Major conflicts, terrorism, lawlessness, and natural disasters all have the potential to threaten the national security of the United States. Multiple branches of the US Department of Defense (DOD) (i.e., US Navy, Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) are responsible for our nation’s security. In terms of national security at sea, the US Department of the Navy (Navy) and the US Coast Guard (USCG) are the primary branches that carry out training and testing activities at sea to be able to protect the United States against its enemies, to protect and defend the rights of the United States and its allies to move freely on the oceans, and to provide humanitarian assistance when needed.

While the US Navy is the primary focus for military activities related to ocean and coastal planning programs, the USCG also operates in the ocean, coastal waters, and harbors. The USCG is tasked with law enforcement, border control, and ensuring the safety of our domestic waterways and their users. These responsibilities are executed through the region’s several command centers. A command center facilitates the execution of all the USCG missions and provides valuable information and coordination capability to other government agencies and port partners. The USCG, through the Captains of the Port, is also the lead agency for coordinating all maritime security planning and operations in US ports and waterways in its designation as federal maritime security coordinator. Additionally, the USCG conducts training exercises in coastal waters to remain ready to execute its many and varied security missions.

The Navy operates on the world’s oceans, seas, and coastal areas—the international maritime domain—on which 90 percent of the world’s trade and two-thirds of its oil are transported. Naval forces must be ready for a variety of military operations—from large-scale conflict to maritime security and humanitarian assistance/disaster relief—to deal with the dynamic, social, political, economic, and environmental issues that occur in today’s world. The Navy supports these military operations through its continuous presence on the world’s oceans, and it can respond to a wide range of issues because, on any given day, over one-third of its ships, submarines, and aircraft are deployed overseas. To learn these capabilities, personnel must train with the equipment and systems that will achieve military objectives. The training process provides personnel with an in-depth understanding of their individual limits and capabilities, and helps the testing community
improve new weapon systems. The Navy’s research and acquisition community engages in a broad spectrum of testing activities in support of the fleet. These activities include, but are not limited to, basic and applied scientific research and technology development; testing, evaluation, and maintenance of systems (missiles, radar, and sonar) and platforms (surface ships, submarines, and aircraft); and acquisition of systems and platforms to support Navy missions and give the Navy a technological edge over adversaries. Operational requirements for deployment of US military forces worldwide drive and shape training doctrine and procedures. The nature of modern warfare and security operations has become increasingly complex. Naval forces carry out operations on and below the ocean surface, on land, and in the air simultaneously. To stay prepared to effectively counter the array of threats, naval forces bring together thousands of sailors and marines, their equipment, vehicles, ships, and aircraft. Military forces must operate in an environment of continuous readiness and training certification. Therefore, military readiness training must be as realistic as possible to provide the experiences that are vital to success and survival. While simulators and synthetic training are critical elements of training—to provide early skill repetition and enhance teamwork—there is no substitute for live training with real equipment in a realistic environment.

The Department of Defense has historically used areas along the eastern coast of the United States and in the Gulf of Mexico for training and testing. These areas were established as geographic regions and named “range complexes.” A range complex is a set of adjacent areas of sea space, undersea space, land ranges, and overlying airspace delineated for military training and testing activities. Range complexes provide controlled and safe environments where military ship, submarine, and aircraft crews can train in realistic conditions. The combination of undersea ranges and operating areas (OPAREAs) with land training ranges, safety landing fields, and nearshore amphibious landing sites is critical to realistic training, which allows electronics on the range to capture data on the effectiveness of tactics and equipment—data that provide a feedback mechanism for training evaluation. The range complexes, test ranges, and OPAREAs provide realistic environments with sufficient sea and airspace vital for safety, training complexity, and mission success. Range complexes must provide flexibility to meet these diverse training and testing requirements given the wide range of warfare specialties and array of skills and proficiencies the fleets must demonstrate before certification for deployment.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PRESENCE AND REGIONAL CONCERNS

The Boston, Narragansett, Atlantic City, and Virginia Capes (VACAPES) range complexes are located along the Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Seaboard of the United States. Combined, these areas are the principal locations for portions of the DOD’s major training and testing events and infrastructure, including activities originating out of nearby Navy and Air Force installations. Three separate range complexes...
(the Boston Range Complex, the Narragansett Bay Range Complex, and the Atlantic City Range Complex) are collectively referred to as the Northeast Range Complex. The Northeast Range Complex spans 761 miles along the coast of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey. The Northeast Range Complex also includes OPAREAs and associated special-use airspace for Navy and Air Force training and testing activities. The Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division Newport (NUWCDIVNPT) Testing Range consists of waters within Narragansett Bay; nearshore waters of Rhode Island Sound; Block Island Sound; and coastal waters of New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts.

Proximity of the range complexes to naval homeports is strategically important to the Navy because close access allows for efficient execution of training activities and nontraining maintenance functions, and access to alternate airfields when necessary. The proximity of training to homeports also ensures that sailors and marines do not have to routinely travel far from their families. Less time away from home is an important factor in military readiness, morale, and retention. The proximate availability of the range complexes is critical to Navy efforts in these areas. Several military installations, including the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard (PNSY), Naval Station (NS) Newport, Naval Submarine Base (NSB) New London, Naval Weapons Station Earl, and Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst (JB MDL), are located on land adjacent to the offshore Northeast Range Complexes. These installations use the waters and airspace of the range complexes for training or testing activities (as well as other nearby range complexes such as VACAPES).

The Northeast Range Complexes also support training and testing by other branches of the military, primarily the USCG and the US Air Force (USAF) from nearby bases, as well as visiting operators with home bases located farther away. Overall, minimal surface training occurs within the Northeast OPAREAs due to the time and distance from the operators’ homeports and home bases. The primary activities in the Northeast OPAREAs consist of submarine and submersible training and testing. Submarine and submersible testing and training is conducted out of NSB New London, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and the Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division Newport, while Bath Iron Works builds and tests surface ships in the area. In addition to these users, non-DOD users are likely to use the offshore range complexes for research, including assorted government agencies such as various branches of the NOAA, research institutions such as Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, universities such as the University of Rhode Island, the University of Connecticut, and Rutgers University (among others), and various state agencies. The USCG also conducts weapons training in areas beyond three nautical miles from shore for small boats and in areas beyond 12 nautical miles (typically in Navy-designated ranges) for larger vessels such as the national security cutters.

The series of range complexes along the East Coast provides a critical controlled environment for all military branches that accommodate training and testing operations in realistic combat conditions. Most of the operating, warning, and restricted areas were initially established before or during World War II and have been in use for decades. Maintaining access to, and usage of, offshore training areas is of the utmost importance. Through a variety of internal and public documents, the DOD attempts to quantify potential impacts to offshore ranges in order to minimize incompatibilities and maximize range sustainment. Some concerns are summarized in the following pages.
Airborne noise
The central issue of airborne noise is the perceived impact of this noise on people, animals, structures, and land use. The magnitude of noise and resulting complaints, pressure to modify or suspend operations, and threats of litigation are directly related to the degree to which there are people, wildlife, and other noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of training space.

Competition for scarce resources
Community pressure to gain access to valuable resources located in littoral areas or seas that the DOD and DHS use may affect the ability to use these waters for operational training or test objectives. Access may include processing and transporting materials. There is also pressure to limit the DOD and DHS’s access to the public’s resources, as well as pressure on the DOD to develop renewable resources.

Threatened and endangered species
Restrictions for the purpose of protecting threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat can reduce the value of training space for testing and training by limiting the types of permissible activities in terms of composition, magnitude, or timing.

Maritime issues
Regulatory or permit requirements protecting ocean resources cumulatively affect the DOD and DHS’s ability to conduct operations, training exercises, or testing in the marine environment.

Safety arcs and footprints
Land or water adjacent to range safety zones may not be suitable for certain types of use or economic development.

Electromagnetic spectrum
The competition for available frequency spectrum may lead to a reduction in available spectrum for training and testing activities. The lack of spectrum may decrease the effectiveness of exercises by restricting the number of war-fighting systems that can participate. As the potential for residential and commercial encroachment increases, so does the risk of increased radio frequency emitters and receivers, which could result in interference with DOD and DHS electromagnetic systems from public or commercial systems.

Habitat
Prohibited or restricted access to sensitive littoral zones such as tidal wetland areas and buffer zones, essential fish habitat, and critical habitat can restrict existing training, preclude or restrict integration of new technology/weapon systems, or preclude future execution of new missions in amphibious, riverine, or estuarine operations.

Interpretation of environmental regulations
Regulatory or permit requirements may affect training and testing operations. Other nonmilitary actions may affect the current regulatory or permit requirements for DOD and DHS.

Interagency coordination
Use of land or sea space controlled by another federal or state agency can limit allowable uses and restrictions. Such allowable uses or restrictions are often the result of negotiations between the parties or are subject to the other federal agency’s policies and regulations. Restrictive uses can limit training and operations.
Legislative initiatives that restrict operations
Congress may enact legislation that directly or indirectly limits the DOD and DHS’s flexibility in conducting planned operations, training, or testing. Additionally, local ordinances and/or state legislation may limit military operations, training, or testing.

Potential training and testing impacts may occur due to the concerns listed in this section, which can severely affect the overall readiness of the military. For example, when range access is reduced, the limitations imposed on DOD and DHS units may degrade the realism and value of the training. If areas within training or testing space are permanently or temporarily unavailable for operations, avoidance areas may inadvertently be created. If the number of training days are reduced or if certain types of operations, training, and testing are prohibited or if operations are restricted for a period of time and/or in certain geographic areas, the DOD will be impaired in fulfilling its Title 10 requirements. In these cases, the testing or training must be conducted at other locations or a workaround must be developed, which can reduce realism and the value of the testing or training experiences. Civilian and commercial use of airspace or development on the ground may prevent DOD forces from taking full advantage of training space. During testing or training, aircraft may be forced to fly at artificially low or high altitudes or artificially low airspeeds, which reduces realism. Night-time operations and training are essential to force readiness. However, while voluntary restrictions on military training at night may foster better community relations, such restrictions pose especially critical limits on militarily essential testing and training. Restrictions can also reduce opportunities for the use of live-fire ordnance, thereby reducing proficiency. While the use of simulation and inert ordnance can replace some live-fire training, testing or training with live ordnance remains essential for adequately preparing DOD forces for combat.

DOD MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS AND REGULATORY COORDINATION
The DOD has policies and processes that currently exist to manage military training and testing space, identify potential impacts to training, and integrate the DOD within other federal and state agency directives and programs. DOD offshore operations are subject to regulatory compliance and management measures that can be time-consuming and costly. Establishing (and maintaining) programs that build alliances between DOD, other federal agencies, state regulators, and tribes is essential for sustaining a proactive approach to meeting requirements for compliance. Routine coordination and consultation with other agencies provide information regarding future agency actions and allow the DOD opportunity to advocate for the importance of training activities to sustain its mission. As future at-sea testing and training activities and required compliance efforts continue and expand, these relationships will prove invaluable. The following examples of existing regulatory, management, and coordination activities are most relevant to the Plan:
• The DOD coordinates with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) representatives to foster better communication. A military liaison to the FAA is currently based at the FAA regional headquarters in Burlington, Massachusetts, and/or Jamaica, New York.
• The DOD coordinates with the appropriate frequency allocation and oversight agencies to identify frequency spectrum impacts on military operations and to develop strategies that will reduce encroachment while ensuring pending use of emerging spectrum technologies.
• The DOD participates in all of BOEM’s inter-governmental renewable energy task forces, which include federal agencies as well as state, tribal, and local governments.
• The Navy has developed a working group, the Ocean Observing System Security Group (OOSSG), for tracking and addressing potential issues with ocean observing systems (OOS). Additionally, the Situational Awareness Office is developing a program to be used as a tool to help the Navy identify the locations and types of OOS worldwide. The program will tell the Navy where each OOS is, what type of data it collects, and how to avoid it (i.e., avoidance distances).

• To respond to and execute range sustainment and compatibility requirements, the Navy established a monitoring and coordination process based on networked regional coordination teams (RCTs). RCTs are composed of knowledgeable representatives from the fleets, system commands, and installation headquarters. RCTs are equipped to review and analyze potential encroachment problems, determine impacts on DOD operations, and provide alternatives and mitigation requirements. Once an encroachment threat or issue is identified, either at the Navy HQ level or by a subordinate command or unit, the issue is forwarded to the appropriate RCT for initial analysis. The RCT then distributes the encroachment information to all relevant stakeholders.

• Under the Navy At-Sea Environmental Compliance Program, a number of environmental documents have analyzed Navy training and testing in nearshore and open-ocean areas. In conjunction with release of the Navy’s Final Environmental Impact Statements/Overseas Environmental Impact Statements and the associated Records of Decision (RODs), NMFS and USFWS issue final rules and letters of authorization (LOAs) under MMPA, and biological opinions (BOs) or letters of concurrence under ESA. The Navy’s RODs, final rules, LOAs, BOs, and concurrence letters outline requirements that the Navy must satisfy in order to remain in compliance with environmental laws and regulations.

• Under the Navy At-Sea Environmental Compliance Program, the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing (AFTT) Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement was prepared to comply with NEPA, Executive Order 12114, CZMA, MMPA, and ESA requirements, and to assess the potential environmental effects associated with military activities. The study area included the western North Atlantic Ocean along the East Coast of North America, the lower Chesapeake Bay, and the Gulf of Mexico. The study area also included several Navy testing ranges and range complexes including the Boston, Narragansett, and Atlantic City OPAREAs (more information can be found at http://aftteis.com).

MAPS AND DATA
The National Security theme on the Portal was developed and reviewed by DOD. It includes the following map layers showing DOD presence in the region, as previously described. Complete descriptions and appropriate DOD points of contact for each layer can be found on the Portal.

• Military installations
• Military range complexes
• NUWCDIVNPT testing range
• OPAREA boundaries
• Submarine transit lanes
• Warning areas
• Cape Cod TORPEX boxes
• Danger zones and restricted areas
OVERVIEW

ACTIONS

NS-1  Maintain and update National Security maps and data on the Portal

NS-2  Inform management and regulation of military activities
**ACTIONS: MAINTAIN AND UPDATE DATA**

**NS-1. Maintain and update National Security maps and data on the Portal:** The DOD will update the national security data on the Portal periodically as needed, such as when applicable permits are renewed or when operations significantly change. All layers were provided by DOD with the exception of danger zones and restricted areas, which were provided by the Marine Cadastre and will be maintained through subsequent updates provided by the Marine Cadastre. In addition, DOD will update appropriate points of contact for the national security data layers, as necessary. Ensuring that agencies have appropriate points of contact improves interagency coordination and will enable decision makers to understand the implications of proposed regulations and development plans on DOD security, training, and testing, and on a variety of other mission-specific needs.

**ACTIONS: INFORM REGULATORY AND MANAGEMENT DECISIONS**

**NS-2. Inform management and regulation of military activities:** The DOD intends to use the Plan and the Portal as one mechanism to guide and inform DOD programs, initiatives, and planning documents when involved in the multiple coordination task forces and other planning groups in which the DOD currently participates, including those listed in this Plan.

- DOD will to the extent practicable use the Plan and the Portal as one source of information to identify potential impacts on and encroachments to DOD operations resulting from existing or newly proposed activities, such as energy installations, aquaculture, and new navigational measures. The DOD regularly participates in a wide variety of existing local, state, and federal agency coordination groups, forums, and advisory panels across the nation, and will work to identify any additional outlets that it would be beneficial to participate in.

- DOD and DHS will to the extent practicable consult the Plan and the Portal in the preparation of internal agency guidance, existing procedures, and environmental planning. DOD and DHS will also, if practical, identify the Plan and the Portal as important sources of information in decision-making. DOD participation in future RPB efforts will be as directed by the DOD National Ocean Council Executive Steering Group (NOC ESG). Designated DOD and Joint Chiefs of Staff RPB representatives will coordinate Plan implementation actions between the RPB, DOD, and Joint Chiefs of Staff.