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HAWAII SAYS NO TO STRYKERS

Stryker transformation in Hawaii will mark the largest military land grab since WWII. The Army will seize and destroy 25,000 more acres of land.

Strykers contribute to global warming by dramatically increasing the Army’s fuel consumption. The military is Hawaii’s largest consumer of energy.
CULTURAL PRACTICE:

- According to the DEIS, “expansion of training exercises to SRAA and the Keamuku Parcel could limit . . . use of sites for traditional or religious purposes.” What are the limits and what would the process be to gain access to sites for traditional and religious purposes?

ORAL TRADITIONS:

- Why were no TCP surveys or oral histories completed for the DMR? Would this not suggest that the Cultural impacts section of the DEIS is incomplete?

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED SITES:

- How many sites have been identified by the cultural monitors during the most recent surveys of training areas at Pohakuloa, Kahuku, Mokuleia and Lihue?

Please provide more information and documentation on the most recent surveys (including records and documents of cultural and archaeological monitoring, evaluation of known sites, and archaeological surveys for all training areas).

Please include prior archaeological surveys in the final document.

Please explain the breach of Haleauau heiau by a bulldozer during BAX construction. How does the Army plan to prevent future breaches of sacred sites if cultural monitors have not been given adequate time to survey?

Should we be concerned about the safekeeping of our cultural sites since the Army has repeatedly violated its Programmatic Agreement (PA) with OHA? How does the Army plan to protect our sites if it is not in compliance with the PA?

How does the Army plan to mitigate sites that have been damaged during construction or training? Data recovery is NOT an acceptable form of mitigation!

Cultural monitoring AFTER training to determine impacts on sites is NOT an acceptable form of mitigation!

How can the Army adjust protection to previously unidentified sites that are accidentally destroyed? Why have cultural monitors not been given more time for proper surveying to prevent destruction of previously identified sites?

How has the community been involved in surveys of ATIs? When will the survey reports completed? How can impacts to cultural sites be truly measured without these reports?

Is the community involved in the process of the survey report draft? According to the DEIS, the report is undergoing “internal review” - what does this mean? Who is responsible for the internal review? What are their qualifications in relation to native Hawaiian culture?

Has road construction and training taken place at KTA and KLOA despite the fact that many sites have not yet been evaluated for eligibility? Will construction or training be allowed to continue or to take place while the sites are under evaluation?

Why are cultural impacts connected to the presence of an additional IBCT in Hawaii incomplete? Wouldn’t this information be important in the final decision for SBCT transformation?

Has the community had any say in the hiring of cultural monitors? Can the community be included in future selection of cultural monitors?

STRYKERS: A THREAT TO CULTURAL SURVIVAL

CULTURAL SITES:

- How many sites have been identified by the cultural monitors during the most recent surveys of training areas at Pohakuloa, Kahuku, Mokuleia and Lihue?

Please provide more information and documentation on the most recent surveys (including records and documents of cultural and archaeological monitoring, evaluation of known sites, and archaeological surveys for all training areas).

Please include prior archaeological surveys in the final document.

Please explain the breach of Haleauau heiau by a bulldozer during BAX construction. How does the Army plan to prevent future breaches of sacred sites if cultural monitors have not been given adequate time to survey?

Should we be concerned about the safekeeping of our cultural sites since the Army has repeatedly violated its Programmatic Agreement (PA) with OHA? How does the Army plan to protect our sites if it is not in compliance with the PA?

How does the Army plan to mitigate sites that have been damaged during construction or training? Data recovery is NOT an acceptable form of mitigation!

Cultural monitoring AFTER training to determine impacts on sites is NOT an acceptable form of mitigation!

How can the Army adjust protection to previously unidentified sites that are accidentally destroyed? Why have cultural monitors not been given more time for proper surveying to prevent destruction of previously identified sites?

How has the community been involved in surveys of ATIs? When will the survey reports completed? How can impacts to cultural sites be truly measured without these reports?

Is the community involved in the process of the survey report draft? According to the DEIS, the report is undergoing “internal review” - what does this mean? Who is responsible for the internal review? What are their qualifications in relation to native Hawaiian culture?

Has road construction and training taken place at KTA and KLOA despite the fact that many sites have not yet been evaluated for eligibility? Will construction or training be allowed to continue or to take place while the sites are under evaluation?

Why are cultural impacts connected to the presence of an additional IBCT in Hawaii incomplete? Wouldn’t this information be important in the final decision for SBCT transformation?

Has the community had any say in the hiring of cultural monitors? Can the community be included in future selection of cultural monitors?

CULTURAL PRACTICE:

- According to the DEIS, “expansion of training exercises to SRAA and the Keamuku Parcel could limit . . . use of sites for traditional or religious purposes.” What are the limits and what would the process be to gain access to sites for traditional and religious purposes?

ORAL TRADITIONS:

- Why were no TCP surveys or oral histories completed for the DMR? Would this not suggest that the Cultural impacts section of the DEIS is incomplete?

WHY HAWAII MUST CONTINUE TO SAY NO!

- Strykers contaminate land and endanger our health and safety: 25% more ammunition into our environment, more unexploded bombs and more toxics like RDX, HMX, TNT, Arsenic and Lead. Strykers will kick up more than 13.4 million pounds of dust per year which may include toxics like radioactive Depleted Uranium.

- Strykers destroy sacred sites and disrupt Native Hawaiian cultural practice. The Army failed to properly survey cultural sites and continues to limit the efforts of cultural monitors hired under the Army’s Programmatic Agreement with OHA.

- Stryker maneuver impacts will increase by 300% including serious soil erosion that can eventually kill our fragile reef systems.

- Strykers can cause fires that destroy ecosystems and kill endangered species.

- Strykers will raise the cost of living, strain public services and schools, and increase competition for housing and jobs.

- Strykers will increase the transient population in Hawaii, potentially increasing violence, and introducing sexual predators in our communities.

- Strykers were rejected by the people of Hawaii. In the first round of hearings, Hawaii overwhelmingly said “No!” to Strykers. In a recent Star Bulletin poll, 73% opposed Strykers in Hawaii.