

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 300  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219  
FAX (415) 904-5400  
Voice (415) 904-5260



# Th9a

**CD-0007-24 (United States Space Force)**

**February 6, 2025**

**Correspondence**

**From:** [Valerie Weiss](#)  
**To:** [Energy@Coastal](mailto:Energy@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Testimony: Increasing SpaceX launches  
**Date:** Friday, January 24, 2025 1:51:29 PM

---

I am in strong opposition to increasing SpaceX launches from 36 to 50. I take this position as a former long term resident of the Santa Barbara south coast area and now as a resident of Hawaii where debris from failed launches can fall into Hawaiian waters and our national ocean monuments.

Valerie Weiss  
Kauai HI

**From:** [Lynn Arneill-Brown](#)  
**To:** [Energy@Coastal](mailto:Energy@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Re: Notice for February 2025 Coastal Commission Meeting on Revised Findings  
**Date:** Friday, January 24, 2025 2:09:23 PM

---

I just read your decision regarding Space Force and SpaceX for the Feb. 2025 mtg. I completely agree that the Government is not providing the necessary info to keep wildlife, the environment and our homes safe from the over pressure waves created by sonic booms.

I have noticed that landings at Vandenburg do not cause sonic booms in Ventura. But, all these offshore landings are doing irreparable damage to everything. Stop them!!

I attended a Space Force mtg in Ventura regarding their EIR for Vandenburg and it was pointless, with loads of bureaucrats just standing around not able to answer any of our questions about the destructive nature of these sonic booms. They could not give us any idea how many months or years we would have to put up with this. Some didn't even realize the sonic booms were created by the landing of the rocket and not take-off.

I've watched my dog jump 3 inches off the sand while at Bates Beach (Carpinteria) after a launch. The noise reverberated off the ocean for close to 6 seconds after the initial boom. I can't imagine what it does to all the ocean and land critters.

Today, at 614am there were 2 sonic booms, so strong that they turned on our motion sensor light in our garage. My husband was outside watching the launch. Unacceptable!!! The government had better form a fund to help pay for damage costs to our houses if they continue on this absurd mission. And no Elon Musk, should not have this much power or make so much \$\$ of the shirt tails of the Federal Government.

Sincerely,

Lynn Arneill-Brown

On Fri, Jan 24, 2025 at 1:24 PM Energy@Coastal <[EORFC@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:EORFC@coastal.ca.gov)> wrote:

Hello,

Please find attached the hearing notice for the February 2025 Coastal Commission meeting for consideration of revised findings for the Commission's October 10, 2024, objection to a consistency determination by the United States Space Force to increase Space Exploration Technologies' (SpaceX) Falcon 9 launch activities at Vandenberg Space Force Base (VSFB) from 36 to 50 per year, in Santa Barbara County.

**From:** [Natalie Kilmer](#)  
**To:** [Energy@Coastal](#)  
**Subject:** Environmental Impact Statement on SpaceX's proposed increas  
**Date:** Friday, January 24, 2025 4:54:01 PM

---

Please stop these launches. We live quite far away and it shakes our house every time. These launches do not benefit our community and they are a hazard to our homes, businesses, and local structures and extremely loud, they need to stop.  
thanks, natalie Ojai ca

**From:** [Jean Camp](#)  
**To:** [Energy@Coastal](mailto:Energy@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Comments on Coastal Commission's Revised Finding for Feb 2025 Hearing  
**Date:** Sunday, January 26, 2025 2:49:18 PM  
**Attachments:** [Comments on Coastal Commission's Revised Findings 1.26.25.pdf](#)

---

Hi,

Please find attached my comments on the Coastal Commission's revised findings - Ref CD-0007-24 for the upcoming hearing in Feb 2025.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your good work.

Sincerely,

Jean Camp

525 San Ysidro Rd  
Suite D144  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108  
January 26, 2025

California Coastal Commission  
Energy, Ocean Resources & Federal Consistency Division  
455 Market St, Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94105

**RE: Comments on Coastal Commission's Revised Findings  
CD-0007-24  
Commission Action – OBJECTION**

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Jean Camp and I live off East Valley Road in Montecito/Santa Barbara, CA.

- 1) I have read the revised findings and I completely agree with the Coastal Commission's Objection – SpaceX should not be allowed to increase their launches beyond the current 35 launches per year.
- 2) I agree that SpaceX launches are NOT a federal agency activity. SpaceX launches should be treated as commercial activities and permitted as such. SpaceX launches should NOT be covered under military activities. SpaceX should not be allowed to launch their commercial satellites or others' satellites from Vandenberg. Have SpaceX evaluate all other locations in the USA and with other international partners/countries to find a less impactful location for launching their commercial satellites.
- 3) Sonic boom and shock wave measurements – Throughout all affected areas in CA, there should be independent engineering analyses, tests and review of 1) current and expected sonic booms/decibel levels – not averages, but immediate, and 2) the known and expected shock wave levels showing experienced and expected damage to homes.

As an engineer and past licensed contractor, I have personally experienced my windows rattle, tile grout crack and framed pictures move around on the walls of a solidly constructed home after several of the louder sonic booms/shock wave events. I am not alone. This is totally unacceptable and the future proposed heavier rockets will only cause more problems.

In December 2024, I had a guest who experienced a sonic boom during the nighttime sleeping hours. He had PTSD and woke up several nights after with night terrors – screaming during his sleep! My dog is always unsettled too during these booms.

- 4) I agree with the Coastal Commission's requirement that other wildlife and environmental impacts (both on earth, in the oceans and in space) need to be considered and resolved before further military only launches are considered.
- 5) Timeframe – I agree with the Coastal Commission's requirement of completion of all Coastal Commission requests before ANY additional launches are considered. I am against the currently proposed 50 and then 100 launches per year and against the heavier rocket launches proposed at Vandenberg. I do not think that SpaceX should be allowed to use our military facilities for private use.

Kindly contact me at [kinaincarlsbad@gmail.com](mailto:kinaincarlsbad@gmail.com) should you have any questions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Jean S. Camp

**From:** [Deirdre](#)  
**To:** [info@vsfbfalconlauncheis.com](mailto:info@vsfbfalconlauncheis.com)  
**Cc:** [Horn, Wesley@Coastal](mailto:Horn,Wesley@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Comments on rocket launches  
**Date:** Sunday, January 26, 2025 3:05:16 PM

---

Hello Vandenberg Air Force Base staff,

I'm writing as a resident of Santa Barbara, with concerns about the acoustic impacts, marine debris impacts, and adverse impacts to both land and ocean resources as a result of the sonic booms from the SpaceX program that are emanating from Vandenberg Air Force Base at a rate of approximately three times per month, with potential plans for expansion of up to 50 per year in 2025, and then 186 launches anticipated in 2026.

The radius of these sonic booms can be felt on both land and sea over Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties.

I have serious concerns with regard to the lack of evaluation under the following:

1. Marine Mammal Protection Act
2. Endangered Species Act
3. National Historic Preservation Act
4. Magnusen Stevens Act
5. Administrative Procedures Act
6. The unevaluated impact to larval fish development and,
7. The resultant potential financial consequences to the commercial fishing industry
8. Impacts to the sanctuary resources of the federal government's Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary and the Chumash Heritage National Marine Sanctuary
9. Impacts to the chain of fifty State of California Marine Protected Areas
10. The range of the area impacted by the sonic booms – I live approximately 70 miles from the VAFB and I am continually negatively impacted by the sonic booms occurring at 1am, 3am, 5:30 am and other times of the day. This startle impact also applies to other mammals and birds.

**In addition:**

The impacts of this project have not been adequately evaluated.

This routine sonic boom shakes my home and feels like a serious and strong earthquake.

The sonic booms cause a startle effect and are likely triggering individuals with post-traumatic stress who are affected by loud and sudden noises in the middle of the night-consistent with that condition.

Reduction or elimination of this project, not expansion should be strongly considered.



The state laws of California are more robust than Florida – perhaps that state is a better place for this project and the associated negative impacts.

SpaceX, is well documented to be a private company – it should not be considered a federal agency under any circumstances, and as such, it should follow the appropriate permit process paths (which thus far it has avoided).

Any existing garbage from the rocket launches should be removed from the ocean, and not simply be paid at a rate of \$10/ per pound for toxic chemical disposal in our ocean. Our ocean is not a garbage dump for the economic benefit of a private company.

The total radius of the significant negative impacts on both land and sea within Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles counties needs to be identified.

The mention of the inter-agency working group seems aspirational (at best), as it has not been established, no interagency members have been identified, nothing has been done to consider the litany of environmental impacts, needed monitoring requirements have not been considered, nor have mitigation requirements of any kind been established.

How many negative complaints has the VAFB received from the public thus far on this project? And more importantly, how will they be addressed?

I support the No Action Alternative - as the area of impact is too sensitive for this level of environmental consequences.

Should you have questions, I may be reached via this email.

~ Deirdre Erin

\*\*\*

**From:** [Energy@Coastal](mailto:Energy@Coastal)  
**To:** [Energy@Coastal](mailto:Energy@Coastal)  
**Subject:** FW: STOP THE ROCKET LAUNCHES AT VANDENBURG  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 4, 2025 10:55:35 AM

---

---

**From:** lisaostend <lisaostend@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 27, 2025 4:25 PM  
**To:** Energy@Coastal <EORFC@coastal.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** STOP THE ROCKET LAUNCHES AT VANDENBURG OUTSIDE THE ACCEPTED NOISE LAW HOURS OF 7 AM TO 10 PM. LAUNCHES AT 3:15 AM AND 6 AM ARE NOT ONLY UNACCEPTABLE BUT ILLEGAL! I DON'T CARE HOW MUCH MONEY IS INVOLVED. THE PEOPLES' TAX MONEY IS FUNDING THE BASE. YOU M...

**From:** [al](#)  
**To:** [Energy@Coastal](mailto:Energy@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Testimony RE: 9. a. Revised Findings CD-0007-24 (United States Space Force) Thursday, Feb. 6th, 2025  
**Date:** Monday, January 27, 2025 9:59:30 PM  
**Attachments:** [CA Coastal Commission Testimony RE 9. a. Revised Findings CD-0007-24 \(United States Space Force\) Feb 6 2025 Hearing Albert LePage.pdf](#)

---

Hello CA Coastal Commission:

Attached you will find my testimony, RE: 9. a. Revised Findings CD-0007-24 (United States Space Force) Thursday, Feb. 6th, 2025

The essential testimony is simply page one, specifically with my comments, reasons, why the revised findings DO reflect the Commission's Oct. 10, 2024 decision.

The remaining few pages are relevant comments, some validating the revised findings relative in input recently provided to the DAF about redevelopment of a launch pad area in response to their opportunity for an EIS.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the Commission, and the Commission's for the people and wildlife of California's wonderful coast -- of which I have hiked every single inch along the entire California Coastal Trail in 1996 -- and in support of wildlife in the air, on the land, and in the ocean.

With Respect and Gratitude,

Albert LePage  
1944 Cleveland Street  
Eugene, Oregon 97405

**Respectfully . . . To the California Coastal Commission:**

Testimony RE: **9. a. Revised Findings CD-0007-24 (United States Space Force)**

The revised findings for CD-0007-24 reflect the Commission's October 10, 2024 decision to object to the consistency determination for the following reasons:

**1. Characterization of SpaceX Activities:**

The Commission rejected the Department of Air Force's (DAF) characterization of SpaceX launch activities as a "federal agency activity" under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The revised findings emphasize that SpaceX is a privately owned company, not a public federal agency, and should be regulated accordingly.

**2. Insufficient Information:**

Additional information is required from SpaceX or the Space Force to demonstrate how the proposed activities constitute federal agency actions, rather than private commercial activities potentially subject to Coastal Development Permits or consistency certifications.

**3. Limited Implementation of Previous Conditions:**

While DAF accepted the seven conditions from the August 8th conditional concurrence, implementation remains very limited. Initial versions of required plans lacked detail and provided only general outlines.

**4. Lack of Clear Timeline:**

DAF provided no clear timeline for plan implementation or means for the Commission to determine if they will sufficiently protect coastal resources and ensure consistency with the California Coastal Management Program (CCMP) under a 40% increase in launch and landing activity.

**5. Uncertainty of Working Group Effectiveness:**

Despite DAF's steps to convene a multi-agency working group, its effectiveness remains uncertain. The continued push for greater launch levels on truncated timelines presents a significant challenge to assessing impacts on coastal resources and uses.

**6. Primary Purpose of Launches:**

The revised findings state that the primary purpose of the proposed SpaceX launch activities appears to be expanding and supporting SpaceX's commercial Starlink network, rather than serving as a federal agency activity.

**7. Regulatory Inconsistency:**

The Commission notes that SpaceX is required to lease its launch complex on VSBF from DAF and obtain various licenses, permits, and authorizations from state, local, and federal agencies. This suggests that the launches are not federal agency activities, as DAF would be responsible for obtaining these if they were.

**8. Ongoing Disagreement:**

Despite some positive developments in coastal resource protection measures, the revised findings highlight the ongoing disagreement between DAF and the Commission regarding the classification of SpaceX launch activities.

In conclusion, the revised findings reflect the Commission's decision to object to the consistency determination due to insufficient evidence supporting the classification of SpaceX launches as federal agency activities, inadequate implementation of previously agreed-upon conditions, and concerns about the effectiveness of proposed measures to protect coastal resources under increased launch frequency.

**Albert J. LePage, M. Ed. Science, B.S. Biology / Member, *Society for Conservation Biology* / Attachment**

**Comments\* were submitted January 20, 2025 to the DAF as input** relative to the proposed action regarding the redevelopment of Space Launch Complex (SLC)-6 at Vandenberg Space Force Base (VSFB) that should be considered in the **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**. While the comments I submitted focus on a broader range of environmental and socioeconomic impacts than those addressed in the attached California Coastal Commission (CCC) report, **there are some areas of overlap and relevance that reinforces information relative to the revised findings of CD-0007-24 (United States Space Force)**.

### **1. Environmental Impacts:**

My comments emphasized the need for comprehensive environmental assessments, which aligns with the CCC's concerns. The CCC report highlights the limited implementation of previously agreed-upon conditions, including Enhanced Biological Monitoring and Marine Debris Reduction plans. My focus on wetlands, floodplains, air quality, and marine biological resources complements the CCC's emphasis on coastal resource protection.

### **2. Cultural Resources:**

While my comments stress the importance of evaluating impacts on cultural resources under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the CCC report does not specifically address this aspect.

### **3. Socioeconomic Impacts:**

My comments emphasizing analyzing socioeconomic implications for local communities is not directly addressed in the CCC report. However, the report does mention the need for a Coastal Access and Recreation Enhancement plan, which may indirectly relate to community impacts.

### **4. Launch Frequency:**

The CCC report discusses an increase from 36 to 50 launches per year, while my comments reference an increase from 50 to 100 launches annually. I will allow the Commission to draw their own conclusions in this regard, and further, consider the implications of developing an EIS from more than 50 launches per year, when the potential environmental impacts of increasing launches from 36 to 50 are unknown.

### **5. Alternative Considerations:**

My comments on evaluating alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, are not directly addressed in the CCC report. The CCC focuses more on the characterization of SpaceX activities and their regulatory status.

### **6. Precautionary Principle:**

My emphasis on the precautionary principle and establishing a comprehensive baseline aligns with the CCC's concerns about insufficient information and the need for more detailed plans before approving increased launch activities.

### **7. Regulatory Framework:**

The CCC report primarily focuses on the Coastal Zone Management Act and California Coastal Act, while my comments address a broader range of environmental regulations and executive orders.

### **8. Public Engagement:**

Both my comments and the CCC report emphasize the importance of stakeholder engagement and public input in the decision-making process.

In conclusion, while my submitted comments cover a broader scope of environmental and socioeconomic concerns, they complement the CCC's focus on coastal resource protection and the need for more comprehensive information before approving increased launch activities. The CCC's objection to the consistency determination aligns with my emphasis on thorough environmental assessment and the precautionary principle.

**\*Comments RE: Redevelopment of Space Launch Complex (SLC)-6 EIS Attached**

The following comments are relevant to the proposed action regarding the redevelopment of Space Launch Complex (SLC)-6 at Vandenberg Space Force Base (VSFB) and should be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS):

### **Comments on Environmental Effects**

1. Wetlands and Floodplains: Given that portions of the proposed action are located within wetlands and floodplains, it is crucial to assess the potential impacts on these sensitive ecosystems. Compliance with Executive Order 11988 and Executive Order 11990 should be prioritized to ensure that floodplain management and wetland protection objectives are met. A detailed hydrological study should be conducted to understand how increased launch operations may affect water flow and wetland health.

2. Air Quality and Noise Pollution: The increase in launch cadence from 50 to 100 launches per year will likely exacerbate air quality issues and noise pollution in surrounding areas. A comprehensive analysis of emissions from rocket launches, including particulate matter and greenhouse gases, should be undertaken. Additionally, noise impact assessments must consider both immediate and cumulative effects on local communities and wildlife.

3. Cultural Resources: The potential impacts on cultural resources, particularly historic properties, must be thoroughly evaluated under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Public comments should focus on identifying any historic sites or artifacts that could be affected by the proposed action or alternatives. Engaging with local historical societies and Indigenous groups may provide valuable insights into cultural significance.

4. Marine Biological Resources: The proposed downrange landings in the Pacific Ocean raise concerns about marine life, particularly endangered species. An assessment of potential impacts on marine ecosystems, including fish populations and habitats, should be included in the EIS. This analysis should also consider cumulative impacts from other maritime activities in the region.

5. Socioeconomic Impacts: The increase in launch operations may have significant socioeconomic implications for local communities. It would be beneficial to analyze how increased traffic, noise, and environmental changes might affect property values, local businesses, and public health. Stakeholder engagement is essential to understand community concerns and perspectives.

### **Comments on Alternatives**

1. Alternative 1 Consideration: While Alternative 1 proposes constructing a new hangar rather than modifying the existing horizontal integration facility (HIF), a comparative analysis of both options' environmental impacts is necessary. This includes evaluating land use changes, construction-related disturbances, and long-term operational footprints.

2. No Action Alternative: The No Action Alternative should not only serve as a baseline but also explore its implications for national security objectives and commercial space activities. An analysis of how forgoing the proposed action could affect U.S. capabilities in space launch services would provide critical context for decision-making.

Overall Consideration: The primary purpose of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to thoroughly analyze and disclose the potential environmental effects of a proposed project, including both positive and negative impacts, to inform decision-makers and the public about the project's environmental implications, and to identify alternative actions and mitigation measures to minimize adverse effects before a decision is made on the project.

**Integrating the Proposed Action and Alternative 1 with the No Action Alternative** under the framework of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the precautionary principle emphasizes the need for a thorough understanding of existing environmental conditions before proceeding with increased launch operations at Vandenberg Space Force Base (VSFB).

The precautionary principle advocates for erring on the side of caution in environmental decision-making, particularly when potential impacts are uncertain. In this context, it is essential to establish a

comprehensive baseline of current environmental conditions related to existing launch activities before any new infrastructure modifications or increases in launch frequency are considered. This approach ensures that any decision made is informed by empirical data regarding the existing impacts of current operations.

**The No Action Alternative** proposes that no additional Falcon 9 or Falcon Heavy launches occur until an EIS is completed. This option aligns with the precautionary principle by allowing time to gather data on existing impacts and ensuring that any future decisions regarding launch frequency or infrastructure changes are made based on solid evidence.

In conclusion, integrating the Proposed Action and Alternative 1 with the No Action Alternative underlines the importance of establishing a clear environmental baseline before proceeding with increased launch activities at VSFB. Adopting a cautious approach ensures that decisions are grounded in scientific evidence, protecting both local ecosystems and community interests while fulfilling national security objectives. **The only responsible course of action is** to prioritize comprehensive environmental assessments through an EIS before advancing any modifications or increases in launch frequency.

### **Additional Relevant Studies**

- Studies on the **ecological impact of increased rocket launches on local wildlife populations.**
- Research examining community health outcomes related to noise pollution from launch operations.
- Historical assessments documenting any archaeological sites in proximity to VSFB that may be impacted by construction or operational changes.

Public input is vital for ensuring that all potential environmental effects are comprehensively evaluated in the EIS process. Engaging with diverse stakeholders will enhance the decision-making process and ensure that community concerns are adequately addressed.

**Albert J. LePage**, M.Ed. Science, B.S. Biology  
Member, Society for Conservation Biology  
1944 Cleveland Street, Eugene, OR 97405  
January 20, 2025

**From:** [ExecutiveStaff@Coastal](mailto:ExecutiveStaff@Coastal)  
**To:** [Deppe, Walt@Coastal](mailto:Deppe_Walt@Coastal); [Energy@Coastal](mailto:Energy@Coastal)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment on February 2025 Agenda Item Thursday 9 - SpaceX Increase  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 1:15:39 PM

---

Fyi -

---

**From:** Dulanie La Barre <dulanie@me.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 4:54 PM  
**To:** ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment on February 2025 Agenda Item Thursday 9 - SpaceX Increase

January 27, 2025

Item for 2/6/25 - Agenda #9, SpaceX

I am fervently against the requested increase in SpaceX Falcon 9 launches for a variety of reasons.

Most importantly is the literal fall-out of enormous amounts of deadly rocket debris falling into the ocean coupled with toxic pollution of the water from rocket fuel. There is no question that 50 launches annually, a weekly occurrence, will significantly act to destroy our national marine sanctuaries and wildlife.

The whole thrust in California coastal conservation for years has been to link up the Monterey Bay Area with the Channel Islands; and we proudly just received federal status for the Chumash National Marine Sanctuary. That means nothing if this is allowed to pass. It may look pretty but it is no sanctuary.

Frankly, I dropped my coffee when I read that SpaceX is asking for a massive increase in the incidental take (legal killing of endangered species) which may total around **15,000** whales and other marine mammals hurt or KILLED PER YEAR! Are you kidding me? The Gray Whale Migration only counts about **26,000** in the population. Are you, as the California Coastal Commission, prepared to agree to the decimation of the species?

At the very least, do not allow or severely minimize SpaceX to operate during the months of the Gray Whale Migration. Pregnant mothers are swimming south from Alaska to Baja from September to December. Nursing calves are cruising northward by their mothers side from February through April. While you probably can't shut down launches for half the year, you could restrict or limit them during the months of greatest migration. Having several months with no launches would give time for the ocean and marine life to partially recover.

Whatever number you decide, recognize that Musk has a habit of ignoring the contract. He has done more launches than he is currently licensed to do. Rather than a financial fine, simply "the cost of doing business", consider every unapproved launch to count against the number he is allowed in the future by a factor of 5-10, something significant.

But really ... You are the California Coastal Commission! Your mission is to "protect and enhance our coast and ocean for the present and future generations." I expect you to fight



tooth and nail, pulling out every stop, lobbying every elected you know, to decline ANY increase in the number of SpaceX Falcon 9 launches now or in the foreseeable future.

Your mission is to care for the coastal environment, not travel to Mars.

Other reasons to decline include your very correct assessment that SpaceX is getting federal favor for private wealth at great cost to citizens of California. Additionally, non-starters for any increase is the impact to endangered coastal wildlife, the cracking of plaster and routinely frightened humans and pets in homes up to 100 miles away (“is that an earthquake?”), not to mention pollution of outer space. Just say No!

Respectfully,  
Dulanie Ellis-La Barre  
206 S. Blanche St., Ojai, CA 93023

**From:** [Cynthia Replogle](#)  
**To:** [Energy@Coastal](mailto:Energy@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Feb 25 Agenda Item 9A  
**Date:** Thursday, January 30, 2025 12:35:06 PM

---

Thank you for standing up for the California coast against SpaceX's demand via the Space Force to increase launch frequency from Vandenberg SFB. We know from the environmental harms caused by SpaceX at its Texas launch base, and from Elon Musk's demonstrated contempt for regulations, that his company doesn't care about protecting our coast or communities. Space Force is attempting to provide cover by claiming SpaceX commercial launches somehow fall under its purview, but that's a transparent fiction.

Best,  
Cynthia Replogle  
Pronouns: she/her/hers

**From:** [Deirdre](#)  
**To:** [Energy@Coastal](#)  
**Cc:** [Horn, Wesley@Coastal](#)  
**Subject:** CCC hearing on: No. CD-0007-24 re SpaceX at Vandenberg  
**Date:** Friday, January 31, 2025 11:42:59 AM

---

Hello California Coastal Commissioners & Staff

I'm writing as a resident of Santa Barbara, with concerns about the acoustic impacts, marine debris impacts, and adverse impacts to both land and ocean resources as a result of the sonic booms from the SpaceX program that are emanating from Vandenberg Air Force Base at a current rate of approximately three times per month, with potential plans for expansion of up to 50 per year in 2025, and then 186 launches anticipated in 2026.

The radius of these sonic booms can be felt on both land and sea over Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties.

The initial environmental documents that previously evaluated this project under the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act are woefully scant and inadequate, given the scope of the sonic booms were not adequately evaluated as it relates to adverse impacts to sensitive and protected species. This program should be completely halted until very careful analysis and monitoring has been undertaken, versus being granted a modified after-the-fact permit and/or continued approval when it is clear, based upon existing precedent, that this is a significant project.

I have serious concerns regarding the lack of evaluation under the following:

### **Marine Mammal Protection Act & Endangered Species Act**

As stated on Page 73 Exhibits document, Policy 30230 of the CCMP requires that "special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance." The Commission has interpreted this to mean that special protection must be provided for areas such as marine mammal haul-outs and marine protected areas. There are several state of California marine protected areas, as well as national marine sanctuaries within this project area, and it doesn't seem that special protection has been granted. While any initial commitment by the DOD to begin monitoring to understand these impacts is nice, it is not sufficient. Operations should be halted until the significant impacts of this operation are fully understood.

### **Federal Consistency**

SpaceX, is well documented to be a private company – it should not be considered a federal agency under any circumstances, and as such, it should follow the appropriate permit process paths (which thus far it has avoided). Issuing a Coastal Development Permit or worse yet, a Federal Consistency Determination to a private company, for this activity should not be done.

### **Discharging garbage in the ocean**

Any existing abandoned garbage from the rocket launches should be removed from the ocean, and potential future abandoned discharges should not simply be paid at a rate of \$10-\$20/ per pound for future toxic chemical disposal in our ocean. Our

ocean, and the sensitive resources contained within it, is not a garbage dump for the economic benefit of a private company.

### **Human Impacts**

The total range and radius of the significant negative impacts on both land and sea within Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles counties needs to be identified. I live approximately 70 miles from the VAFB and I am continually negatively impacted by the sonic booms occurring at 1am, 3am, 5:30 am and other times of the day. This startle impact also applies to other mammals and birds. This routine sonic boom shakes my home and feels like a very strong earthquake. In addition, the sonic booms cause a startle effect and are likely triggering individuals with post-traumatic stress who are affected by loud and sudden noises in the middle of the night - consistent with that condition.

### **State laws**

The state laws of California are more robust than Florida – perhaps that state is a better place for this project and the associated negative impacts.

### **Federal Law - omitted**

There is another federal agency responsible for the management for the protected ocean area within the sonic boom and ocean garbage disposal area. I don't see any evidence in the staff report of consultation or permitting for wildlife harassment, discharge, or evaluation of the project that would typically be required under the National Marine Sanctuaries Act of 1972. There are two national marine sanctuaries within the impact area. See Code of Federal Regulations 15 CFR Part 922 for more information.

Why has this federal regulatory requirement been overlooked or ignored?

### **Proposed Working Group**

The mention of the inter-agency working group seems aspirational (at best), as it has not been established, no interagency members have been identified, nothing has been done to consider the litany of negative environmental impacts, needed monitoring requirements have not been considered, nor have mitigation requirements of any kind been established. In addition, this proposed WG does not seem to have any regulatory authority. So, while it does seem like a nice public relations interface, the goals, responsibilities, and decision making capabilities (if any) of this group needs to be better described.

### **In addition:**

The following impacts of this project have not been adequately evaluated.

1. Endangered Species Act
2. Marine Mammal Protection Act
3. National Historic Preservation Act
4. Magnuson-Stevens Act
5. Administrative Procedures Act

6. The unevaluated impact to potential larval fish from sonic booms, which are known to penetrate the ocean
7. The resultant potential financial consequences to the commercial fishing industry
8. Impacts to the sanctuary resources of the federal government's Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary and the Chumash Heritage National Marine Sanctuary
9. Impacts to the chain of State of California Marine Protected Areas

**Public Input**

How many negative complaints has the VSFB and the California Coastal Commission received from the public thus far on this project? And more importantly, how will they be addressed?

**Next steps**

Reduction or elimination of this project, not expansion should be strongly considered –at least until an EIS NEPA document has been completed.

Should you have questions on my comments, I may be reached via this email.  
~ Deirdre Brannigan