



Mission Sustainability- Related Articles

17 September 2010

Fred Pierson
&
Bonnie Curtiss
Navy East Coast AICUZ/RAICUZ
Center of Excellence



CONTENTS

	Page
ARIZONA	
Glendale to annex 200 acres to protect Luke Air Force Base	1
FLORIDA	
Whiting Field land purchase.....	3
MONTANA	
Land-use study looks at conflicts between military, private sector.....	4
NORTH DAKOTA	
N.D. airspace for unmanned aircraft behind schedule.....	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Ranchers voice concern over bombing range expansion	9
OTHER –	
ALTERNATIVE ENERGY	
Wind backer charges politics in radar debate	10
OUTLYING LANDING FIELD NC-VA	
N.C. Want Navy To Put Landing Field Elsewhere.....	13
N.C. leaders renew opposition to OLF	14
OVERSEAS	
U.S. To Send V-22 Ospreys.....	15
Marines: existing firing ranges “top notch”	17

ARIZONA



Glendale to annex 200 acres to protect Luke Air Force Base

Cecilia Chan - Sept. 16, 2010 11:58 AM

Glendale grew a little larger on Tuesday as the City Council voted to annex nearly 200 acres in the city's far west planning area.

No one from the audience or from the council spoke at the public hearing on the annexation that takes the land's jurisdiction out of Maricopa County's hands. No homes exist on the acreage.

"These are very important properties that we have been working on for some time," said Jon Froke, city planning director.

The annexation affords better protection against encroachment for Luke Air Force Base and allows an existing McDonald's restaurant to be razed and redeveloped with a new prototype of McDonald's, Froke said.

More than half of the 200 acres is Falcon Dunes Golf Course, a military 18-hole golf course belonging to the base.

Glendale annexed the military base into the city in 1995 to help protect it from incompatible land-use encroachment.

"The base has been in our city limits for 15 years," Froke said. "Because the golf course is part of the Air Force's portfolio we thought it was important it be in the city's limit."

Froke said because the city had to deal with so many levels of the federal government, it took three years to get approval to annex the golf course, which was built in 1997.

"They like the city," Froke said of Luke. "We have had a mutual respect for one another and our partnership dates back decades."

The city's annexation includes a 19-acre parcel known as Dysart Drain, which cuts through land owned by El Paso Natural Gas Co. and causes the owner logistical problems, Froke said.

When Dysart Drain was under the county's jurisdiction, it meant another governmental entity for El Paso to answer to in developing a proposed business park at the northwestern corner of Glendale Avenue and El Mirage Road.

In 2008, the council approved El Paso's request to change the General Plan land-use map on 344 acres, paving the way for the Northern Parkway Commerce Center, Froke said.

"With it in the city's limit, it's easier for (El Paso) to develop that property," he said.

The four properties annexed are:

- Luke Air Force Base's 163-acre Falcon Dunes Golf Course with clubhouse and restaurant at Northern Avenue and Reems Road.
- Dysart Drain, about 19 acres, conveys water from Luke to the Agua Fria River.
- Bethany Home Alignment, about 10 acres purchased by Glendale for the placement of waterlines.
- McDonald's, about 1 acre at the northeastern corner of Glendale Avenue and Litchfield Road.

The city has its eyes on annexing other properties.

The area in the far west part of Glendale's planning region was part of a chunk of land the city staked claim to in 1978 through strip annexation. Apart from Luke, most of the land within the strip annexation boundaries has gone without annexation for decades.

Froke said the city has been working with property owners in an area referred to as the Loop 303 Corridor.

"Approximately 6,000 acres are included in this area of pending annexation," he said. "There is no timeline right now for that pending annexation."

With the construction of Loop 303 to connect Interstate 17 and Interstate 10 in the West Valley, the city is looking at developing retail, office, industrial and residential development along the route.

FLORIDA



Whiting Field land purchase

Travis Griggs • September 12, 2010

3 Whiting Field officials last week announced a deal to prevent residential encroachment on 128 acres of land adjacent to the Santa Rosa County military base.

The base partnered with Santa Rosa County to purchase "restrictive easements" on two tracts of county-owned land near the base. The easements will restrict development to uses that will not conflict with military air traffic in the area.

The Navy paid Santa Rosa County \$189,750 for the restrictive easements on the land.

The purchase included two tracts to the southeast and southwest of the base. Santa Rosa County Commissioner Don Salter said the southwest portion will likely be used for nature trails and public recreational areas. The southeast parcel may eventually be used for light-industrial development, Salter said.

"The property the county purchased is an investment, not only to protect the future of Whiting Field, but to continue to provide land for public use," Salter said.

Land-use study looks at conflicts between military, private sector

KARL PUCKETT • Tribune Staff Writer • September 16, 2010

Glare from solar panels on the ground reaching military aircraft or wind turbines interfering with radar are just two examples of conflicts that could occur between private development and national defense in northcentral Montana, according to experts leading a land-use study on the issue.

The study, sponsored by Cascade County and the U.S. Air Force, is in the works to limit such land-use conflicts. It's addressing 24 so-called "compatibility factors," including the impact of the state's budding wind industry on the nuclear missile mission of Malmstrom Air Force Base.

"The whole idea is to be able to coexist more easily," said Joe Briggs, chairman of the Cascade County Commission.

The study will contain land-use recommendations that area governments could choose to adopt but wouldn't have to, Briggs said.

Being able to demonstrate compatible land use is an advantage to Malmstrom in maintaining its missile mission and attracting new missions, he said.

In 2009, Malmstrom Air Force Base produced \$222 million in payroll and \$433 million in economic benefit to the region, said Kristen Jespersen, a planner with Phoenix-based Matrix Design Group Inc., which the county hired to provide technical expertise to two local committees working on the plan.



A stubble field is shown bordering Malmstrom Air Force Base on Wednesday. A land-use study, sponsored by Cascade County and the U.S. Air Force, is in the works to limit such conflicts on such lands. (TRIBUNE PHOTOS/RION SANDERS)

The base employs 3,149 military personnel and 1,375 civilian workers. More than half of the active-duty personnel live off the base.

"That's a real compelling reason to engage in this study," Jespersen said, adding that it will take a year to complete.

The Office of Economic Adjustment in the U.S. Department of Defense is funding similar studies nationwide.

It awarded Cascade County a \$185,000 grant for the study, which will cost \$220,000. The county is matching the difference with staff time, Briggs said.

Matrix conducted its first meeting to gather input from the public Wednesday in the commission chambers in the Courthouse Annex in Great Falls.

Among the audience members were Lt. Col. Don Treanor, the Air Force's Washington, D.C.-based military liaison officer, and Garry Gontz, a civilian project manager working in the DoD's economic adjustment office.

NORTH DAKOTA

GrandForksHerald.com

September 13, 2010

N.D. airspace for unmanned aircraft behind schedule

FAA may not be able to meet Air Force's deadline

Plans to create training airspace for unmanned aircraft in North Dakota may be falling behind schedule, prompting Sen. Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., to hold a field hearing at UND today to, essentially, knock some heads together

By: **Tu-Uyen Tran**, Grand Forks Herald

Plans to create training airspace for unmanned aircraft in North Dakota may be falling behind schedule, prompting Sen. Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., to hold a field hearing Monday at UND.

The Air Force needs the airspace by January 2012, but the Federal Aviation Administration may not be able to create the necessary restricted airspace by that deadline.

The optimistic scenario would have all legally required documentation and hearings completed within a year. The pessimistic scenario would take twice that long, meaning September 2012.

Dorgan, who chairs the Senate subcommittee that oversees the FAA, said that while he respects the safety issues involved, his experience with the agency suggests that their deadlines have a tendency to slide.

On the other hand, the Air Force apparently has not made things easy for itself.

FAA Chief Operating Officer Hank Krakowski said the process would go faster if the Air Force were to bring new radar units to track unmanned aircraft, reducing the risk of collision with civilian-manned aircraft.

Yet David Ahern, who heads a Pentagon technology office, and Maj. Gen. Marke Gibson, the Air Force's director of operations, who were present at the hearing, could not commit to a date when such a radar system would arrive here.

This issue is of some importance because the Predators and Global Hawks that the military will bring to Grand Forks Air Force Base represent a significant investment that would be hobbled without airspace for training, said Rep. Earl Pomeroy, D-N.D., who accompanied Dorgan in the hearing.

It's also of some importance to UND, which seeks a major role in training pilots and developing new technology, including so-called sense-and-avoid systems that could allow unmanned aircraft to automatically steer away from other aircraft.

There is already a procedure for unmanned aircraft to fly in North Dakota, or anywhere else for that matter. In fact, the two Predator Bs that U.S. Customs and Border Protection have at Grand Forks Air Force Base operate using such a procedure.

Krakowski said the FAA imposes flight restricts over the base whenever the Predators take off or land — civilians may legally fly over the base the rest of the time — and the restrictions remain in place until they reach 18,000 feet.

That's considered "protected airspace," meaning that any aircraft at that altitude must be under the guidance of air traffic controllers. At that point, unmanned aircraft do not pose a potential threat to manned aircraft because controllers will keep both separated at safe distances. At lower altitudes, the only things keeping aircraft separated are the eyes of the pilots.

But Krakowski said FAA rules make exceptions only for issues of national security, which qualifies Customs border patrols but not military training. He said the military could piggyback on Customs flights for training.

The military considers such restrictions too cumbersome with the expected training tempo.

Pomeroy agreed: "We must not take comfort in those interim arrangements; they don't do the job."

Dorgan asked Gibson what would happen if the restricted airspace isn't available by January 2012, to which Gibson replied that the military won't be as ready for war as it needs to be.

"That's not satisfactory. We've had time — BRAC

didn't happen yesterday," Dorgan said, referring to the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure round that took away GFAFB's tankers and brought the unmanned aircraft.

Ideally, the military would prefer that its unmanned aircraft share all civilian airspace, but that's a huge regulatory hurdle.

Krakowski described unmanned aircraft as "unusual machines ... designed for the war theater," which is why care is required.

Gibson said there's a "fundamental disconnect" between FAA rules designed for manned aircraft and the rapidly developing capabilities of unmanned aircraft. In Kandahar, Afghanistan, he said, the two kinds of aircraft amicably share airspace, and the number of operations there rivals that of Miami International Airport.

On the other hand, there have been a few reports of pilots losing control of unmanned aircraft in American airspace. In one incident a few weeks ago, an unmanned helicopter belonging to the Navy wandered out of restricted military airspace into the restricted airspace above Washington,

D.C. North American Aerospace Defense Command even considered shooting the runaway down, but the Navy was able to restore control in time.

The less ideal solution for the military is to have restricted airspace over the southern portion of Camp Grafton, the National Guard base near Devils Lake, where there is already a much smaller restricted block.

It had originally asked for two blocks, one north of the city and one south with restricted corridors connecting them to each other and to the Grand Forks base. The request for one 35-mile-by-45-mile-by-4,000-foot block, which it describes as the bare minimum needed, is meant to simplify the regulatory process.

Air Force Predators are already here in North Dakota.

Six are sitting in boxes with the National Guard's 119th Wing in Fargo, said Brig. Gen. L. Scott Rice, who heads the Massachusetts Air Guard and is a co-chairman of the National Airspace and Range Executive Council.

The limiting factor on training isn't the lack of airspace, he said, but the lack of manpower. The guardsmen are all busy remotely flying Predators in Afghanistan and Iraq, he said, and training won't get started until 2012 when it's anticipated they'll start to go off war duty.

Once training starts, though, it'll likely be big. Military officials have reiterated many times — and Rice said it again Monday — that their fleet of unmanned aircraft and the vast capabilities the aircraft possesses are already stretching the training pipeline to the limit, meaning that once they can stretch the pipeline farther there will be a torrent of trainees needing a place to fly.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Rapid City Journal

Ranchers voice concern over bombing range expansion

By Nick Penzenstadler

Tuesday, September 14, 2010 11:00 pm

Ray Jilek said he worries his Spearfish business will be crippled if the Air Force goes ahead with plans to dramatically increase its training airspace across South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming and Montana.

The chief pilot at Eagle Aviation joined about 100 other people Tuesday at the first of several listening sessions over the proposed expansion of the Powder River Training Complex, where B-1B Lancer and B-52 Stratofortress bomber pilots train.



Dr. David Schweitert, left, expresses his concern to officers from Ellsworth Air Force Base before a hearing for the Powder River Training Complex at the Holiday Inn in Rapid City on Tuesday, September 14, 2010. The Air Force wants to provide realistic training for the B-1 and B-52 aircrews flying from Ellsworth AFB. The air space would include Western South Dakota, parts of Wyoming and parts of Montana. The Air Force plans to hold 19 more hearings in areas under the proposed air space. All information presented by the public at the hearings will be considered in the final Environmental Impact Statement. Schweitert's concerns included lack of communication and issues involving icing and weather during the training exercises. (Aaron Rosenblatt/Journal staff)

Jilek expressed concern over an Air Force plan that would at times redirect his flights to and from Billings, Mont.

“This effectively will cripple aviation in our area,” Jilek said after the hearing at the Rushmore Plaza Holiday Inn. “I’m concerned that they haven’t even considered the business traveler who will wait an extra four hours.”

Ranchers said the area will be ruined by the noise of the bombers flying at only 500 feet and upward of 500 mph.

“We treasure our peace and quiet,” said rancher Marvin Kammerer, who ranches near Ellsworth Air Force Base. “If it’s so safe, then why don’t they just fly over Rapid City at midnight and let them hear the sound of freedom?”

Col. Jeffrey Taliaferro, the commander at Ellsworth, explained that some

modifications had been made to the proposed plan, reflecting area residents’ concerns. The new

space would be divided into four separate military operation areas in Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota, that he compared to plots of farm land.

“It will be like crop rotation, where we can use individual areas at certain times,” Taliaferro said, noting that the same number of flights flown today will be spread over a larger area. The plan more than quadruples the current site to almost 28,000 square miles.

If approved, the training area will be among the largest in the nation. Under the current boundaries, Taliaferro said, “Pilots have needed to pretend more.”

“When I first started flying the B-1 in 1990, we bombed from less than a mile away, and now, threats reach out over a couple of hundred miles,” Taliaferro said. “It’s about creating more realistic setups for our airmen.”

Other concerns have been raised about the addition of training with flares and chaff. Flares are used to distract heat-seeking missiles. The Air Force said they will only be used above 2,000 feet and burn out within 500 feet. They also pledged to suspend their use in areas of extreme fire conditions.

That wasn’t good enough for some in attendance, who pointed out that the risk of wildfires is tremendous in the Black Hills.

“Even now, as green as it is, there is a real concern for fire,” said Robert Heidgerken, who ranches near Ellsworth.

After pointing to his brown cowboy hat, he asked, “Is this what the new enemy looks like? We’re not terrorists, and we don’t deserve to be treated like this.”

Chaff is tiny, aluminum-coated material which, after blocking radar, would fall to the ground but not pose a safety hazard, according to the Air Force presentation.

Several in the crowd suggested some sort of monetary compensation for the flyovers and sonic booms that would occur 10 days a year.

Linda DeVine, an Air Force representative from Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, said the booms could shake some homes enough to knock over things but would not harm foundations.

The likelihood of landowners receiving money for simply the inconvenience is very unlikely, according to DeVine.

“There is a claims process through the Air Force for any physical damage,” DeVine said. “To my knowledge, the Department of Defense has never paid anyone for the noise.”

Tuesday’s hearing was the beginning of the process that could lead to a final decision next fall.

“The public hearings are an important part of the process. It’s a challenge to reach out to all the areas the area affects,” Taliaferro said. “People have reasonable questions, and we have reasonable answers.”

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY



Wind backer charges politics in radar debate

By Jerry Daniel Reed

Posted September 14, 2010 at 11:31 p.m.

Potential wind turbine interference with weather and air traffic radar may be less of a technological problem than a political problem, wind energy advocate Greg Wortham says.

Last week, Martin LaMonica, senior writer for CNET’s Green Tech blog wrote:

“Concerns over the disturbances turbines can cause on air traffic control systems are already stunting the growth of wind power. Radar and wind turbines conflicts derailed nearly as much as the total amount of installed wind power capacity in the U.S. last year.” CNET is a website that offers technology news and reviews, among other services.

It’s impossible to say how much effect radar concerns may have on wind energy projects, Wortham said, because some potential projects are scratched without ever coming into public view, for a variety of reasons, including financing hurdles. Wortham is executive director of the Texas Wind Energy Clearinghouse in Sweetwater.

Representatives at Dyess Air Force Base and the National Weather Service in San Angelo said wind turbines are not a major concern.

“We can tell the difference between a storm and a wind turbine,” said Amy McCullough, science and operations officer of the San Angelo NWS office, which provides forecasting and storm warning services to the Abilene area.

“Dyess personnel have continued to work with developers to either mitigate or select alternate locations for turbines so as not to hinder operations here,” said 2nd Lt. AnnMarie Annicelli, deputy chief of public affairs for the 7th Bomb Wing at Dyess.

“Because of the outstanding support of our local leaders, wind farms have not encroached upon Dyess AFB to cause radar interference,” Annicelli said in an e-mail.

Wortham said regulations on physical encroachment, such as the height of a wind turbine, cause wind turbines to be located a certain distance from the Air Force base. The turbines’ required distance from the base lessens the potential for radar problems, he said.

The closest wind farms to Dyess are the Callahan Divide and Horse Hollow farms to the south and southwest and the Lone Star farm to the northeast. Callahan Divide lies in Taylor County and Horse Hollow spills from Taylor into Nolan County. Lone Star is located in Shackelford and Callahan counties. Taylor and Nolan counties are at the heart of North America's wind energy industry.

Wind farms can cause interference, or "clutter," on radar systems in more than one way. Spinning blades can appear on radar screens as an airplane, creating a false "target," LaMonica wrote in his Sept. 7 essay.

Signals from the turbines also can cause legitimate targets, such as an aircraft above a farm, to suddenly jump position, CNET's LaMonica said, quoting industry expert Peter Drake. He is technical director for Raytheon, a manufacturer of airport radar.

Wortham said the radar-wind turbine issue has a technical component, but the controversy is largely political.

The political opposition to the Cape Wind project, a proposed offshore wind farm to be located in Nantucket Sound, was led by the late U.S. Sen. Ted Kennedy, D-Mass., and former U.S. Sen. John Warner, R-Va., Wortham observed.

Members of the Kennedy family probably are the best known residents of the cape, and Warner relatives own property in the exclusive upscale enclave.

The Cape Wind project created a clash of aesthetics versus environment, with some project opponents such as the Kennedys usually counted in the environmental camp. Opponents contend the offshore wind project will ruin the currently unspoiled ocean view for Martha's Vineyard residents.

Opponents raise issues such as potential radar interference, Wortham said, when they really are against the projects in any event.

Interior Secretary Ken Salazar approved the project, consisting of 130 turbines with 3.6 megawatt capacity, in April. The completion date is uncertain because of threatened litigation.

"There are technical solutions to the (radar) issue, in most cases," Wortham said.

A Doppler radar placed in Nolan County, opposite the side of the wind farm that faces Dyess, could work with existing radar coverage to help pinpoint and distinguish turbines from aircraft and weather, he said.

OUTLYING LANDING FIELD NC-VA



N.C. Wants Navy To Put Landing Field Elsewhere

September 13, 2010

Raleigh, N.C. — Gov. Beverly Perdue and legislative leaders on Monday asked the Navy to stop looking in eastern North Carolina for a landing field.

"The procurement of an (outlying landing field) in North Carolina must not be forced upon any community that has voiced its opposition to it," Perdue, Senate President Pro Tempore Marc Basnight and House Speaker Joe Hackney wrote in a letter to Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus. "The local governments of Camden, Currituck, and Gates Counties have clearly expressed such opposition," they wrote.

A 2005 land-use study for the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission cited development around Naval Air Station Oceana and its landing field as an obstacle to the Navy's continued flight operations in and around Virginia Beach, Va. The study recommended that the Navy "pursue development of an additional outlying landing field in North Carolina" to alleviate the impact of growth in southeastern Virginia.

"For decades, Virginia Beach has ignored Navy restrictions and built closer and closer to Oceana," Camden County Manager Randell Woodruff said in a statement. "North Carolina is being forced to bear the brunt of Virginia Beach's poor land-use planning that allowed commercial and residential development right next to the runways."

U.S. Sens. Richard Burr and Kay Hagan sponsored an amendment that was recently passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee to restrict the Navy's funding of a new landing field for Oceana. Part of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2011, the amendment requires the Navy to consider using one of several landing fields already on the East Coast and provide a cost analysis of obtaining a new installation versus rehabilitating an existing site. The defense bill is expected to be voted upon when Congress returns to session next month.



N.C. leaders renew opposition to OLF

The Associated Press
© September 14, 2010

RALEIGH, N.C.

Gov. Beverly Perdue and North Carolina's top legislative leaders are making clear again to the Navy that they don't want a practice jet landing field in a location strongly opposed by the local community.

Perdue, Senate leader Marc Basnight and House Speaker Joe Hackney signed a letter sent last week to Navy Secretary Ray Mabus that says the so-called outlying landing field shouldn't be forced upon any community in the state.

The Navy is examining five sites for a landing field — two in Gates and Camden counties and three in Virginia. Local governments in Gates, Camden and adjoining Currituck counties have opposed it.

The three leaders said they didn't oppose the landing field idea "at an appropriate location in North Carolina."

OVERSEAS

The World's Window on Japan
The Japan Times
ONLINE

September 11, 2010

U.S. To Send V-22 Ospreys

Controversial plane's deployment sure to anger Okinawa residents

WASHINGTON (Kyodo)--The Pentagon said Thursday it plans to operate the V-22 Osprey, a vertical takeoff and landing aircraft, at U.S. bases in Japan, officially acknowledging the deployment for the first time.

"We anticipate that Ospreys will indeed operate in Japan. And we've told the Japanese government as much, where and when and how are things to be determined," Pentagon Press Secretary Geoff Morrell told a news conference.

Morrell said that the Osprey is "an incredibly effective form of airlift that will enhance our alliance capabilities." He didn't specify when the aircraft will be introduced in Japan, only saying "at some point."

According to sources close to the matter, the United States aims to deploy the Ospreys at the planned replacement facility for U.S. Marine Corps Air Station Futenma in Okinawa Prefecture, but that would likely draw fire from residents in the prefecture due to safety concerns as a number of people were killed during the aircraft's test flights.

The deployment could affect the relocation plan of the Futenma base by causing a change in flight routes at the facility.

The Democratic Party of Japan-led government, fearing opposition from locals in Okinawa, has not acknowledged the deployment plan.

In Tokyo on Friday, Defense Minister Toshimi Kitazawa said any Osprey deployment would follow established U.S. trends.

"We are exchanging opinions at the working level on that assumption (of Osprey deployment)," Kitazawa said, adding that the U.S. has not yet formally notified Tokyo about its deployment in relation to the Futenma base relocation.

Okinawa Gov. Hirokazu Nakaima separately expressed displeasure at the envisioned deployment, given the security risks posed by the aircraft.

At a Diet panel earlier this month, Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada referred to the possibility of such a deployment taking place and indicated the government plans to explain to local governments in Okinawa about U.S. deployment plans and flight routes.

Meanwhile, Morrell suggested that Japan and the U.S. will study Tokyo's proposal for joint use of the relocated Futenma base between U.S. forces and the Self-Defense Forces through their experts' group.

The two countries agreed to relocate Futenma from a crowded residential area to a less densely populated area in Okinawa, but they still differ on the design of the replacement facility and aircraft flight routes, issues linked to the impact on the local marine environment and noise pollution.



Marines: existing firing ranges "top notch"

September 14, 2010

by Nick Delgado

Guam - A group of U.S. Marines with the 3rd Reconnaissance Battalion are on island for their deployment certification exercise. Captain Damon Doykos says the battalion is part of the same unit that is planned to relocate from Okinawa to Guam. Despite a lot of the community's concern to open a Marine firing range in the Pagat area, Doykos admits the training at Naval Magazine and Orote Point firing ranges meet the needs of the Marines, as they conduct their annual M-9 pistol qualification training.

He said, "Guam obviously is very dense jungle, really rough terrain, offers us a great opportunity to try our long range communications, which is one of our mission essential task so we were working that a couple of days ago down at Naval Magazine and we're working great. I don't know that much about what's available on Guam besides the range of where I trained already but from what I've seen everything is really good, top notch."

Meanwhile, the 30th Guam Legislature has also passed Resolution 444, which cites significant defects in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and reiterates major areas of concern with buildup plans.