

*Attachment 3*

**Quotations from the Administrative Record showing  
Vermont Air National Guard Interference in the F-35A NEPA Basing Process**

Rose to Wright (5-14-10) "We still have time to discuss your concerns regarding the changes since the 2006 Part 150 but just as an FYI, this is the same approach we were going to take with the JAX airport." #41588

Clark to Rose and Caputo (5-18-10) "...they are using our operational data from our latest noise study. **We do not want that**—correct? You may have this all under control, just wanted to check." #41607

Rose to Clark (5-18-10) "Sir, we are just in the data gathering and review mode. We will confirm the approach we are taking with you (and get your input) before initiating our evaluations. Just so you know, we need to be consistent (as much as possible) about how we model the bases and need to be able to justify/tell the story if we decide on different model approaches." #41607

Wright to Clark (6-30-10) "I asked Kevin Marek about the profile data used in the VTANG 2005 Noise Data Resource Book (NDRB). He called the two main contractor POCs who worked on the report and both said the same thing: that **the base provided all of the data** and had at least one shot at reviewing a draft document before it went final. I also called John Ferraro, the former EM, and he recalled the same thing - **all data came from the base**, and he routed it internally for review." #42541

Caputo to Fick (10-13-10) "I'm meeting with Sheryl Parker and LtCol Jamie Key (ACC/JAG) tomorrow for lunch over here at the Alert Det to discuss the Karnes 3 profile incorporation into the EIS. I spent most of the afternoon on the phone trying to track down who is holding up the decision to incorporate the updated Karnes 2 flight profiles (i.e. Karnes 3) into our EIS. After talking with Sheryl Parker (ACC/A7), LtCol Chapman (F-35 JPO), Kevin Peters (TEC, and Joe Czech (Wyle), I think I've finally figured who is holding up this action. It appears that Lynn Engelman (SAF/IEI) has reservations about the "new data" and using it in this round of EIS's when we've already gone public with the Eglin EIS using the Karnes 2 flight profiles." #45103

Caputo to Will (Leahy's staffer) (10-15-10) "I think **I can convince ACC and Air Staff** that using the Karnes 3 flight profiles are essential to maintaining the integrity of the EIS process by presenting the most accurate and representative F-35 data for noise contour development. With that being said, I respectfully request a few more weeks to work this issue prior to sending the letter from Sen Leahy to the SECAF. I will keep you posted weekly on any updates or potential issue that arise." #45119

Cray to Caputo (11-13-10) "I feel confident that **we can get the Karnes 3 data in the public release document.**" #45729

Caputo to Cray (11-12-10) "...there is significant improvement **as a result of our inputs** during the on-board review and **the modification we demanded to the Karnes 2 flight profiles to accommodate our local noise abatement procedures**... If we can get the Karnes 3 flight profiles incorporated prior to going public with the Draft EIS in Jan 2010, I'm confident those numbers will decrease even more. My guess is they would probably be cut in half again if not even more! This just strengthens our argument that much more...if we weren't "making noise"

at the on-board review regarding the Karnes 2 flight profiles as presented in the Preliminary Draft, the Air Force would have been perfectly content on releasing the original data as presented.” #45728 and #45729

Wright to Clark (11-24-10) “We should keep in mind that Wyle is a subcontractor to TEC on this so **we should probably get with TEC before asking Wyle for too much.**” #46107

Clark to Wright (11-24-10) “Agree about discussion further before asking for “too much.” #46107

Caputo to Clark (11-25-10) “I’m extremely reluctant about asking/tasking Wyle and TEC regarding the scope of their work for the OP EIS... My concern about pressing this issue is that we are still aggressively pursuing the use of Karnes 3 flight profiles to be used in the draft EIS, and if approved, this is going to require a significant amount of work from both Wyle and TEC in the limited time remaining prior to the scheduled public release of the draft EIS in early Jan...By far, the Karnes 3 issue is a much higher priority than the additional set of INM noise contours and **I do not want to make any additional requests from either Wyle or TEC** that might jeopardize that... **MG Cray and Col Baczewski have been working the issue with senior leaders in ANG, ACC, and Congress.**” #46107

Cray to Caputo (11-26-10) “After many phone calls with Ping, I think we have reached a point where **we (VTANG) are now pushing the limit.** There is considerable work to be done to get Karnes 3 incorporated into the draft EIS. That’s been our focus and effort. I don’t think we should jeopardize that effort.” #46107

Wright to Cray (11-30-10) “...we should look at effect of using 2006 and 2010 civilian data for the EIS. BTV has fewer ops now so it might shrink all the lines a bit to use the actual current.” #46107

Czech to Peter (11-4-11) “...we’ve talked with Pooter today and we are going to make revisions to Baseline and Alts at Burly for a revised closed pattern track. Pooter confirmed that the track is indeed too short and should have a 1nm final leg. This affects Baseline and the Alts. #64016

Caputo to Czech (11-23-11) “Are you telling me that the ‘hold down’ here at Burlington is actually causing an increase in our contours, because that is definitely not something we want to do? **If using the standard Karnes 3 flight profile for departures without the ‘hold down’ is more favorable from a noise perspective we need to change back to the standard K3 profile.**” #49140

Caputo to Cray (4-6-12) “**We may need to get Senator Leahy involved** and have his office contact Senator Susan Collins’ office...” #51240

Wright to Finnegan (8-28-12) “**It would be possible to modify the F-35 flight profiles somewhat for that document,** which we could not do for the EIS. If we stayed with profile/power setting changes that our pilots know could be implemented, I think these would be reasonable assumptions to include in the data we provide to BTV, and would be publicly defensible...” #54360

Cray to Holland (10-12-12) “Just a quick note from VT on the F35 basing. We are anxiously awaiting the roll-out of the Final EIS and then ROD. I have heard that the small but vocal group comments continue to make it into discussions in the Pentagon. I want to re-emphasis that this

small group has a much larger agenda than a mission change from F16's to the F35. We continue to supply SAF/PA folks with the "other side" that has been reported with positive support including over 11,000 signatures for the F35, local and state chambers of commerce support as well as unanimous support from our Congressional and State elected leadership. I am open to any suggestions you may have on making sure that AF decision makers get the whole story and why it continues to be a good decision for the AF to base the F35 in Vermont. I understand that we are delayed as the training range discussions get ironed out and any insight you have on the current timeline for the final EOS and the ROD is appreciated. As always I am available to answer any questions and provide my perspective on the "rest of the story" here in Vermont." #55333

Finnegan to Marek (11-19-12) "...In short, reduced fuel loads are a possibility but not required to do reduce the power setting at the departure end of the runway. There are other mitigation measure[s] possible such as managing the ground track and arrival altitudes. All of which are possible but do not need to be modeled in the EIS. The EIS clearly states once operational profiles have been consistently flown follow on noise studies will be performed. We're just saying that using the same procedures we've implemented with the F-16 that we can reduce the 65DNL in F-35. **It doesn't need to be shown in the EIS...**" #56124

Caputo to Ardern (9-6-13) "**We need someone down on the ACC staff to bring some common sense to this debacle** that is being created by a very vocal minority that is getting unrestricted, non-factual print published in the newspapers up here. Anything you can do to assist would be greatly appreciated, and if you ever need me to come down for any meetings, please let me know." #62507

Caputo to Harris (10-2-13) "**I had the 33rd OGV guys run in conjunction with a Lockheed Rep.** I had them run a standard CT configured jet with full fuel load (46,500 GW) for each Eglin, Jax, McEntire, and Burlington for average annual temps and then one for Burlington at 100 degrees. I think we're completely legal stating that even under worst case scenarios with a full fuel load for our standard CT configuration, there's nothing that is going to drive us to use afterburners to take-off (reference AFI for 50% take off roll requirement)...there are **some concerns with an emergency landing immediately after take-off on a wet runway** as evidenced by the landing distances of 8.4 (44 degree day) and 9.0 (100 degree day), but something we can easily mitigate by using the **fuel dump option, the hook, or emergency landing at Plattsburgh. Not information we need to share with the public at this time**, just wanted to provide it for your SA." #63135

~~~~~

**Quotations from Air Force Personnel regarding  
VTANG Actions during the F-35A NEPA Basing Process**

Engelman to Chatman (6-29-10) "I am a **bit concerned about the focus on the Vermont Guard profiles** in emails.... I'm going to talk to Sheryl re Vermont when I get a chance to see what she had been discussing with Rich since we had separate discussions." #42446

Engelman to Marek (6-30-10) "...**several years ago Vermont ANG started strapping on external fuel tanks and started flying with AB, but that info didn't get into the Part 150 study.** Did EIAP get done with noise analysis for that change in operations? Vermont ANG Profiles would have obviously changed with that change in operations." #42687

Marek to Engelman (6-30-10) "NO. I became aware of it a month ago. **They should have picked it up in Part 150 which was done in 2008.** We don't go back and do EIAP after the fact. The unit is going to work with the airport to update the noise mapping (NEM) in their Part 150. The EIS for the F-35 will have a baseline based on how they fly now." #42687

Peter to Parker (7-7-10) "We have come to a very critical time in the process of preparing the F-35A OB EIS. To move forward and meet the end date for the ROD, several issues need resolution and we all must be in concert concerning the proposed action, approach, and source data....Simulator Data—On July 6, 2010, a LTC Chatham from JPO dropped off 'simulator data' with Wyle. **We can only assume this is the data from LTC Caputo's visit to Lockheed Martin. We have not delved into this data for two reasons. First it would likely present profiles contrary to/different from Karnes II and using Karnes II is the direction from HQ USAF...** We will not be using any of the simulator data and only using Karnes II....Inconsistencies in Operations Parameters—Per previous direction, we have been using the Burlington (LTC Caputo) parameters for proposed operations at the ANG bases... The data we have been provided **propose that the F-35As at Burlington would fly using 1% afterburner takeoffs, but all the other bases would use afterburner 60% of the time. This seems very inconsistent. Please provide direction...** For the ANG bases, LTC Caputo indicated that **17% of the total proposed F-35A airfield operations would be conducted elsewhere. However, no such deployment/detachment scenario has been identified for the active-duty bases.** As such, there is a **marked proportional difference between the two sets of bases. Is this ok?** Solution Suggest we have a summit meeting with respective individuals who can make the decision we need to have done on the spot. **We are losing a lot of precious time going back and forth with bases getting inconsistent answers depending on who we talk to and decisions as to what is correct are delayed.**" #64024

Engelman to Penland (1-20-11) "TEC told me **they still had locations trying to game things with local course rules....**" #46610

Penland to Engelman (1-20-11) "**I know for a fact there are folks trying to game things out there and it will just make life tougher later if we ever have to defend this stuff!**" #46610

Engelman to Downing (1-24-11) "...**what we are doing (which is different than what the gentleman at the Vermont Guard was apparently doing for either themselves or Sheryl) is trying to have a few generic profiles that all could use to get a sense on how the aircraft will respond in certain conditions...** What started as a fairly simple effort to re-fly approaches to get better power settings **got partially hijacked by the effort to validate Karnes 2 by a**

**recently created Lockheed Martin tool.** With the mixing of the effort I had been trying to get executed since last January, and the **Vermont Guard-Lockheed Martin exercise**, there is no longer a clear sense of what we were trying to do and what the inputs should have been. I think this is a good example of what happens when we get too many cooks in the kitchen.” #46651 and 46667

Engelman to Thomas (3-22-11) “...we need to document assumption that were used to deflect criticism from **Caputo. I don’t need him calling the Guard 2 star and having him challenge the work with Ms. Ferguson. If full fuel and full munitions is not a big issue for power settings then why did Caputo have a fit over it and complain about how that would increase noise.**” #47104

Engelman to Dryden (3-22-11) “**The reason that TEC proposed this was because in part some of the bases were trying to do end runs around the noise modeling rules.**” #47097

Engelman to Nelson (4-1-11) “**Given the concerns of the ANG General, if a question comes up about the Vermont guard wanting to fly with less than full mil power (as it did in skull slides), that is not in the profiles because that is not the standard way we fly.** That condition would be considered a location specific operational modification that would be incorporated into an additional alternative for a specific location. **(Assuming the plane can depart with munitions at less than mil power.) that kind of change will not decrease the total size of the noise contour, but it may shift noise somewhere else.** I don’t know if the plane can attain the same airspeed and altitude with less power or if it will mean the plane will take longer to get out of the area and the two factors offset themselves - less noise but more time, so the SEL stays more or less the same....**Any other changes mean we are just shifting the noise one place to another. The ultimate question is where are the people - close in to the airfield or further out.**” #47285

Nelson to Ferguson (4-7-11) “Ma’am, FYI, this issue has surfaced over the last few days. Short version: the Karnes 3 profiles, which reduce throttle settings on approach, end up using the lower-throttle end of the Edwards data—which has a large variation from the Mineral Wells data and also from similar aircraft. I understand we’ve been trying to get that problem clarified for months. **The potential concern is using this potentially unreliable area of data could significantly understate the noise contours. It would look ‘better,’ but maybe not appropriately so.**” #47384

Ferguson to Nelson (4-7-11) “Thanks – makes me wonder whether there is value in going to Karnes 3???” #47384

Penland to Ferguson (4-7-11) “**Karnes 3 and its lower power settings are only magnifying the issue. The issue exists no matter what profiles you use, since it is resident in the noise source data itself...**” #47384

Germanos to Marek (2-15-12) “Yes – these were the only three. Just wanted you to be aware of what Burlington is saying... Concerning #111, he is saying that the first sentence of BR3.2.1.1, page BR4-12 has not been corrected. ‘The data used for the baseline noise conditions were derived from actual, current F-16 operations. Civilian data may have come from the Part 150 report (HMMH 2006), but not the F-16 baseline data that is used in the EIS.’ Perhaps the first sentence should be clarified.” #49751

Rose to Germanos (6-28-12) **“While it is Burlington AGS belief that they will not need to take off in AB at all, it would not reflect reality. The F-35 program office directed us to use this split and it was equally applied across all bases. We stand by the approach taken for noise modeling....”** #53433

Penland to Ettenson (9-10-12) “Even before the new F-35 requirements discussion, our lawyers have been concerned we would be sued by folks at Burlington. The noise is the main issue. Burlington ANG said they would mitigate using departure procedures now used by F-16s to lessen the impact. They even wanted the contours changed to reflect those procedures. However, I’m told they have not been able to get those procedures to work in the simulator.” #54609

Finnegan to Germanos (11-8-12) “What was the determination regarding releasing the profile file to Lockheed Martin?” #55890

Germanos to Finnegan (11-8-12) “My leadership and my legal advisor informed me not to release the background and files that were used to assemble the Burlington noise data to LM. We feel that all points of analysis should be completed through the standard EIS process, and releasing source information to other agencies with the intent of additional analysis via other processes is not prudent.” #55890

Penland to Engelman (11-16-12) “Reducing your power in a climb typically means you takeoff in A/B or military and once safely airborne and established in a climb then you can reduce your power settings for the climb out. Assuming your aircraft can do that, which I assume this one can. What we heard they wanted to do was takeoff in a reduced power setting, something below A/B or military from brake release. **That is not normal for a fighter. Some larger aircraft with multiple engines do that, but not normal for fighters.**” #56055

{The following five email exchanges are part of #56076}

Engelman to Downing, Penland (11-15-12) “Note Vt Guard taking position they will take off with lower power settings.”

Penland to Engelman (11-16-12) “In the article the Guard is talking about doing reduced power climbs out of Vermont. What we heard they were talking about is reduced power takeoffs, two different things.”

Bush to Penland (11-16-12) “o.k., so what does this mean for the EIS and noise analysis? We need to get on this ASAP.”

Penland to Engelman (11-16-12) “Has anyone suggested doing any more noise modeling? I don’t think our discussion changes anything unless they have officially come on line and stated they will fly differently than currently modeled...correct??

Engelman to Penland (11-16-12) "That is what I think. Jack was wanting to call up the guard and ask how they were going to operate. That would be an entirely new set of worms. What we do have a potential problem with is the ANG going on air and saying what they are saying. I know they mean well, but they have to be careful about unfulfilled expectations should they not be able to do what they say. Also who knows what it will really do to the noise—could be that it makes it worse somewhere else, or it doesn't really change it at all because they are in the area of the base longer because of the lower power." #56076

Bush to Knudsen (11-16-12) "Need your assistance to get a no kidding answer to how ANG proposes to fly F-35 operations at Burlington. This is important 'cause **I am hearing that they may fly differently from what is currently covered in the F-35 Ops EIS.** If it is different, then we could be looking at more delays in the EIS completion." #56127

Marek to Finnegan (11-19-12) "Need your assistance to determine how ANG proposed to fly F-35 operations at Burlington. Below is information on how the operations at Burlington would be conducted. **I know Chris Caputo worked with the F-35 folks where Karnes 3 and analysis and course rules for current operations of F-16 at Burlington would be used in modeling.** The question to Burlington is the F-35 Ops in the EIS what is correct as to how you will fly? If you plan to fly differently from what is currently covered in the EIS, then we could be looking at more delays in the EIS." #56092

Engelman to Penland (12-14-12) "ACC said it was 1% AB, they think the 5% was before Karnes III (which shouldn't have changed % of departures with AB). **Would bet if it changed it was because the ANG wanted it changed. Will be interesting to see what the real percentage is and if it is the lower number if the Guard can live with it. (They are using AB 95% with F-16 after being told to do that a few years back.)**" #56570

Engelman to Germanos (12-14-12) "Apparently the **VT ANG General has made a statement in a news article that if the F-35 comes to Burlington, they will be doing no afterburner take-offs.** That has the A3 folks up here asking questions of Mike Penland. The EIS doesn't really state how many of the various kinds of take offs will be done." #56566

Engelman to Germanos (12-14-12) "Do you know why the number might have been changed? Had they changed the training requirements? Karnes III wouldn't have affected that - **could be the ANG just decided they didn't want to fly with AB (if that is the case I hope they can live with that should they get the plane).** Will be interesting to see if the percentage changed." #56566

Engelman to Penland (12-17-12) "...Guard may not take off with AB, but until they know it is a smart thing to do then I think our modeling assumptions are the safest to go with... no commitment until we know that it is sensible and logical (the same with their earlier statement that indicated they wanted to take off at less than Milpower.)" # 56593

Engelman to Germanos (12-17-12) "See Joe's email below re AB vs Milpower. Guard may feel that is the way they are going to fly but it was modeled 5% and 95%. I think that is good since it is unclear whether only doing Milpower take offs is a reasonable assumption." #56591

Engelman to Kilbourn (1-3-13) "...What factors did the EIS authors use to justify these reductions? **The real question is who developed the numbers (the EIS consultant was**

**provided operational numbers). The A30-BAR office knows from an earlier email that Lt Col Dan Finnegan and Lt Col Caputo came up with the ANG operations numbers....”**  
#56817

Caputo to Finnegan (1-10-13) “I have not responded either. My personal opinion is that I think we should delay providing data as long as possible. Rationale: I do not think it is in our best interest to have yet another set of noise contours released to the public prior to the ROD...regardless of what they look like. I know this is completely a civilian initiative, but it will only add to the confusion of the ignorant SOBs that are fighting the F35 beddown.” #56874

Ahmann to Caputo (1-11-13) “I agree with Pooter—any more added potential controversial information would not be good for us or this process. If we can delay until after ROD, then I think we should.” #56874

Poulos to Will (9-5-13) “There is a **strong speculation that the ANG is the leak to Sen Leahy’s office**....Lastly, Mr. P asked us if we know of any noise mitigation strategies that BVT could employ if selected. Maj Gen Cray (TAG-VT) said they currently fly noise profiles, but those weren’t taken into account with the F-35 noise contours. Mr. P would like to have a list available to present to the CSAF, SecAF on things that can be done if BVT is selected.” #62375

Ardern to Caputo (9-5-13) “Need your help, and fast. **Apparently your TAG has opined to someone in the Air Staff that there are many noise mitigation steps that you could take to reduce the impact of F-35 noise. I need a list and description of any ideas you have that you are not currently doing.** As I understand it, your current flight profiles (and nighttime hour restrictions) were applied to the Karnes 3 profiles and used in the EIS. What else do you have or could you do?” #62507

Czech to Rose (9-10-13) “I’m primarily responding to Pooter’s most recent email in this chain. I understand Pooter saying they’d like to incorporate revised departure tracks for Rwy 33... Ballparking, this could lessen the DNL to the northwest on runway heading by a few dB but would increase DNL under these new tracks by half as much on each... **I don’t understand Pooter’s response to the 2nd question**...Is Pooter saying these changes are just for the F-35 if it were to come to Burly or for the existing F-16s too? If the latter, then the difference to Baseline would, of course, be less than what I stated above.” #62507

Germanos to Ardern (9-11-13) “**Sounds to me like there would be a small decrease, but probably not enough to solve the issues. Since they are testing and implementing these procedures now (therefore apply to the F-16) if we have to adjust the baseline it would mask much of the improvement. But developing the procedures now and then not implementing them until the F-35 arrives is gaming the system.** And from the questions still to be answered, we can’t get this done by the end of Oct. Hold off; consider for an SEIS is my recommendation.” #62519

Flood to Leclair (10-10-13) “**ANG and Burlington: they did not want the property value issue changed from decreased to unknown. Obviously, the rest of the discussion today moved it to other considerations versus socioeconomic. It is now rated green.**” #63305

Barradell to Penland (11-4-13) “**A/B takeoffs are a safety of flight concern and the norm for even twin engine fighters. A quicker access, less runway used for T/O and therefore**

**more length to abort or put back down on the runway.** Based on temp and fuel weights, this can be anywhere from 1000-1500 foot difference in takeoff roll. This jet can FLCP at MAX fuel weight and therefore heavyweight takeoffs are the norm....Bottomline, **the acceleration and additional options afforded a single engine aircraft drive the takeoff to the more appropriate AB go and that is what is being executed by the services currently at Eglin.** Not sure why the other OPS tables did not reflect that, even considering the long runways at Eglin. Mil takeoffs are also above 85dB threshold and occur over the runway." #64767

Chamblee to Oliver (11-24-13) **"I have some concern about the comment below regarding afterburner use.** I seem to recall a discussion in which it was implied that we modeled Burlington without any afterburner use. Hopefully, that's just my aging memory failing again. Can you confirm what ACC modeled for afterburner use at Burlington? **If it was zero, the statement below will be inconsistent with the modeling.** "Reduced use of afterburners: Afterburner use during departure is required for heavy aircraft loads that must be carried to accomplish certain training missions. The number of afterburner departures reflects training requirement and reducing them further would adversely affect training for combat readiness." #65470

Kohns to Chamblee (11-25-13) "For what it's worth, page BR4-23 talks about afterburner use at Burlington - **I couldn't find anything in the main body of the EIS saying that we wouldn't use afterburners at Burlington.**" #65470

Engelman to Oliver (11-25-13) **"We modeled Burlington with AB, they said they were only going to use AB at some low percentage of operations so we modeled it based on what they said."** #65470

~~~~~

## Individuals mentioned in the citations

Ahmann, Michael L - LtCol USAF ANG 158 FW/XP "Torch"

Ardern, Thomas D – Civ GS-13 USAF ACC/A8BA "Hardturn"

Baczewski, David P - Col USAF ANG 158 FW/CC "Baz"

Barradell, Luke A - CDR USN AETC JSF/FIT

Bush, Jack – Civ GS-14 USAF AF/A7CIB

Caputo, Christopher P – LtCol USAF ANG 158 OSF/CC, F-35 Program Integration Ofc "Pooter"

Chamblee, Andrew K – Civ USAF AF-A3-5, Chief Bases, Ranges and Ops Sustainment

Chatman, Alexander A – LtCol OUSD (AT&L) JSF

Chupein, Edward - Civ USAF AF/A3O-BA

Clark, Joel A – Col USAF ANG 158 FW/FW

Cray, Steven A – Maj Gen USAF NGVT

Czech, Joseph J – Wyle, Principal Engineer

Dittmyre, Bruce A - Civ USAF ACC/A8BA

Downing, Micah -- Blue Ridge Research

Dryden, Larry H – Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7PS

Engelman, Lynn – Civ USAF AF/A7CIB, AF Noise/Encroachment Management

Ettenson, Gordon M - SES USAF AF/A3O, Deputy Director of Operations

Ferguson, Kathleen I – SES USAF HQ SAF/IE

Finnegan, Daniel P – LtCol USAF ANG 158 MXS/CC

Fick, Douglas E – Col USAF ANG 158 FW/FW

Flood, Kevin J – CTR USAF ACC/A8BA

Germanos, Nicholas M – Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7PS, Project Manager

Goodman, Will – Legislative Fellow, Office of Senator Patrick Leahy

Harris, Richard N – BGen USAF NGVT

Holland, James P - Civ USAF SAF/IEI, Deputy for Installation Policy

Jackman, Thomas W - Col USAF ANG 158 FW/CV

Kilbourn, Jennifer – Col USAF HQ ACC/A7N

Knudsen, Harry A – Civ USAF ANG NGB/A7R, Chief Resources Div

Kohns, Gerald P - GS-15 USAF HQ SAF/GC, Gen Counsel (Installations, Energy, Environment)

LeClair, Michael A - CTR USAF ACC/A5FO

Marek, Kevin P – Civ USAF ANG NGB/A7AM

Murr, Paul E - GS-14 USAF ACC/A8B “Shark”

Nelson, Lowell A – Col USAF SAF/IEI, Director, Planning and Programs

Nichols, George E - Maj USAF HQ SAF-FM, Congressional Appropriations Liaison

Oliver, Geoffrey S - CTR USAF SAF/IEI

Parker, Sheryl K – Civ USAF HQ AF ACC/A7PS, Environmental Analysis Project Manager

Penland, Michael W – Civ USAF AF/A3O-BR, AF Chief Operational Basing “Pappy”

Peter, Kevin J – CARDNO TEC, Principal

Pohlmeier, Mark A - GS-15 USAF HQ AF-A8PB, Chief Strategic Basing Division

Poulos, Steven L – LtCol USAF ANG NGB/A8FB, Chief Strategic Basing Branch “Ziptie”

Rose, Kathy L – CARDNO TEC, Principal

Thomas, Stephen W – Civ GS-13 USAF AETC/A5RJ, F-35 Program Analyst “Skid”

Will, Christopher J – Col USAF ANG NGB/A8F, Chief Force Planning Div “Blanks”

Wright, Adam G – Civ USAF ANG 158 MDG/SG, Environmental Manager