

1 **Fair Public Process Needed for Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range Plan**

2
3 **WHEREAS** , the U. S. Navy has submitted an application to the Forest Service for a
4 permit allowing use of Forest Service roads for its proposed Pacific Northwest
5 Electronic Warfare Range (EWR); and
6

7 **WHEREAS** , the proposed EWR covers large areas of Olympic National Park,
8 Olympic National Forest, and Tribal and private land in western Clallam, Jefferson,
9 and Grays Harbor Counties; and
10

11 **WHEREAS** both the Navy and the Forest Service are required by the National
12 Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) to prepare environmental evaluations of the
13 proposed project; and to inform and consult with the public about the proposed project by
14 providing the affected communities with notice of the project and the opportunity to make a
15 public record of their concerns, and
16

17 **WHEREAS** the Navy has prepared, and the Forest Service is using, for their environmental
18 evaluations of the proposed project a multitude of incomplete, confusing, incorrect, and
19 voluminous documents, including the Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range
20 Environmental Assessment (EA), the Northwest Training Range Complex EIS, and the
21 Northwest Training and Testing Draft EIS. In addition, the Navy has prepared a Supplement to
22 the Northwest Training and Testing Draft EIS, and is preparing to draft another EIS on the
23 proposed addition of 36 more EA-18G Growler aircraft to Naval Air Station Whidbey Island,
24 and
25

26 **WHEREAS** the Navy has unreasonably limited the scope of the EA, and public comment on
27 the proposed EWR, to essentially a consideration of the impacts of the proposed EWR on the
28 Forest Service roads; and
29

30 **WHEREAS** the public was given insufficient notice and insufficient time to comment on the
31 proposed project. No notice was published in any newspaper, including the Peninsula Daily
32 News, Sequim Gazette or Forks Forum, directly serving a community directly affected by the
33 project as required by NEPA
34

35 **WHEREAS** the National Forest Service Management Act and Forest Plan require the
36 Forest Service not to give greater priority to the needs or demands of any outside
37 agency than to its responsibility to the public; and
38

39 **WHEREAS** the Forest Service has not independently verified statements in the Navy's
40 Environmental Assessment (EA), as required by law; and has not justified its reasons for a
41 Finding of No Significant Impacts on the environment; and
42

43 **WHEREAS** Citizens residing in the affected Counties, and throughout the US, as
44 demonstrated by the well-attended informational meetings and over 3,000 public
45 comments during the extended comment period, have multiple and grave concerns about
46 Electronic Warfare Range project including, but not limited to, noise pollution from the
47 Growler and other aircraft using the EWR, training with Growler aircraft using electronic

48 attack weapons, health effects on wildlife and humans, economic effects on the local
49 economy, and the environmental impacts; and

50
51 **WHEREAS** it appears that the Navy and the Forest Service have not adequately performed
52 their responsibilities under NEPA, and their responsibilities to inform and receive official
53 comment from the public on the full range of impacts of the proposed Electronic Warfare
54 Range;

55
56 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Clallam County Democrats call upon our
57 elected representatives at all levels to use all their authority to effect the following:

58
59 1. Suspend any previous approval of the proposed EWR by the US Navy and the US
60 Forest Service;

61 2. Publish any notice of future public comment periods in newspapers with wide-
62 circulation in Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, Island, San Juan, and other counties
63 adversely affected by the proposed EWR;

64 3. Schedule public hearings as required by NEPA throughout the affected counties so
65 that the public may have the opportunity to refute any information provided in the
66 NEPA documents;

67 4. That neither the US Navy nor the US Forest Service take any further action on the
68 proposed EWR until a current and complete Environmental Impact Statement has been
69 prepared by an independent third party covering the whole range of possible impacts of
70 the proposed EWR, and of all the aircraft using the EWR, including impacts to the areas
71 under the flight paths to and from the EWR, and including impacts from both Electronic
72 Surveillance and Electronic Attack training.