliant on military production for jobs. We hope to accelerate a statewide discussion about the need to diversify Maine's growing dependence on military production. Last year, Connecticut passed legislation creating a statewide planning commission to begin the process of moving away from its heavy reliance on military production. We need jobs building things like rail, solar, properly placed wind and other sustainable measures to help us deal with the coming reality of climate change.

The Pentagon has announced that Rangeley is one of four sites along the east coast being considered for deployment of an expensive and destabilizing "missile defense" Interceptor Base. These systems will be targeted on Russia and China and are key elements in US first-strike attack planning. General Dynamics Ordnance & Tactical Systems in Saco has a multi-million dollar contract to build gun barrel kits for the Army. In North Berwick, Pratt Whitney has a $2 billion contract to build F-35 Joint Strike fighter engines. Bath Iron Works has billions of dollars in contracts to build destroyers for the Navy. Taken together almost 10% of Maine's gross domestic product derives from military spending. How can we ever end war unless we begin to deal with our domestic addiction to Pentagon spending?

The walk will be led by Buddhist monks and nuns from the order Nipponzan Myohoji that does peace walks around the world and has previously walked with us in Maine.

Maine Veterans for Peace • www.vfpmaine.org • 207-443-9502
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 14 AUG 2014

Having served in the U.S. Army and the New York Army National Guard, I am entirely in favor of protecting this still great nation.

Personally, I hope and pray that these missile systems will never be used. However, it is far better to have something and not need it, than to need something and not have it.

While I fully expect that the MDA will be as environmentally responsible as possible, I have no trouble whatsoever with parting with a few fine trees in favor of better security in an increasingly unstable world.

God bless America!

Name: [Signature]
Affiliation: [Local Resident]
Street Address: [Address]
City, State, Zip Code: [Address]
Email: [Email]
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8-14-14

Suggest strongly that website/publication of availability of "DRAFT" EIS be posted in local newspapers.

Rangeley Highlander
Sun Journal Maine Portland Press Herald

Justification: Significant percentage of seasonal homeowners, vacationers, or campers frequent the area.

Maine Mountain & will not engage with browser searches. Network or even realize draft is complete & ready for input.

But many of them subscribe to the Rangeley Highlander.

Daily Bulletin & Journal accomplishing their own sourcing.

Thanks

Name: Stephen Marchand
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email:
Date: 3-14-14

In the event of a launch against THI-1 US or FRANKY - a fail-safe malfunction and a system failing route a training/exercise "THIS IS NOT A REAL PARADIGM INTO A LAUNCH" (OR)
We'll go to ELEVATED DEF from MDA/SEC's immediately go to launch. A launch is imminent.
1: How u gonna let the school & town know.
2: It's a 200 homes in the area. What are u gonna do? I2 very 911??

Command & Control/Accident outside a Battle Management mode.

Something tragic occurs - fire, explosion, gotta run for cover scenario.

Has some "watch off, era" or low echelon... NIC... (whatever) does

Name: STEPHEN MARCHAK
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email: SIA
PRIVACY ADVISORY

Public comments on the scope of the EIS and environmental issues that should be studied are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. All written comments received during the comment period will become part of the public record and will be considered during the preparation of the Draft EIS. Providing private address information with your comment is voluntary and such personal information will be kept confidential unless release is required by law. Your address will be used to compile a mailing list so that you may be notified of any future public meetings, and release of the Draft EIS and Final EIS in the Federal Register. Failure to provide your address will result in your name not being included on the list, and you will not receive notifications about this project.

The mountain command and control have decision making ability to intervene to mitigate or do they have to wake up someone in another time zone in order to act.

Are accident decisions internal or do eyeballs have to be directed to NORAD, Cheyenne Mt., Northcom, Huntsville, Patterson, Vandenberg?

Are they going to “Have to call the bus” to prevent a catastrophe or “many deaths” or will operations doctrine endorse a take action immediately? Will the detachment have authority to act?
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8-14-14

Will Rangeley have a representative beyond the scope of a local building code inspector for mitigating or monitoring execution requirements associated with site preparation activities inside the classified DOD paradigm? On systems - environmental impact, specifically: Could you kindly define what process is planned to enable residents or ombudsman town to identify, correlate, correct, execution track, and confirm certification, if not planned. I suggest a community representative be engaged associated with project managers & facilitators, in short order (an established role), with oversight in construction to what ever company secures a bid / contract for construction. Initiation to launch (not a pun!) ASAP after RFP & awarding design & contract to construct. Concerns of some residents remain.

Name: Stephen Marchacos

Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
PRIVACY ADVISORY

Public comments on the scope of the EIS and environmental issues that should be studied are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. All written comments received during the comment period will become part of the public record and will be considered during the preparation of the Draft EIS. Providing private address information with your comment is voluntary and such personal information will be kept confidential unless release is required by law. Your address will be used to compile a mailing list so that you may be notified of any future public meetings, and release of the Draft EIS and Final EIS in the Federal Register. Failure to provide your address will result in your name not being included on the list, and you will not receive notifications about this project.

We have already identified “triggering” events that are concerns for an environment & location that are focused primarily on the geography totally dependent on recreation, tourists, seasonal vacations etc., etc.

Mitigation includes, but are not limited to:

1) Initiation of site preparation.
2) Transport of materials or equip. on town roads & infrastructure.
3) Expansion of current activities on the mountain & development of related fitting to the base close to what exists now.
4) Inordinate changes in schedule or duration of construction or development.

THANKS
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
Attn: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211
Or
Email: MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
Fax: 913-435-1091

Date: 3-14-14

In the event of a launch against this US or foreign - a fail-safe malfunction and a system failing route a training exercise. "This is NOT a "Dull" Paradigm into a Launch." (OR) We go to elevated def. - MDA/SERE's immediately go on launch. A launch is imminent. 1: How are you going to get the school district to know? 2: It's 2:00 AM in the AM; what are you going to do? 12:00 AM. G11? ??
Command & Control/ Accident outside a Batt Man Neural Node.

Something tragic occurs - fire, explosion, gotta run for cover scenario. Has some "Watch off, son" go down echelon... NIC... (whatever)... Does?

Name: STEPHEN MARCHAK
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email: 5/17
The mountain command & control have decision making ability to intervene to mitigate or do they have to wake up someone in another time zone in order to act.

Are accident decisions internal or do eyeballs have to be directed to NORAD, Cheyenne Mtn. Northcom, Huntsville, Patterson, Vandenburo?

Are they going to "have to call the bus" to prevent a catastrophe or "many deaths" or will operations doctrine endorse a take action immediately? Will the detachment have an incentive to act?
Since I cannot be at the Rangely or Farmington public hearings, I would like to submit my comments by email:
1. I oppose the environmental destruction and impact on wildlife
2. you can't be serious to think that you can transport 55 ft. long missiles on backcountry roads
3. these systems are really aimed at Russia and China. our govt. lies when it says we need to protect ourselves from North Korea and Iran, which don't have the capability;
   this is part of our first-strike attack system, and NOT a missile defense against a first-strike from elsewhere
4. this is a huge waste of our tax dollars
5. this just keeps the arms race going

Natasha Mayers
The impact studies appear they are to be conducted by private contractors, but will be paid by M.O. D. for their work. What steps are you taking to ensure confidentiality and to remove any influence of conflict of interest?

Your questions identified. I am advised all sites are equally applicable from a strategic perspective standpoint.

The site allows for future expansion. If it possible such future expansion could include:

Name: M.K. McCall
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
Hello,
I write regarding a possible Dept. of Defense "Interceptor" defense system (SEKE EAST) in Redington Township, in the State of Maine.

This area is a pristine place of great natural beauty, our beautiful and old mountains, clean and healthy lakes, and many forested areas should not be degraded by this project. We depend on forests and waters to absorb carbon emissions. We depend on our environment to help us here in Maine earn a living. We have many visitors and guests visit each year who spend their money to visit our beautiful state. They hike, swim, fish, hunt, ski, build second homes and this project would be a disaster for this environment and our livelihood.

Please do not come to Redington Township! Why not look to Limestone, Maine where a large Air Force Base (Loring) was closed and the people in that area might welcome this? Thank you - Barbara [illegible]
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
Attn: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211

Or
Email: MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
Fax: 913-458-1091

Date: 8/29/14

Should this project be approved, is there a protected life that this greatly enlarged base (Reddington) would stay active? As I am sure you are aware that a base closing can have a tremendous effect on the town and community.

I have a business in town that was doing business with Reddington until the last base realignment and they were told that purchases were to come out of Portsmouth. Besides personal purchases by base personnel, will the military be doing business with the town and how would that work?

The effects good or bad on property values?

This is an area that depends on tourism and our tax base on vacation homes. Effects on this?

Name: Jack McCormack
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8/29/14

The Redwing Base (Aquifer Protection) is located on/over one of the main aquifers for the area. Unfortunately, there are a number of bases that are toxic clean up sites. What are the protocols for containment? Will the base have a hazmat team and facility on base? If not, how quickly can a hazmat crew be brought in?

Should a situation occur, it would severely compromise the area which is considered one of the crown jewels of the state of Maine. Poland Spring also uses this aquifer.

From what I gathered at the presentation that from a logistical and cost point of view, Fort Drum would be the first choice should that not be the way a selection be made?

Name: [Signature]
Affiliation: [Signature]
Street Address: [Signature]
City, State, Zip Code: [Signature]
Email: [Signature]
Hello, Please accept my attached letter as part of the scoping for the MDA CIS EIS process.

Thank you, Peter

Peter S. McKinley, Ph.D.
Climate Adaptation Ecologist
The Wilderness Society | Northeast Region, Maine
(office phone) 207.626.2773 | www.wilderness.org

Facebook: www.facebook.com/TheWildernessSociety
Twitter: twitter.com/Wilderness

We protect wilderness and inspire Americans to care for our wild places
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp ATTN: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211-1504

Dear Sir or Madam:

On behalf of the Maine office of The Wilderness Society, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and environmental issues deserving of study in relation to the proposed Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS) at The Center for Security Forces Detachment Kittery Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape Facility (SERF East), Redington Township, Maine.

The Wilderness Society (TWS) was formed in 1935 to defend our country's wildlands against rapid development, urbanization, and natural resource exploitation. The Wilderness Society (TWS) is a leading American conservation organization protecting a network of landscapes and waters that provide a safety net for natural processes, a refuge for wildlife and plants, and numerous benefits such as clean air, water, and recreational opportunities. The Wilderness Society office in Maine has been involved in ecological research, mapping, conservation planning, and conservation implementation in the northeast with a strong focus on eastern New Hampshire and western Maine since 2005. In particular, western Maine's High Peaks region, which includes the SERF East facility in Redington Township, Maine, has been identified as a conservation priority of local and regional conservation significance for its ability to serve as an ecological refuge and ecological linkage for the northern forest in the face of numerous stressors including forest habitat reduction, fragmentation, and climate change.

The High Peaks region includes approximately 230,000 acres of relatively intact and ecologically diverse forest cover spanning an ecological gradient that rises from tributaries of the Kennebec and Dead Rivers through northern hardwood, northern mixed-wood, spruce-fir, and subalpine forests to arctic alpine ridge and summits. This gradient includes spawning habitat for the Atlantic Salmon in the Orbeton and Perham Streams that rise out of a pond and wetland system on the Navy SERF lands which are at the geographic and ecological center of the High Peaks landscape. The middle and higher elevation forests of the SERF lands include approximately 1,564 acres of mountain bird habitat according to models developed and field tested by the Vermont Center for Ecological Studies. Mountain birds include the threatened bicknell’s thrush and several other species of birds of conservation concern due to declines in adequate region-wide habitat. The importance of this landscape based on its ecological diversity and relatively high quality forest with minimal permanent roads is recognized by the state of Maine Beginning with Habitat Program which identified close to 11,665 acres of the SERF lands within a statewide system of Focal Areas representing conservation priorities.
Much of the landscape’s habitat quality, ecological connectivity, and predicted resilience in the face of climate change derives from the relatively low human impact present on this landscape in conjunction with the high ecological diversity along the mountain gradient. TWS and conservation partners have targeted this landscape based in part on the roughly 47,000 acres scoring in the least impacted, least fragmented decile of the Wildlife Conservation Society Human Footprint Model. As importantly, a similar sized area scores in the second to lowest decile of modeled human impact. The SERE lands include close to 7,900 acres in the lowest decile of human impact and approximately 4,400 acres in the second to lowest decile of human impact. These qualities are often associated with higher ecological integrity, including greater ecological connectivity and population viabilities.

In the face of climate change these attributes associated with the landscape’s relative contiguity and ecological diversity suggest that it may well function as an ecological refugia for varying periods of time. The entirety of the SERE lands are within The Nature Conservancy modeled lands of high ecological resilience in the face of climate change. The landscape plays a much larger scale and longer term potential role in the face of climate change as well as it is ecologically connected to the rest of the northern forest through a relatively narrow band of the Appalachian Mountain chain. This point was made in an ecological report on the region by the Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust, and the Wilderness Society with the identification of the Heart of the Northern Forest, and has since been reiterated by the Staying Connected Initiative. The Nature Conservancy model of regional ecological connectivity significant to regional climate change resilience identifies the entirety of the SERE lands within a slightly wider band of landscape.

Significant conservation has occurred here to date and is ongoing. There is currently a proposal to establish a new National Wildlife Refuge in the High Peaks that would include the SERE lands. The Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust has conserved approximately 6,000 acres of the lowest impacted lands in the Human Footprint Model as ecological reserve and these lands are in the immediate vicinity of the SERE lands. The Trust for Public Land has recently closed on one project and will soon close on another project that together will conserve approximately 17,000 acres of land in the immediate vicinity of the SERE lands as part of its White Mountains to Moosehead Lake Initiative. These two projects will conserve approximately 6,759 acres of land in the lowest decile of human impact in the Human Footprint Model.

Based upon the acreage of relatively intact forest in the best condition available in this landscape, the acreage conserved to date through great effort and expense, and the potential contribution that the SERE lands offer at the center of this landscape, we are concerned about the ecological and landscape fragmentation effects that would occur with the development and operation of the CIS. The fragmentation effects would furthermore potentially have a negative impact upon the regional contribution that this landscape may offer as a refuge and source of northern forest connectivity in the face of all stressors including forest reduction, overall fragmentation, and climate change.

We hope this information is useful and may point the way to important areas of consideration during the EIS process. We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to comment and look forward to continued participation.

Sincerely,

Peter S. McKinley, Ph.D.
Climate Adaptation Ecologist
The Wilderness Society
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Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: August 13, 2014

In further discussions with the community, and for purposes of analysis, more explicit information should be provided regarding the expected increase in population (including dependents) and the potential impacts on housing, schools, medical facilities, etc. on site and throughout the region? A population increase of roughly 4,500 people (including dependents) is immense relative to the current permanent population of the Rangeley area. A statement that most living facilities will be on-site does not address until the end of the current presentation.

Name: [Signature]
Affiliation: [Signature]
Street Address: [Signature]
City, State, Zip Code: [Signature]
Email: [Signature]
My name is John Meyers and I live full-time in

Words cannot express the intensity of my opposition to an interceptor site in our area. I have copied below a letter you received yesterday from my cousin, Ms. Debbie Spielberg. There is no way to improve on her eloquent points of opposition -- so I will simply say that I "second" everything she states.

But let me please just add one more point. For centuries, Native Americans regarded Rangeley Lake as a spiritual epicenter. What makes it one still today is the darkness of the night sky. The feeling of "being at the end of the line." The way Rangeley attracts visitors and permanent residents who come because of the feeling that it is pristine and relatively "untouched."

Please, you must recognize that constructing the interceptor site at Reddington would permanently ruin -- going forward and forever more -- what makes our little hamlet so very special. The other three potential locations are far more suited to this project on every level.

In the name of decency, I fervently ask you to not destroy our Rangeley.

Sincerely,
John Meyers
Age 56

I am writing to oppose an interceptor site at Reddington Township, Maine. This site would not be a good location for both economic and environmental reasons.

The development that would accompany such a site would have a strong negative impact on the surrounding pristine environment, including the Appalachian Trail. This is one of the last mostly pristine, yet accessible, areas on the East Coast. Even the best efforts to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development could not prevent destroying some of the quiet, calm and virtually complete darkness. The impact of the 24-hour/day lighting for the site would create light pollution far beyond the immediate area. There are few remaining areas on the east coast where one can see the night sky without light pollution. The additional traffic to and from the site would also detract from the quiet beauty of the area.

Not only would the serenity and majesty of the area be degraded by this siting, but the local economy could also face loss. Much of the local economy is dependent on the tourism and visitors who are drawn to the area for its beauty, remoteness and natural resources. Visitors can hike, bike, canoe, kayak, boat, snowboard, ski, and more. Some people believe that this interceptor site would provide jobs for local residents, but all of the jobs at the site are assigned via a federal, national process. There is no preference given for hiring local residents. The main possible benefit for local residents would be the potential of more visitors at local dining and shopping establishments; however, the degraded quality of the area and accompanying loss of visitors drawn to the area for the natural beauty would exceed any potential gain.

The existing SERE site at Reddington Township is a different type of military installation that does not significantly impact the surrounding area since its focus is to provide wilderness training and so the wilderness is left mostly undisturbed. The proposed interceptor site has a different focus that is not compatible with the surrounding area.
Additionally, the logistics of this site are much more complicated than the other sites under consideration. Reddington Township is a remote area that would need significant additional infrastructure, which would be expensive and destructive to the surrounding environment to put in place.

I have been a summer visitor to nearby Rangeley, Maine for the past 17 years and currently own properties there with the plan eventually to live there more permanently. Therefore, I have a personal interest in the outcome of this decision. More important, however, is my strong belief that siting the interceptor in this pristine area would have a strong negative impact that outweighs any potential benefits.

For all the above reasons, I urge you not to build the interceptor at the proposed Reddington Township, Maine site.

In addition, I am requesting that you confirm the following:

1. The site would have 24-hour/day, 7-day/week lighting. If this is accurate, please specify the actual type and amount of lighting.

2. There would be no local preference in hiring for any new jobs at the site. Please outline the process for any new job hirings.

Thank you in advance for your attention to these important issues.

Sincerely,
Deborah Spielberg
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 08/27/14

The proposed missile defense system for the East Coast needs to happen especially in Rangeley. It would be an economic boost to the area. As a Vietnam vet, I feel the United States of America should do everything it possibly can to protect this great country. We need to protect our borders in every way possible.

Name: Alexander C. Miller
Affiliation: Rangeley Lake B&B
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email: 
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Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: **8-12-14**

**Being the closest site to the East Coast, I agree with the site being in Redington Pt at Osprey.**

**The influx of workers and base personnel would be a great benefit to the local economy.**

**Upgrading the roads and infrastructure would be a plus.**

**Security is #1 when protecting the US.**

SHERE is so remote it would be a perfect place for it.

Name: **Nick Pathiakis**

Affiliation: 

Street Address: 

City, State, Zip Code: 

Email: 

K-194
THUMBS UP: We all should support the pending missile base in the Rangeley area. Many jobs, some temporary but never the less, what a shot to our economy. You won’t see it, but if you hear it, it won’t make much difference, Duck and Cover.

Larry R Pearson
USAF, Retired
Environmental Impact Statement

Rangeley, Maine -- August 12, 2014

Questions or Comments
by

Tim Pellerin, Town of Rangeley, Fire Chief:

I’d just like to ask a few questions, that at some point during the process, I’m sure the MDA would communicate to the local community such items as, things like traffic flow for construction equipment, and then once the system is being built, response actions and emergency action plans, items such as after the facility is built and in place, response capability plans for emergency services, fire rescue, police, security, and then more onto community impact, housing, schools, how that would affect, how many people it would affect, so the question basically, centers around emergency services, planning, communications and working together with MDA to make a determination on what the appropriate response and trains would be, to be able to facilitate emergency events at that facility.

Thank you.
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Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
Attn: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211

Or
Email: MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
Fax: 913-438-1091

Date: 8-12-14

Was told you already have an adequate system in California and Alaska that is 100% -
why do you need to do this - for 110%??

..............................

Name: 
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email: 

K-197
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8-12-14

This is a vacation, tourist, small town gem of a community.

The impact of a defense missile post will be devastating.

The roads needed to be built to supply this venture would change this community. The ground water will be impacted.

Name: Judith Phifer
3. Housing and the school would change in scope and size.

People live here and come here because of the open, clean land, air, and quiet, beautiful setting.

This proposal is only to be in addition to what is already in place in CA and Alaska. It is not necessary—it has no place here.
To whom it may concern,

Attached are comments from the Appalachian Trail Conservancy for submission to Black and Veatch Special Projects Corp in regards to the EIS for the proposed CIS at the SERE East facility in Redington Township, Maine. The Appalachian Trail Conservancy is a 43,000 member non-profit whose mission is to preserve and manage the Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

Please confirm that you have received the comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into this process.

Sincerely,

Claire Polfus

--
Claire Polfus
Maine Conservation Resources Manager
Appalachian Trail Conservancy
P.O. Box 454
Farmington, ME 04938
Phone: 207.778.0700
Fax (call first): 207.778.0700

[Website Link]
www.appalachiantrail.org

The Appalachian Trail Conservancy’s mission is to preserve and manage the Appalachian Trail – ensuring that its vast natural beauty and priceless cultural heritage can be shared and enjoyed today, tomorrow, and for centuries to come. To become a member, volunteer, or learn more, visit www.appalachiantrail.org.
Thank you for inviting the Appalachian Trail Conservancy (ATC) to comment on the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS) in Redington Township, Maine. We have reviewed the provided documentation, maps, and visual simulations and found them to be helpful in formatting our comments. Our comments on the proposed EIS follow the background information on ATC and the Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

**Organizational background:** ATC is a private, nonprofit, conservation organization founded in 1925 to coordinate private-citizen as well as public-agency efforts to design, construct, maintain, and protect the Appalachian Trail and to conserve and manage adjacent lands and resources. ATC has a membership of 43,000 individuals representing all 50 states and many countries, and is also a federation of 31 affiliated hiking and outing clubs throughout the eastern United States, each of which maintains an assigned segment of the Appalachian Trail. ATC, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Forest Service lead a cooperative management system that serves as a worldwide model for volunteer management, public-private partnership, and collaborative conservation. From its earliest beginnings, the Appalachian Trail and its associated facilities have been maintained largely by a corps of dedicated volunteers that today numbers 6,000 individuals, who last year contributed more than 245,000 hours to Trail maintenance, protection, and education.

**Mission:** The Appalachian Trail Conservancy’s mission is to preserve and manage the Appalachian Trail—ensuring that its vast natural beauty and priceless cultural heritage can be shared and enjoyed today, tomorrow, and for centuries to come.

**Appalachian Trail overview:** The Appalachian Trail (A.T.) is a 2,185-mile footpath extending from Maine to Georgia through 14 states, generally along the ridgelines and major valleys of the Appalachian Mountain range. The A.T. connects six national parks, eight national forests, and more than 60 state parks, forests, and game-management units. The Trail received Federal recognition as the nation’s first National Scenic Trail in 1968 under the National Trails System Act. Congress mandated through that act that the Appalachian National Scenic Trail would be administered by the Secretary of Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. As an outgrowth of amendments to the act in 1978, and notwithstanding its checkerboard pattern of land ownership and administration, the Trail is now identified as a unit of the National Park System and is administered by the A.T. Park Office and the Appalachian Trail Conservancy in separate offices in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia. ATC has formal agreements with the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, and numerous state agencies in the management of the A.T. Over two million visitors annually hike or backpack on the A.T.

**Comments on proposed CIS in Maine:** The Appalachian Trail through Maine includes some of the most rugged and remote sections of the entire Trail. In the High Peaks region from Route 4 across to the Bigelows, the A.T. traverses six peaks over 4,000 feet and across some of the largest alpine areas in the state. The area is known for steep climbs, with the reward of outstanding 360-degree vistas of the large tracts of forests and lakes of western Maine.

The Appalachian Trail corridor shares 8.4 miles (4.9 miles on the north and 3.5 miles on the south) of boundary with the Department of Navy’s Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape Facility (SERE East) Facility in Redington Township. Within this section are five miles of the Trail that include viewpoints on Saddleback Junior and Poplar Ridge and an overnight lean-to and campsite. This section is also part of a twenty-mile stretch, one of the longest on the entire Appalachian Trail, without a sanctioned public motorized crossing. In very few places can a hiker in the eastern United States experience the quiet and remoteness found on this section of Trail. The SERE facility’s current
mission—to teach our military the essential tactical skills of survival, evasion, resistance and escape, all of which require natural, wilderness conditions—is much more compatible with the exceptional national park values of the Appalachian Trail at this location.

The area is also vital to maintaining healthy natural resources in the region. After 175 years, federally endangered Atlantic salmon are once again spawning in the region, including in Orbeton Stream. Salmon, as well as native brook trout, use the shady and cool streams of the area for spawning habitat. In higher elevations, dense spruce-fir provides important nesting habitat for Bicknell’s thrush, a species of Special Concern in Maine that is also being considered to be listed as federally endangered. The federally threatened Canada lynx also uses spruce-fir thickets in the area as it hunts for its main prey species, snowshoe hare. Finally, the topographic diversity in the region is vital to the survival of many more species as they are forced to adapt to climate change.

In 2012, the town of Rangeley, Maine was accepted as an Appalachian Trail Community™. ATC created the program to develop and support a network of collaborating rural communities, promoting sustainable economic development through four-season outdoor recreation and engaging local citizens along the Appalachian Trail in Trail stewardship. ATC is cosponsoring an Americorps VISTA position that will support healthy living initiatives, youth engagement, and recreational development in the Rangeley area. The beauty and natural and recreational resources of the Rangeley region have always been and always will be vital to the sustainability of the community.

The current use of the SERE facility in Redington Township fits well into the recreation and natural resource-based landscape of the High Peaks Region. However, development of the facility into a Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS) would be incompatible with the natural resources, recreation values, and communities in the region. Moreover, the 24-hour lighting and noise from the CIS would destroy the unique experience of hiking on the Appalachian Trail through the High Peaks of Maine. The Appalachian National Scenic Trail, a national resource that has been protected through federal legislation, supported by millions of taxpayer dollars, and made possible by millions more hours of volunteer labor, would be severely negatively impacted by construction, noise, lighting, and ongoing operation necessary for the CIS. In addition to the direct impacts of the facility itself, this 33-mile section of the Appalachian Trail would be seriously affected by the associated development required to accommodate staffing and support personnel for the CIS. Further, the proposed CIS and associated development would fundamentally and very quickly change the rural character of the nearby community in ways that would be detrimental to the outdoor industry that they are dependent on.

In conclusion, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy is very concerned that the proposed CIS would profoundly negatively impact the A.T. experience, the natural resources surrounding the Trail and the communities that support the A.T. ATC requests that Black and Veatch Special Projects Corp conduct a comprehensive and programmatic environmental impact assessment specifically in regard to the potential impacts to the Appalachian National Scenic Trail including those described above.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the proposed CIS in Redington Township, Maine. Please keep ATC apprised of the progress for the EIS process and any other updates on the project as they become available.

Claire Polfus  
Maine Conservation Resources Manager  
Appalachian Trail Conservancy  
PO Box 454  
Farmington, ME 04938
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Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.
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Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
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Overland Park, KS 66211

Or
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Date: 13 Aug 14

TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION ON WHETHER RANGELEY IS A GOOD FIT FOR A CIS, I WOULD NEED TO SEE THE SITE FIRST HAND. SUGGEST OPEN HOUSE AT SERE IN AREA OF PROPOSED CIS

Name: RANDELL POUTON & DEB POUTON

Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
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Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: September 15, 2014 VIA FAX: 913-468-1091

Comments (SERE East location): This technology continues the illusion of safety and represents a lost opportunity to direct resources toward disarmament and other non-military strategies. The public scoping session was not a meeting in the true sense. More akin to attendees individually running the gauntlet of defense experts, it was an inappropriate and ineffective approach. I was not able to listen to very many other attendees’ questions so that I could adequately formulate my own questions and reactions to the proposal. Notwithstanding the above comments, I have identified the following issues I feel are important for my community:

1) Will the agency regularly communicate with local government(s) and if so, how?
2) Will increased capacity for fire fighting or emergency response be needed?
3) Who will pay for increased training for local first responders and other personnel?
4) Will Franklin County be reimbursed for expenses it incurs to protect human life?
5) What are the general implications of limited road access in our region?
6) Will evacuation plans be prepared, and if so, who will be involved?
7) What would happen if a fire breaks out on or off the site?
8) What would be the consequences of an explosion on or off the site?
9) How will the agency deal with any fuel leak or spill?
10) What would be the consequences if the site’s security or computers went down?
11) Will presence of the site mean increased surveillance, and if so, where?
12) Will the agency assist local government(s) with natural disaster recovery?

While I make these comments as an individual, I should mention that I am a candidate for Franklin County Treasurer this November.

Name: Pamela Prodan
Affiliation:
Address:

cc: Congressman Mike Michaud, VIA FAX: 202-225-2943

K-204
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine — August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
Doug Rawlings, Veterans for Peace:

My name is Doug Rawlings. I live in and I am a member of Veterans for Peace.

I guess my comment about this whole situation is, not necessarily an environmental concern, although I have those, a cultural concern, I have those. It's a moral concern. I am totally opposed to all of this money and time and human effort, being spent on preparation for war, and to protect us against, I think a false fear, certainly of Korea and Iran. I think it's a false fear.

So I'm not opposed to this site being in Maine, it should be somewhere else. I'm opposed to it in general. And that's where I'm coming from, and I've spoken to the people here, and I have to say that I appreciate their listening, and their sharing of ideas. I'm okay with that.

But I really do think we have to have a general town meeting to discuss this further, because I'd much rather sit in a room with my fellow community members, and listen to their concerns, and also the positive statements that people are making too, in a setting where we're all together as opposed of this piecemeal approach. So I would definitely appreciate that.

But I guess my mind is set, and, you know, my heart is set, and I'm just not going to give that up.

I'm totally opposed to the preparation for war.

And I think we should spend our tax dollars much more effectively, in building our schools and our health systems and our roads, and not missile-defense systems.
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Date: 8/13/14

I believe this is a good proposal and I endorse this completely.

The missile threat is a piece of America’s defense needed.

The best offense is a good defense.

Name: D.S. Raymond Strange (Ret.)
Affiliation: _
Street Address: _
City, State, Zip Code: _
Email: _

K-206
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8-13-2014

The CIS site in the Rangeley area would be a very positive impact on the economic future of this region. The economy in Rangeley has always been dependent on tourism, however industries such as logging and paper have decreased significantly. As demographics change and tourism dollars are spread in multiple locations instead of concentrated this region will need to look to new industries to survive. The construction of a missile defense site would help tremendously. The defense of our country is paramount in our current world and I would be proud to support a defense capability in our region.

Please let concerned residents like myself know what we can do to help Rangeley be chosen for this important project.

Name: Paul Reynolds
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine  --  August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments

by

Mark Roman, Global Network against Weapons
& Nuclear Power in Space:

My name is Mark Roman. I live ir , about an hour’s drive from Farmington. I'm with the Global Network against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space.

I have, feel a lot of trepidation about the idea of putting this missile system in the western mountains of Maine for many reasons.

Environmental impact is one. But mainly I feel that it is going to be another very costly economic boondoggle by the military-industrial complex, that, really wants to make a lot of money. They do make a lot of money by selling us, first a lot of fear, and second a lot of very sophisticated weapon systems that often are obsolete before they're deployed. I've lived in Maine long enough to have seen the building of the "over the horizon" radar site in Moscow, Maine, back in the early 80s, and it took years, and millions and millions to build. And it was obsolete pretty much, as soon as it opened, and it was touted to be able to see planes taking off in Moscow. But there is system after system like this. This particular system, the midrange missile, has been tested, and it is shown to be very unreliable. The only successful test they've had with this missile system that they're planning for Maine, has been with a target that had an actual beacon fastened to it to locate, for the missile to locate. So it's not a sure thing missile system.

The other thing is, I know this is an Environmental Impact Statement, but it seems that with all the knowledge here, everyone I've asked, I've asked four people so far, how far it is from Iran, or North Korea, to Rangeley, Maine, and not a single one has any idea how far that is. And it’s about, they talk about future threats, and they talk about . . well these countries have launched satellites, and the next step is ICBMs. Well, France has launched satellites, I mean, there are many countries in the world that have launched satellites, and it doesn’t mean that they’re heading to ICBMs. If I look at a map of Iran, and see how many U. S. bases, or NATO bases surround Iran, it makes me really incredulous to think that Iran would try to launch a missile at the United States. And I think it's basically
fear mongering. I hope to interact with the public that's coming tonight, and give them some information that I don't think is being presented. And I also tried to ask the presenters tonight, if any of them are from Maine. And the gentleman who's interviewing me, or right now, is the only person I've heard say he's from Maine.

I think that's about it for my comments, and I appreciate your time. Thank you.
Date: 8/13/14

Environmental Impact & Analysis

1. Concerns more. If any mitigative needs to be done, my hope is that dollars stay within the community.

2. Read implications thoroughly. The timing in which MBOT [current upgrades] to avoid overseas/ and dollars.

4. Can Rangeley handle the traffic? Health care, restaurants, lodging, boat parties, invasive plants (aquatic & terrestrial), etc...

   Thanks.

   Very informative!!

Name: Shelby Rouspan

Affiliation: ______

Street Address: ______

City, State, Zip Code: ______

Email: ______
Please see the attached comments for the EIS - SERE East.

Simon Rucker  
Executive Director  
Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust  
P.O. Box 761  
Portland ME, 04104

Check out our Facebook page and our News and Events!
September 15, 2014

Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp
ATTN: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211-1504

Re: Public Comments on Scope of EIS and Environmental Issues – SERE East

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process regarding the proposed additional location for the Continental United States Interceptor Site (CIS) at The Center for Security Forces Detachment Kittery Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape Facility (SERE East), Redington Township, Maine.

The Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust was formed in June 2002 as an independent land trust for the purpose of acquiring and protecting the land surrounding the Appalachian Trail (A.T.) in Maine for public benefit. The A.T. lands in the High Peaks Region of Maine represent some of the most diverse natural communities in the state and provide an important recreation resource. Maine A.T. Land Trust owns the land just east of the Appalachian Trail corridor on Saddleback Mountain and has interests in other properties in the High Peaks region. We are concerned that the locating of the CIS at the SERE East facility will adversely impact not only the Appalachian Trail itself (the corridor of which is surrounded by the facility for over two miles) but the surrounding natural landscapes and intact forest blocks which are integral to the region.

In our role of carrying out our mission to protect the land surrounding the Appalachian Trail, the siting of the CIS in such close proximity to the A.T. must be examined closely. At a minimum, approximately 350 acres in seven non-contiguous blocks would be converted from mature spruce/fir and mixed hardwood forest to CIS facilities. The facilities would have to be brightly lit around the clock and would be entirely powered by generators. Approximately 1200 to 1500 individuals would be operating the CIS. All of this activity would be occurring approximately one half mile from the most famous walking path in the world, in the midst of one of the longest stretches of the Appalachian Trail without a public road crossing (twenty miles).
The region in which the SERE East facility lies depends on outdoors tourism, and the Appalachian Trail is a considerable draw. But other aspects of outdoor recreation would also be effected by the CIS. Naturalists are concerned with the impact on wildlife habitat – those in the A.T. area are likely to have a significantly lower chance of seeing threatened or elusive species like the Bicknell’s Thrush or the Canadian Lynx. They will be concerned with water quality and the increased potential for industrial accidents. The SERE East facility also contains Redington Pond which is the source of Orbeton Stream – headwaters of the Atlantic Salmon which has just recently been successfully reintroduced.

The Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust is concerned that the choice of The Center for Security Forces Detachment Kittery Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape Facility (SERE East), Redington Township, Maine, as a site for the CIS would jeopardize the Appalachian Trail experience and environment. We request that you examine closely these and other impacts on the trail and the natural setting through which it passes in this region.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Simon Rucker
Executive Director
Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust
Thank you for attending this public scoring meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8-14-14

My concerns beyond the enormous cost—funds that should be put to better use to provide real security (affordable housing, healthcare, healthy food, education for all, living wage jobs, impact on local schools/businesses; long-term pollution due caused by construction and maintenance of decommissioning (military has gone and) native American lands

Put our tax dollars to better use. Use real diplomacy, not so-called envoys. Share our enormous wealth + resource

Name: CHRIS RUSNOV
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email:
From: Frank Sanfilippo
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2014 7:53 PM
To: MDA.CIS.EIS
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Comments

To Whom It May Concern,

My understanding of missile defense (offense) is that there is no evidence that it is effective. Even if missile defense worked, it only escalates and inflames tensions when our tax money could be used to forge unity among the people of the world, envisioning a friendship where there was fear and hatred. Pointing missiles at each other is the same as pointing guns, waiting for the other guy to shoot first. We can create peace not by aggression, but by taking action toward a shared reality of kindness and understanding. Missile defense is going the wrong way, especially when we think of our children and the environment they are growing up in. A few people stand to to make a lot of money while our security continues to fall away. I do not want this in Maine or anywhere else. Thank you for taking my comment.

With gratitude,
Frank Sanfilippo, LCSW

The good we secure for ourselves is precarious and uncertain until it is secured for all of us and incorporated into our common life.-Jane Addams (1860-1935)

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, may contain confidential and privileged information and is for the SOLE use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy/delete all copies of the original message.
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine  --  August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
Lisa Savage, Code Pink Maine:

My name is Lisa Savage. I'm from and the district that serves that area. I am also, in my spare time, a local coordinator for Code Pink Maine, which is a women led Peace and Justice organization.

I am very concerned to express my disapproval and bad feelings about bringing giant toxic missiles into the western mountains. I was born in Maine, I lived in Maine most of my life.

And this area, this particular part of Maine, is especially beautiful, and has historically over my lifetime been economically depressed. But tourism is a huge source of prosperity for this area, the western mountains, and particularly the missile site, represent Northern reach of the Appalachian Trail, which is a historic, walking trail, that begins in Georgia and ends in Maine. Many, many visitors come to Maine on the Appalachian Trail. Many other visitors come to Maine to engage in sports year-round, like skiing, fishing, boating, hunting and all of this economic activity depends on continued beauty and also the pristine waterways, and the clean air, and the wildlife being undisturbed, because that is what tourists come to Maine to enjoy. So I'm quite concerned about polluting, and blasting a site in the western mountains. My understanding is that they would blast fifty-five foot holes into the mountains, into the rock of the mountains, in order to put the silos that would hold about 60 missiles that are filled with highly toxic substances including, hydrazine, perchlorate. These toxic substances would not only be in the mountainside, they would be on trucks, with loads of about fifty tons each, going through the town of Farmington, where I am right now making this public statement. I'm at the University of Maine Farmington. It's the University of Maine campus closest to the high school where I teach. Many, many of my students currently go here, have gone here before. And I myself, have been a student here from time to time. And Farmington is a very charming town, a lovely little college town nestled right up against the, sort of the Gateway to Sugarloaf and Rangeley and the ski areas. And my understanding is that the roads in Farmington are not in any way adequate for a fifty ton load of toxic
missiles traveling through it. There would have to be significant reengineering of the boards through Farmington to accomplish this project, and frankly I've been working on the fact that Congress spends well over 50% of my taxes every year on the Pentagon budget, and clearly this would be funded by the Pentagon budget, and all of the contract is would be paid out of the Pentagon budget.

But over the last years in Maine our roads had very little maintenance on them. Our roads are in bad shape, our bridges are in bad shape. The Society of engineers is, always gives us, you know, kind of the concern mark, when they look at our infrastructure here. And it almost makes me wonder whether the federal government will only be spending money to maintain roads that will allow very large, very expensive, very dangerous military installations. It's kind of a, "The Bring Our War Dollars Home" campaign is a grassroots campaign, that started in Maine, and spread nationwide. It continues to work on converting the military-industrial complex to industries that would generate far more jobs than building weapons does. And also would be sustainable jobs that would build our economy and environment, rather than polluting it, and using up resources, to build things that supposedly . . They're called, it's called missile defense? But the word defense is not very honest, because really these are offensive systems meant to make America's first strike capability against a nuclear power, such as Russia or China, viable, because after the first strike, the retaliatory missiles . . this would be the system that's designed to take those missiles out. The claim that they're to protect us from missiles from Iran, or North Korea, at this point in time, 2014, is ludicrous because neither one of those countries have nuclear missiles that could reach the United States. And in any case an arms race is always bad for the people. The people don't have enough money to feed their children, house their children. People graduate from this university, tens of thousands of dollars in debt, into a job market with very few jobs, unless you work for the military-industrial complex. And research by economists shows that almost any investment, late in any kind of industry that you study, would yield more jobs, real full-time jobs with benefits like the old-fashioned kind of real jobs, than building weapons would. We already have General Dynamics operating Bath iron Works in southern Maine. It's one of the biggest employers in the state, and every single one of Maine's congressional delegation pay homage to General Dynamics. They claim to be against war spending. Representative Shelley Pingree, Representative Mike Michaud is running for governor right now. Senator Angus King, Senator Susan Collins, they will all pay lip service to the fact that spending needs to be generating jobs, and generating right livelihood for hard-working people in Maine. However, they consistently in Congress vote to spend
money on wasteful things, such as a missile defense site in Rangeley. So I think this is an incredibly bad idea on so many levels. I think that our country cannot long continue down the path of spending 50 to 57%, depending on what fiscal year we’re in, on the military. It just is not sustainable. I think that my fellow citizens are very ill-informed, and I think that this kind of sort of tradeshow approach to a public hearing, is designed to keep them uninformed. So I'm hopeful that there'll be some press here, there will be some real journalists doing their job and actually getting out some real information to the people of Maine. Thank you.
Dear Sirs,

I have owned property on the Carrabassett River near the bottom of Sugarloaf for the past forty years. During this time I have regularly held seasons' passes at the Sugarloaf and Rangely Ski Areas and worked on both of their ski patrols.

As a retired US Navy ETR 2, I respect the need our Country has for a strong defense. The missile shield that Israel has been employing for the past few months has save thousands of lives. We should have something similar but on the larger scale that this development represents.

The SERE school was purposefully sited in a remote and rugged area to limit access to its activities. This missile site would benefit similarly. Any improvements needed on the roads between BGR and the SERE school will benefit the entire area. These roads are already taking heavy logging and cement truck traffic. That traffic will benefit from widening the curves and sight lines along this route.

Respectfully,

Gardiner L. Schneider, CEO
Asheville Mica Company
PO Box 127
Sedgwick, ME 04676
I am a frequent visitor to Maine and both my mother and sister live there. Job creation should not focus on military "solutions." Maine has plenty of unpaved roads without wide shoulders for bicyclists. I suggest spending money on improving the existing infrastructure of the state instead.

Sincerely,

Ginny Schneider

If money equals speech, then those without it are disenfranchised. -- Ginny Schneider

Open borders are better than a single death. -- Ginny Schneider

If you work for peace, why do you pay for war?
Environmental Impact Statement

Rangeley, Maine — August 12, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
Gary Shaffer, 30 Year Resident:

Hi, my name is Gary Shaffer, and I'm a resident of ____. I've been a resident here for over 30 years. I'm very much in favor of military and the fact that Congress and the military is considering a missile-defense site here in our area. I did have one question that would be in reference to lighting. We are noted for clear skies and lots of stars at night, and a facility the size of what you're talking about, I'm not opposed to that, but I have a concern about the amount of lighting used to illuminate your facility, and how it might affect the brightness of our skies at night.

That's pretty much my only concern right now. Still learning about your process, but I am in favor of the facility being located in our area.

Thank you.
Environmental Impact Statement

Farmington, Maine — August 14, 2014

Questions or Comments
by

Maal Sibulkin, 84-year-old Resident

My name is Maal Sibulkin, I live now in . But I've been almost all of my life in North Franklin County, in Phillips, with a big sight (view) of Saddleback, like Redington has, and so it's my world that's being questioned here for change.

At 86 years of age. I don't have a personal vested interest in this, although I do have dissents behind me. And I have some philosophical thoughts, and one practical one.

It just hurts, hurts, hurts! That we create so much of the need for these horrible machines, and a long history of the 19th and 20th centuries of supporting dictators all over South America and Central America and the world, setting them up, supporting them so the population goes to rebel, and goes into crazy isms, and makes the cause for all of this. Here is Iran, Iran, Iran. But I can remember in the 1980s, when Mossaddegh the elected Prime Minister of Iran, no fundamentalist, he was a pragmatic secularist, and he nationalized Iran’s oil. So we merely throw him overboard, bring the Shah back, and who do we have instead of Mossaddegh, and nationalized oils? We have the Ayatollah’s and their successors, and now we’re building all this because of what they might do to us. And we are so much, the cause of it, and this is true everywhere. Hunger and starvation – and our money goes into all of this!

There’s no music anymore in North Franklin schools, no, hardly any Art, because the taxpayers can’t authorize it, but billions might be spent here.

So this is the thing I just cry over. As far as your doctors, America, well the new MDs wind up $200,000 in debt. How many MDs could have a free education, with the money all over America and the world we’re doing?

Okay, I wish I was leaving this planet, (as I will quite soon), with a better attitude toward our fellow man, (than we have), about shooting down her enemies. And by the way, on the subject of enemies we have in our ancient history, America’s that is, the war of 1812, and the very famous Commodore, Oliver Hazard Perry, a hero-winner of the Naval Battle of Lake Erie. We sunk most of the warships and controlled the lake. As they did in those days, the "Napoleonic Pause" pose, he puts his hand inside of his coat, and sends the message to Congress, "We have met the enemy, and he is ours." Well, you know, in more in our times, I remember back in the 1950s, there was a cartoon in all the newspapers. It was a cartoon about an Opossum named Pogo. Some of you may remember Pogo. The writer was Walt Kelly, and he
had his cute little possum in the Okefenokee Swamp. And as Eisenhower was running for president, and the slogan was, "I like Ike", they decided to nominate Pogo, the opossum in the Okefenokee Swamp, to be president. And his slogan was, "I go Pogo!", that was it. And one of the things he did, although being educated, remembered Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry. And so he had his "paw" in his tuxedo, or uniform, and he said, "We have met the enemy, and he is 'us'!" And that's what I'm saying, we have many enemies in the world, but we are our own worst enemy. And if we would spend our money educating and enlightening the American people, and indirectly the world; money into Ebola vaccines and high-tech food raising, maybe we wouldn't be scared shitless about super ICBMs, and silos.

Okay, so much for the philosophy. Don't worry the grave covers all, and I'll soon be out of your hair!

Practical – I am knowledgeable, very knowledgeable about New England's Appalachian Trail, much of which I've hiked in my youth. And the trail comes right up over Mount Saddleback, and down into the Redington Valley, before it climbs Sugarloaf. And there's a good piece of that trail, which I know, where you will look down on the Redington site. You know, we know all about shoulder fired missiles, we are the inventors of them. We gave the Taliban all kinds of shoulder fired Stinger's, to shoot down Russian planes and knockout Russian tanks back, you know, in the 1990's. Or that's what we thought at the time, well hey, what's to prevent some nutty lunatics, you know, representing the Islamist telathy, from hiking up the Appalachian Trail with some stingers, (the latest type of them, that shoot further, and more deadly) and firing them on the Redington site. What are you going to do, put the Army up there? Hey the Appalachian Trail is families going to talk to God up there; bringing your children to breathe fresh air, enjoy the flowers, and the Bears and the squirrels. And you walk along the Appalachian Trail, "Oh look at the view, look down there, it's Redington Pond, where the Sandy River Railroad used to go, chugga, chugga, chugga, chugga, on its way to Rangeley. And of course you will never allow the revival of the Sandy River Railroad, because, "Oh Military!' All right, that can happen but what about the AT? You get out of your car at Route 4, you fill your big knapsack with Stinger missile parts, you go along the trail, and “wheeeoo", what are you going to do, search them all? Well the purpose of the AT, is to talk to God, and teach your children beautiful things, and walk along with your honey, and kiss her when nobody is looking! Is that what you're going to do with the Appalachian Trail? If you've got to have them somewhere, wouldn't you rather have them in New York or Ohio or Michigan, and leave the beautiful Appalachian Trail the way, God made it?

Thank you for listening.
Environmental Impact Statement

Rangeley, Maine — August 12, 2014

Questions or Comments
by
Lucy Simonds, Parent & Teacher:

Thank you very much. As a 24 year resident of this area, who has raised both of her children here, as I began to leave the building, I looked at the wall of graduates of the school. This last year we only graduated seven students. My children were in classes of 17 and 20. We are special. And if you bring a facility like this into an area where the Appalachian trail crosses a four mile ridge walk, and you nearly double our population, the very unique experience the people in this community get to have, will be destroyed. And I hope everybody takes a look at that wall on their way out.

Thank you
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8/17/14
A verbal over view first and then the expert sub viewings would have been much more informative to the general public.

This area is totally dependent on tourism. If the sound, water, will hurt the reason why people come here. Notice.

Please don't mess with this Florida area. It won't be able to recover.

Name: Nancey Strean
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code
Email:
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
Attn: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211

Or
Email: MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
Fax: 913-413-1091

Date: 8/13/14

Very informative meeting...
Still have concerns -
our area may become a target environmental issues...

Thank you for your time and service

Name: Diane Soule
Affiliation: resident
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code: ___
Email: ___
I am writing to oppose an interceptor site at Reddington Township, Maine. This site would not be a good location for both economic and environmental reasons.

The development that would accompany such a site would have a strong negative impact on the surrounding pristine environment, including the Appalachian Trail. This is one of the last mostly pristine, yet accessible, areas on the East Coast. Even the best efforts to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development could not prevent destroying some of the quiet, calm and virtually complete darkness. The impact of the 24-hour/day lighting for the site would create light pollution far beyond the immediate area. There are few remaining areas on the east coast where one can see the night sky without light pollution. The additional traffic to and from the site would also detract from the quiet beauty of the area.

Not only would the serenity and majesty of the area be degraded by this siting, but the local economy could also face loss. Much of the local economy is dependent on the tourism and visitors who are drawn to the area for its beauty, remoteness and natural resources. Visitors can hike, bike, canoe, kayak, boat, snowboard, ski, and more. Some people believe that this interceptor site would provide jobs for local residents, but all of the jobs at the site are assigned via a federal, national process. There is no preference given for hiring local residents. The main possible benefit for local residents would be the potential of more visitors at local dining and shopping establishments; however, the degraded quality of the area and accompanying loss of visitors drawn to the area for the natural beauty would exceed any potential gain.

The existing SERE site at Reddington Township is a different type of military installation that does not significantly impact the surrounding area since its focus is to provide wilderness training and so the wilderness is left mostly undisturbed. The proposed interceptor site has a different focus that is not compatible with the surrounding area.

Additionally, the logistics of this site are much more complicated than the other sites under consideration. Reddington Township is a remote area that would need significant additional infrastructure, which would be expensive and destructive to the surrounding environment to put in place.

I have been a summer visitor to nearby Rangeley, Maine for the past 17 years and currently own properties there with the plan eventually to live there more permanently. Therefore, I have a personal interest in the outcome of this decision. More important, however, is my strong belief that siting the interceptor in this pristine area would have a strong negative impact that outweighs any potential benefits.

For all the above reasons, I urge you not to build the interceptor at the proposed Reddington Township, Maine site.

In addition, I am requesting that you confirm the following:

1. The site would have 24-hour/day, 7-day/week lighting. If this is accurate, please specify the actual type and amount of lighting.

2. There would be no local preference in hiring for any new jobs at the site. Please outline the process for any new jobhirings.

Thank you in advance for your attention to these important issues.

Sincerely,
Deborah Spielberg
September 15, 2014

Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp
Attn: MDACIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211-1504


Dear Black and Veatch Special Projects Corporation:

On behalf of Maine Audubon and our 15,000 members and supporters, we are writing to share our comments on the scope of the U.S. Department of Defense Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in connection with the Missile Defense Agency’s (MDA) proposed CONUS-CIS projects. Maine Audubon has particular concerns with the proposed site in Redington, Maine.

Maine Audubon is the largest state-wide non-profit conservation organization in Maine with approximately 15,000 members and supporters. We also operate numerous education centers throughout the state. Maine Audubon’s mission is to conserve Maine’s wildlife and wildlife habitat by engaging people of all ages in education, conservation and action. Maine Audubon’s Western Audubon chapter, based in the Western Mountains region of the state, has about 200 members.

Maine Audubon members, including the members of its Western Maine Chapter, have historically used and enjoyed the Western Maine mountain area, including the area in which the proposed CONUS-CIS Project may be located in a variety of ways. Members have hiked and walked in the area, gone birding in the area, and have enjoyed the scenic quality and the biodiversity provided by this large, unfragmented, exemplary natural area. Maine Audubon’s staff and members have studied and enjoyed the species found in the Redington Mountain area.

We have a range of concerns with the proposed CONUS-CIS location in Redington and urge them to be considered as part of the EIS review. We also agree with a number of concerns raised by the Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) in its letter dated September 15, 2014.

Public process
Public access to comments and documentation needs to be strengthened. We support the request that all information be made easily available to the public for review and comment.
Ecological context
The SERE base’s current mission is as a wilderness training site. As such, its use has been compatible with the exceptional value of the region’s landscape and ecosystem. Conversion to a CONUS-CIS facility would drastically change for the worse the natural resources of the region.

The area is part of the largest contiguous area above 2700 ft. elevation in the state. The entire region is generally undeveloped and dominated by a working industrial forest and mountain landscape. The higher elevations, stretching from Saddleback Mountain to Redington and Crocker Mountains, remain nearly totally unfragmented.

Habitat fragmentation
According to Maine’s Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy, the state’s strategy for wildlife conservation which was developed by the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife and the Maine Department of Marine Resources, together with conservation organizations and state and federal agencies, conversion and fragmentation are two key issues affecting wildlife diversity. The Beginning with Habitat Program, a habitat conservation program developed by the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, the Natural Areas Program, Maine Audubon, and others, emphasizes the large role fragmentation has in isolating and diminishing the value of important wildlife habitat. Fragmentation caused by this project has the potential to adversely affect the wildlife diversity found in the Redington Mountain area.

Direct and indirect wildlife impacts
The project will potentially have direct and indirect impacts on a suite of rare species. In our work on the proposed Redington Wind Farm Project, proposed on adjacent land, we discovered that a total of seventeen species listed as endangered or threatened, or of special concern, were identified as likely to occur in the area raising the issue that the project is not well suited for industrial development such as the CONUS-CIS Project. The presence of seven of these species (Northern Bog Lemming, Bicknell’s Thrush, Cooper’s Hawk, Olive-sided Flycatcher, Little Brown Bat, Big Brown Bat, and Hoary Bat) all have the potential for being negatively impacted by the roads and other infrastructure associated with the project.

Bicknell’s Thrush is an example of a high-elevation obligate bird species that has the potential to be adversely affected by the proposal. Bicknell’s Thrush, a species of special concern, has been classified at the highest level of conservation priority by the Maine Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy, the North American Bird Conservation Initiative Atlantic Coast Joint Venture, and Partners in Flight. Bicknell’s Thrush habitat has been declining due to habitat loss and degradation. The Western Maine mountain region, which includes the area in which the proposed project would be located, contains one of the largest populations of Bicknell’s Thrush known in the Northeast. In Maine, Bicknell’s thrush only flourishes in high elevation subalpine forests that are not fragmented by roads. The long-term establishment and management of core protected areas are vital to the future conservation of Bicknell’s Thrush.

The Northern Bog Lemming is another species that has the potential to be adversely impacted by the proposal. As a state-listed threatened species, the Northern Bog Lemming is the state’s only listed non-marine mammal. Conservation of this lemming has been identified as a high priority by the Maine Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. There have been only seven documented observations
in northeastern United States including one at Redington Mountain, very close to the project area. The EIS should consider whether this species would be potentially impacted by the proposal.

**Terrain alteration and potential soil erosion**
The proposed project and its associated infrastructure have the potential to cause undue adverse impacts on the fragile high-elevation soils, seeps, and small wetlands and thus the entire quality of the existing habitat of the subalpine vegetation. Redington is an ecologically sensitive and significant mountain located in the heart of an area that many people and organizations have identified as a high priority for land conservation. The Maine Natural Areas Program has mapped the presence of an exemplary Subalpine Spruce-Fir Forest community on top of the entire Redington Pond Range ridgeline.

**Climate change**
The ecoregion is of high adaptation value for climate change, as AMC mentioned, due to its “undeveloped state, lack of fragmentation, varied topography and rich diversity of ecological communities and high proportion of rare plants and animals.” In addition, the habitat conversion that would occur as a result of the project would cause a loss of significant areas of mature forest with high levels of carbon storage.

**Ongoing land protection**
The High Peaks Region is an area of keen land conservation interest, and the Redington site lies in the heart of this area. Extensive state and federal dollars already have been spent protecting lands in the area from development, and there are more conservation projects in progress or being actively pursued, including those by The Trust for Public Land in concert with the High Peaks Alliance and the White Mountains to Moosehead Lake Initiative. The proposed CONUS-CIS Project could significantly undermine the purpose of these land conservation efforts.

Maine Audubon has serious concerns about the proposed CONUS-CIS facility in Redington, Maine. This area is highly valuable for a variety of reasons including its unfragmented nature, its abundance of high peaks, its value in the face of climate change and its richness of endangered and threatened species. Please make sure all of these values that we’ve discussed above are considered during the EIS process.

Thanks you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sally Stockwell  
Director of Conservation

Jennifer Burns Gray  
Staff Attorney and Advocate
Environmental Impact Statement

Rangeley, Maine — August 12, 2014

Questions or Comments
by

Tom Sullivan, Local Resident:

Okay, thank you. My question is this, I asked the folks on the floor, representatives, if there was a Socio-Economic Study done before and after on Greeley, Alaska, that site. And they expressed that they did not know, and maybe I should ask, make a point of it, and they would see to it. So I'm asking the powers that be, that for a community. I would like to look at that, because it's one thing to go on record, on the nice boards and say, "Well, we're going to provide citizens, jobs for civilians, and etc., etc., and this is going to be favorable. But it's another thing to see the real, the reality of it. And Greeley is an existing site, where you went in and established a missile site, and I would like to know that it was beneficial for the community, for the region and for Greeley. In this case, now Rangeley, and so I can say, and put my weight behind it, and say yes is going to bring a beneficial thing. So I'd like to see somebody put together those numbers, if they would and maybe even tell me when they're available.
I am not in favor of this due to the fact that it will change my entire way of living (lifestyle). The impact will be overwhelming to the people who live in this area and to the wild life and environment. There are so few places left on earth much less Maine left to live a quiet peaceful life.

Date: 8/13/14

Name: LINDA TATE

Affiliation:

Street Address:

City, State, Zip Code:

Email:
Date: 8-13-14

Mahlon Tate here. Ex Army.

Love my country. Love Maine.

Love Eustis, Bangor area.

Please don't come.

There's no evidence that

run to. Quantity and Quality

are inversely proportional.

I prefer 1 Quality of

life.

Thank you.

Name: Mahlon Tate

Affiliation: HUMAN

Street Address:

City, State, Zip Code: __________

Email: __________
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: August 12, 2014

The EIS should look at:

1) Impact on groundwater (a significant concern in the Roselawn region)
2) Impact on the local economy - an economy based on eco-tourism
3) Impact on the local infrastructure as it relates to schools, health facilities, etc.
4) The impact of an operation of this magnitude on a community of 1100
5) Whether the investment required to make this a viable option is a good use of taxpayer money
6) Crowd control over any proposed road enlargement of RT 4
7) Changes to the character of the local community

Name: Cathryn Therap
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 14 Aug 14

* MISSILE DEFENSE IS A GOOD IDEA
* APPEARS TO BE A "LOW IMPACT" MILITARY PROJECT.
* MAINE HAS HAD MANY "HI IMPACT" PROJECTS OF LATE WITH WIND TURBINES & POWER TRANSMISSION RE-BUILD.
* LOCAL ELECTRONIC NEWSPAPER "DAILY BULLDOG" ON dailybulldog.com HAS REPORTED EVENTS. THERE ARE MANY CITIZEN COMMENTS OFFERED, RUNNING ABOUT 4:1 IN FAVOR.
* WHAT ABOUT ABANDONED COMMUNICATION SITE IN CUTLER, MAINE, ABOUT 30 MILES NE OF AUBURN, TWP.?
* THIS IS A SITE WITH MANY STRUCTURES STILL INTACT. USAF PROPERTY.
* COULD BE A GOOD ALTERNATIVE TO SELE SITE.
* LOOKING FORWARD TO CONSTRUCTION & DEFENDING OUR HOMELAND.
* ESSAY:

Name: [Signature]
Affiliation: MAJOR (RET.) MEAVER
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code
Email:
Comments about proposed missile interceptor site near Rangeley:

First of all, it appears that you intentionally did not publicize the meeting effectively. I asked one of your representatives why it had not been announced in any of the three local papers: The Rangeley Highlander, The Mountain Messenger, or the Irregular. The answer was, "We had announcements in the Bangor newspaper." This is outrageous. Hardly anyone from here reads a paper from Bangor.

This was not the only deception. I believe that weapons from terrorists are more likely to come here in a suitcase, or on a boat or small plane. The proposal looks more like a way to continue to justify the huge amount of money the military receives, rather than to protect us from incoming threats.

If the proposed site has 20 interceptor missiles, what happens if the incoming attack has 21 or 22 bombs?

This part of Maine is covered in granite. How would they sink the silos?

Building the facility here would destroy forest, animal habitat, and beauty. Since the meeting wasn't publicized adequately, you have no idea how much opposition the local people would have expressed. Or maybe you do, and you avoided having a public meeting just for that reason.

We are very much opposed to building this facility in Franklin County.

Barbara Ulman

My husband, Burke Zane, agrees with this message.
I do not support the interceptor base being built in Maine.

Sent from my iPad
Environmental Impact Statement

Rangeley, Maine — August 12, 2014

Questions or Comments
by

Robert Welch, Local Innkeeper:

Thank you. As I talked to several of the stations here, I kept asking the same question, "we have a new comprehensive plan for the town of Rangeley. I chaired the comprehensive plan committee, and we're, it speaks of much of Rangeley, and what Rangeley's future goals are, and what it has for assets, and I was suggesting that they need to look at that, and read that, to see the fit, because that would give them a lot of additional information on Rangeley as a Brand, and we market it as a Brand, and one of the considerations would be is, you know, how does this sort of enterprise affect the Brand of Rangeley. The other thing is that much of the Redington Pond Valley is very wet. I know back in the late 70's, Snow Engineering did a comprehensive study for Saddleback Mountain to develop the Valley. It's a ski area, and the end result was, it was just too much water. And DEP enruled the regulations of maintaining water quality were, would be too infected by ski area development. So I just bring those points up as something they should look into. And for now we’re just going to get information and take both sides, and try to see what's good for Rangeley.
Comment Sheet for the
Continental United States (CONUS)
Interceptor Site (CIS)
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8/12/14

The rangeley Region is the wrong location for this installation. It is a vacation, environmentally attractive and relatively pristine location. This defense installation, while perhaps necessary for our future defense against threats real or at least possible, should go elsewhere, in a location that is already environmentally compromised, i.e. Ft. Drum, NY or OH.

Name: Allen Wicke

Affiliation:

Street Address:

City, State, Zip Code:

Email:  

K-239
Please see the attached.

--
Becca Wilson
Conservation Department
Maine Audubon
20 Gilslund Farm Rd.
Falmouth, ME  04105

www.maineaudubon.org
Please find attached a PDF of my comments.

Please let me know by return email that you have received them.

Dr. Margaret R. Yocom
Resident of
TO:
Missile Defense Agency, Department of Defense and
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp. / Attn: MDA CIS EIS
MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
http://www.mda.mil/about/enviro_cis.html

FROM:
Dr. Margaret R. Yocom, Folklorist

Selected affiliations: Curator, Rangeley Lakes Region Logging Museum
Liason to Rangeley Lakes Region Historical Society
Board Member, Maine Folklife Center, U Maine, Orono
Assoc. Prof. Emerita of English, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
http://margaretyocom.com

RE: Comments for the Continental United States (CONUS) Interceptor Site (CIS) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
DATE: Thursday 14 August 2014

On Tuesday evening, 12 August 2014, I attended the Public Meeting held at the Rangeley Regional School, Rangeley, Maine, from 6-9pm. My concerns/comments are the following:

-- Population growth. The impact on our region and its resources will be major. A work force of 1200 to 1800 workers and their families (once the site is fully operational) represents a doubling or tripling or more of the year-round Rangeley population of 1200. Schools, health facilities, emergency services, some roads—as they now exist—will be overwhelmed. Much money will need to be spent on infrastructure, including roads leading from Augusta to Rangeley and Redington Township. I think that this ICBM project could be added to other, already existing military bases, such as that at Ft. Drum, NY, for far less expense and disruption.

-- Impact on local cultures of Rangeley and western Maine. The large number of workers needed to maintain the facility and to provide military security would obviously bring with them occupational cultures of their own. Such military and police cultures exist in Rangeley (Redington Navy base, Border Patrol) but in much smaller numbers than the planned workforce represents. Many of us in western Maine value what we have: cultures based on woods occupation, tourism, subsistence and sports food gathering, outdoor living, outdoor water sports, hiking, gardening, etc. The culture shift would be a major change and an unwelcome one to many of us.

-- Increased risk. As a Department of Defense site, the Rangeley region would be under risk of attack or harm from protestors, terrorists, and—possibly—enemy missiles from anywhere in the world. And, although the missiles do not have nuclear warheads, they are fueled with “solid propellant.” In the case of fire, especially forest fires, such flammables represent an additional danger. I do not welcome such risks. Those of us who live in Rangeley for all or part of the year
have chosen to accept certain risks—an hour-long drive to the nearest hospital; thunderstorms, microbursts, and winter weather conditions that can be violent, damaging; and more—but the ICBMs represent risks of another, potentially catastrophic, region-wide level.

--- **EIS process does not include Maine professional specialists and community scholars.**
The process of the EIS is of great concern to me as a professional cultural specialist—a folklorist, that is, a specialist in traditional practices—who has worked in and researched and written about the Rangeley region since 1975 and continues with that work today.

For example, “Cultural and Archaeological Resources” is one of the areas B&V plan to assess. I was told by several Black & Veatch representatives, including Laura McNeil, that B&V use their own in-house people who are not specialists in Maine culture and history, and who have done no research in western Maine or in Maine.

Particularly disturbing to me was the lack of knowledge about western Maine on the part of the B&V representatives who stood by the “Environmental Resources” and the “Community Resources” posters. For example, one of the representatives, in answering my question about the sub-section on “Cultural and Archaeological Resources” to be analyzed was very focused on early Native American culture. When I mentioned contemporary culture, she seemed not to understand at all, repeating herself about Native Americans. I said, no, I was talking about something in addition to early culture of Native Americans. I was talking about contemporary culture in Rangeley: contemporary Native Americans, yes, as well as the present occupational culture of logging; the culture of subsistence and sports hunters, fisher people, and berry-gatherers; the culture of French Americans; of British Americans; of hikers all through the region; of local associations, etc. All of these cultures would be greatly impacted by the local population doubling or tripling. The B&V reps did say that a Navy woman stationed in Kittery, Maine, and in charge of Cultural Resource assessment, Kerry Vautrot, did attend the Logging Museum’s presentation by Guy Rioux on early logging operations at Redington last week—an indication of the group’s willingness to listen to community scholars such as Rioux. (“Community scholars” is the term in Folklore Studies for those people who have gained vital knowledge through research on their own, usually outside of formal, university education. They are valued partners in the work of folklorists such as myself).

The B&V reps said they would be looking at publications on the area and they were interested in hearing from people like me. Such actions do not seem adequate to me. B&V personnel should hire western Maine specialists to work with them and to have a hand in the writing of the final EIS, at least.

--- **Selected works on the cultures of the Rangeley Lakes Region.** I promised to submit a selected list of my publications and the work of my colleague in Geography at the University of Maine, Farmington, appears, below (Obviously, there are so many, many more publications on the Region, its history and culture. See the Rangeley Public Library. Also the Ecopelagicon store along with Books, Lines, and Thinkers store, both in Rangeley, have many books for sale):

See the Publications page on my website [http://margaretyocom.com](http://margaretyocom.com) for some of my work. Some are in PDF form. All are available in the Rangeley Public Library and from interlibrary
loan services. Some—Working the Woods and Logging in the Maine Woods: The Paintings of Alden Grant—are available by order from the Logging Museum:  http://rlrml.org

Rangeley Lakes Region Cultural Inventory 1998. Funded by Maine Arts Commission and National Endowment for the Arts. I was the primary author, along with others. Available at Rangeley Library.

“Rangeley Sustainability Project,” Dr. Matthew McCourt, Geography, U Maine Farmington. I serve as consultant to the Project. (By listing Dr. McCourt’s name here, I am sharing his professional work only. I do not know his thoughts on the ICBM project in Rangeley).  
http://umaine.edu/mitchellcenter/charting-the-rangeley-regions-social-ecological-systems/

Exhibits on logging, logging families, forest, traditional arts related to woods work: Rangeley Lakes Region Logging Museum  http://rlrlm.org

Exhibits on history, use of forests and water, hunting, fishing and other sports and subsistence use of resources at Rangeley Lakes Region Historical Society’s two museums:  
http://rangeleyoutdoormuseum.org

-- EIS process does not include professional specialists in Maine geology. I have the same concern about the process of the EIS as it gathers data on “Geology and Soils.” In talking with B&V representatives, I learned that, once again, they use their own in-house geologists who are not specialists in Maine geology and have done no research in western Maine or in Maine. Since many such Maine geological specialists exist, B&V should have them do research and help write the final draft of the EIS. Such geologists can easily be found at the Maine Geological Survey in Augusta, ME; at the University of Maine, Farmington; and at the US Geological Survey, (Minerals), in Reston, VA. See websites below:

http://www.maine.gov/dacf/mgs/

http://www.umf.maine.edu/majors-academics/geology/faculty/

http://usgs.gov

Since the two areas I know the most about—cultural and community resources, and geological resources—are handled without the substantial input of Maine scholars, I question the quality of the entire EIS process, at this point.

-- The “Public Meeting” process. I was asked to comment on the process of the “meeting” I attended. As a university professor, I am used to poster sessions and to asking questions of presenters. Not everyone is, though. Not everyone is comfortable asking questions; and in my cultural work in Maine, I have met many such people who feel questions are rather impolite. The announcements about this meeting should have described the format so people could be prepared. Really, though, I would prefer a different format with posters being only a part of the meeting.
While I could get detailed information from the people standing at the posters, I also got conflicting information about topics that were vital to me, specifically, the risk factor. Naval Officer Anderson at the first poster was forthright and straightforward, and I appreciated his information: “Yes,” he said, “like any DOD site, this one would carry risk. Just like living in New York City or Washington, DC.” Other people at other posters hesitated and said such things as “No risk” to “Well, maybe a little, but …” Such different presentations only increase my discomfort with the information at the Meeting.

The information on some of the posters was so general that vital facts were missed by many who did not think to ask. For example, no poster included the astounding fact of “1200-1800 workers and their families” would be involved. That fact doesn’t take up much room on a poster, and several of my friends had no idea of those numbers.

Printouts of the posters were on a table before the sign-in sheet. No person stood nearby the printouts. My friend and I almost missed the fact of what the printouts were and that we were allowed to take them. These materials should have been made more available to attendees.

What I really missed was the opportunity to hear what my co-residents of Rangeley thought. I wanted some time dedicated to discussion so that I could hear the perspectives of those in town. A poster session may be fine as part of a Public Meeting, but it robs attendees of the chance to have a democratic Town Meeting-like experience, so valued here in Maine. Having a moderator / mediator / conflict resolution professional from a local or Maine state organization (outside of DOD and B&V) at such a discussion would facilitate the flow of comments and answers. The kind of “Public Meeting” we had dampened valuable discussion and exchange on the part of the people of western Maine.

END, Yocom, 8/14/2014
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:
Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.
Attn: MDA CIS EIS
6601 College Boulevard
Overland Park, KS 66211

Or
Email: MDA.CIS.EIS@bv.com
FAX: 913-428-1091

Date: Aug 13, 2014

This would negatively affect the form environment, roads, water, and safety of the area. It would negatively affect tourism.

Name: ________________________________
Affiliation: ____________________________
Street Address: ________________________
City, State, Zip Code: ____________________
Email: _______________________________
Date: Aug 15, 2014

Please consider the impact of
- The tourism economy of the area
- How road development will impact local towns and villages in the area
- How increases in population and traffic will impact the local services - will the quality of life be lost?
- The impact of families in ground
- The impact on cultural artifacts from the leggy days
- The impact of population on schools and health services
- How the preferred presentation by each of the spots to the community

as a group, followed by public art.

Name:
Affiliation:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Email:
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 12 August 2014

Concerned about impacts to the recreation experience on the Appalachian Trail, a popular recreation area located less than one mile from the missile defense complex and less than a quarter mile from the future expansion area.

Concerned that the issue of how to study impacts beyond the means of audio and video computer simulation has not been addressed.

Name: 
Affiliation: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip Code: 
Email: 

K-248
Thank you for attending this public scoping meeting. Our purpose for hosting this meeting is to give you an opportunity to comment on issues to be analyzed in the EIS. Please use this sheet to comment on any issues that you feel should be addressed. To ensure that your comments are addressed, we must receive your comments by September 15, 2014.

Date: 8/14/14

- Before we decide whether to put them, we ought to be sure that they are really needed.
- Adding a significant number of new people to the currently small population of Bangley is going to change the culture of the area.
- Why stop?

Name: __________________________

Affiliation: ______________________

Street Address: ___________________

City, State, Zip Code: ___________

Email: __________________________
Date: 8-15-14

I need more information on the job opportunities. Will there go to be housing available for local people after the construction of the site? What kind of jobs will be available and how many?

How well will the "improvement" of roads impact local communities between the two sites?

Will the roads be returned to good condition after the 70 ft. missiles have all passed through?

What is the environmental impact of the propellant? What happens if the launch of the missile fails? What happens if it is a missle that is a failure or can't be used?

What is the impact to this beautiful land, water and all its plants and animals to allow these missiles to be established? How does it affect...
PRIVACY ADVISORY

Public comments on the scope of the EIS and environmental issues that should be studied are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. All written comments received during the comment period will become part of the public record and will be considered during the preparation of the Draft EIS. Providing private address information with your comment is voluntary and such personal information will be kept confidential unless release is required by law. Your address will be used to compile a mailing list so that you may be notified of any future public meetings, and release of the Draft EIS and Final EIS in the Federal Register. Failure to provide your address will result in your name not being included on the list, and you will not receive notifications about this project.

The visual, cultural, essence of the area – not just the immediate sampled area?