

**Compilation of
USAF F-35A Basing Administrative Record Findings**

This list was compiled from 8,000 files that were submitted by the United States Air Force Administrative Records (AR) regarding the F-35A basing in Burlington, VT.

These records were submitted for public view by the USAF in response to a lawsuit filed by the City of Winooski and Vermont citizens that cites multiple violations of the National Environmental Policy (NEPA) Act. NEPA regulates the environmental studies (EIS) that are required by federal law for such basing decisions.

These records, as submitted by the USAF, are not in chronological sequence, and there are many individual responses to email threads, so there is much duplication of conversations. The conversations are primarily between the ACC (F35 basing planners), EIS Manager (NEPA compliance), USAF HQ, and VT Air National Guard.

When searching for a specific record from the records, type in: AR000____ then fill in the rest of the number. Ex: AR00049037

Entries of particular significance are highlighted in yellow.

49037 - 49092: Tables w/ abbreviations and terms not understood. On AR49037 there are references to takeoffs, afterburners, and landings that apply to Burlington.

49098: Comments because "redlines/strikeouts supersedes this response."

49099: "unless carrying hvy wt ordinance." "Question accuracy of data showing noise for AB and Mil are 'equally' loud (F16 and F35A)."

49108: "In general the changes have reduced the potential impacts that had been defined with previous conditions and modeling parameters."

49110: "The draft has been revised so that the new Karnes 3 noise modeling could be incorporated."

49112: Query on EIS emissions factors; also 49114, 49115.

49118: Comment about insuring that EIS is reviewed for "policy consistency by competent authority."

49129-30: "Observations and questions concerning F35 OB noise contours." Reference to documents used and differences between Karnes 2 and Karnes 3 (noise modeling programs).

49135: Specific questions about noise at Burlington.

49140 - 42: "Pooter" has questions about noise-friendliness for community (Burlington area). One of his quotes: "I guess I'm thoroughly confused then...."

49551 - AR49999. This material has a lot to do with Hill AFB as well process in general.

49551 - 53: Talks about slanting EIS: "...the information contained in the F35 Ops Security and Policy Review draft can be utilized to determine areas of potential effect and lead the base to a 'no adverse effect determination, if appropriate.'"

49615: Some comments about F35 ops EIS consultation: "Looks like we can't say we've cleared internal S & P." "JA commented that the document would be legally insufficient."

49751 - 2: Comments about EIS presentation of Burlington noise: "I think it would be very misleading to change this to yellow as it would show no difference in the effect between baseline and proposed." Also comment about source of F16 baseline.

49790: Some comments about how Hill AFB EIS is poorly done: "The EIS in my opinion is not adequate for release for public comment unless we have perhaps some kind of revision in the Executive Summary offering more explanation on what is lacking."

49798: Table with references to Burlington AGS noise.

49826: More Hill AFB EIS comment: "We run the risk of delays after release of the draft to the public for comment, if consulting agencies identify significant issues that were not addressed in the Draft EIS potentially forcing us to re-release a Draft EIS to the public for further comment, before we can finalize the EIS and sign a ROD."

49854: A note from Lynn Engelmann, AF Noise/Encroachment Management: "Help! I received and (sic) email from Geral with concerns about the "tentativeness" of Karnes 3.1 profiles and statements that indicate these profiles could change."

49859: "The short answer is that the document is legally sufficient so long as some action in addition to sending out the IICEP letters to initiate NHPD consultation will have occurred prior to public release."

49886: From Caputo to Frank Cioffi about managing public meetings.

49924 - 44: Noise data from Mineral Wells and Edwards.

49964 - 88: Bullet points about F35A Operational Basing EIS. Has maps of impacted areas as well as following data:

Jacksonville Air Guard Station - A decrease of 10 off-base residents within the 65 dB DNL from 68.
McEntire JNGB - A decrease of 311 from 559.
Burlington AGS - An increase of 2863 over 3812.

50934. part of "HAF Review Comments for F-35A Operational EIS Public Hearing Materials" for DEIS. Date would have been sometime in April 2012 as request for comments went out on April 9.

Comment on Fact Sheet to be distributed at hearing, 5th paragraph: 'All Fact sheets page 8 Cultural and Traditional resources: What about resources listed on the National Register? Why are we doing Section 106 consultation when we say there are "no impacts to National Register-eligible resources"? '

53406 points out that the altitudes listed to be flown by the F-35 in the Ops EIS and the Training EIS are very different (and they give the details). the person says the altitudes should be pretty much the same, and that it "would be hard to explain" why they are different in the two EISs.

53433 is about afterburner use. They mention that the assumption that AB use would be the same everywhere (5% AB and 95% military power) may be an error. **They also mention that the VTANG saying they will never use AB does "not reflect reality."** It's common knowledge that the F-35s use AB at Eglin AFB a lot...but so far I have not found this stated in the AR. Remember the EIS DID NOT list the decibel level for AB use. This is an omission, since the EIS says the F-35 will use AB 5% of the time.

(**Record Reviewer** said: Most of the other emails I have been reading this afternoon have to do with the flurry of activity and "CYAs" over my raising the scoring error. In fact, a few times, various offices mentioned other offices CYA-ing, or trying to put the blame on other offices for the mistake. Don't know if this is a NEPA issue or not; but I'll list the ARs here just in case.)

53429: regarding the scoring problem, someone says "time to tell the truth"

One of the members of the South Burlington City Council publically stated that mistakes were made in the selection of Burlington. We don't think that is a correct characterization. The initial scoring gave Burlington high marks in environmental (we have checked and that is what was reported by NGB at the time). Our site survey team documented a potential problem in the site survey report and that was reported to the Secretary during the 'preferred alternative' decision brief. Subsequently, the Environmental Impact Analysis Process, using F-35 data not available when the Secretary made his decision, has identified specific problems which the Secretary will be made aware of and will consider when he makes his final decision in Oct/Nov prior to the environmental ROD.

53463: trying to explain the scoring error

53487: admits a mistake was made regarding "incompatible development"

53491: is a paper they put together explaining the AF strategic basing process (this is for our info only)

53520: seems that the emailer agrees with me...that there was an error...and it may be NEPA related (he works in the NEPA area)

53562 and 53590 show more letters from the three congressional delegates to the AF supporting the basing. I know this is not a legal issue. but I included it for info, especially since Leahy stated he was not involved. I also found a few more emails referring to him calling the CSAF to express his support for the basing.

53833: SIGNIFICANT ENTRY on the criticality of addressing the range issue "We feel these requirements are significant enough that they will actually drive the basing decision on where we put aircraft..." "We think we need to go back and include these requirements in the OPS EIS.." basically says this EIS should be redone because of the range issue; and other EIS should start with range requirements

53887: references a briefing on the three ACC ranges that the ACC spends money on

53896: says it is unknown how frequently the F-35 needs range training

53908: "actual training requirements...have not been defined...or captured in the EIS

53918: SIGNIFICANT ENTRY "the crux of the issue is this...**the EIS does not accurately reflect the bed down requirements**" then cites Burlington and the Adirondacks not meeting the requirements (still not known) and this could result in huge future costs "**inadequate understanding of the true costs in terms of money and readiness**"

53929: "open us up to NEPA issues down the line"

53938: a letter from Shumlin in support of the F-35. in it he says "F-16 continue to age out

53956: SIGNIFICANT ENTRY "we never defined in NEPA documents" "is that a NEPA foul?" "in violation of the foreseeable clauses in NEPA"

53966: SIGNIFICANT ENTRY "ACC F-35 range requirements differ substantially from range requirements used in initial screening for F-35 basing" "**Of greater concern, the F-35 OPS EIS may not fully capture the environmental impacts of these updated range requirements**"

53982: "much larger and more complicated than we thought before" regarding requirements for F-35 range as the **F-35 has a requirement to "drop" and have targets**

53990: "**ANG basing subterfuge**"

55170. It asks the question "How did we end up fielding the first ops squadron prior to OT&E?" short answer given is "concurrency"

55326. They reveal a major problem, and say "no mention" has been made of it. They also say it could affect other options/locations. **It's about how high the F-35 flies, and that it could interfere with commercial flights.** They say the F-16 flies 70-90% of the time BELOW FL230. But the F-35 flies 80% of the time ABOVE FL230. **They call this a "significant difference" and should have been coordinated with the FAA, as this altitude is where commercial airlines fly.**

55971, Penland talks about airspace. He is the one who said in an email I have "there really were no operational reason as to why Burlington is designated as the preferred ANG alternative." in 7-18-13. (I'm trying to find that email in the AR.)

59212 VTANG says F-16 phase out in 2020

59573: this is a Headquarters Air Force briefing on Total Base Score. It states in the powerpoint slide "in 2009 analysis 50% of a bases total score was attributed to the Range and Airspace available" this shows the importance of airspace and ranges and why so many AF SME (Air Force subject matter experts) are concerned about this issue

55765 they talk about changing criteria for future basing and how that might help VT's lawsuit.

55956 (they talk about already having chosen Hill and Burlington —entry is 11/13/12); 55923 from Jack Bush again talking about "range of alternatives"; and 55769 where they talk about runway safety and a **\$200 million plus cost for Burlington**; and

55981 very interesting, as they talk about the NEPA requirements and infer that what they have ...at that point... did not fulfill NEPA. They use the word "flaw" and "inconsistent argument" among others.

54106 Teresa Rudolph to Adam Wright seeking 106 advice. She advises no ground disturbance etc... so no adverse impact..if your talking about noise there are historic properties in 65 DNL but...already exposed to noise, so suggests no adverse impact as already exposed and the action would not change setting

54349 Germanos question to Finnegan #2 Can u confirm MTR's will not be used? Finnegan...it's ACC's call. ... MTR's have not been included in EIS process.

54343 Adam Wright ...to Kevin Marek...is there any cultural resource person at NGB that can assist with 106 process? don't want to make a mistake on the process.

54360 Adam Wright to Finnegan 8/28/12 As Long as BTV NEM comes out after ROD. It would be possible to modify F35 profiles.....we could not do for EIS (is this the reason for long delay in NEM?)

54377 Figure 1 Airspace Map Associated with BTV ANG

54394 Germanos to K Flood Re: F35 EIS & Range Airspace
Agree. I don't see how to address increase in training.... **and obvious need for greater range size without foregoing ANG decision,,then (Hill only) is what should go forward in ROD.**

54396 Jay Pearsall 8/29/12
Conops roughly the same for F35 and F16

54399 Jay Pearsall Misunderstanding of "optimum" airspace " what we got to research is will we need newer emitters on existing postage stamp ranges?

54410 MOST interesting comment from General Counsel Kohn Also see **54997 & 98** slide and US Air Force Powerpoint for Presenting to AF Secretary with serious BTV basing Concerns

Gerald Kohns Associated General Counsel to Penland/Polheimer 8/28/12 9:12 pm
Discussion Evolving Range Requirements He says: **I agree "we don't know" isn't going to cut it for...AF decision making,..since we know the FEIS is materially inaccurate in ways that have environmental implications.**

54440 Jack Bush Pentagon to Siders CIV Randy re: F35 EIS Discussion 9/4/12
Mr. Polheimer asked what (if anything) Navy & Marines doing to accomodate unique F35 range requirements within their EIS process

56047 from Jack Bush 2nd Page BIG issues NEPA 40 CFR 1502.14

56061 Airspace and Military Training Route Comments from Public + answers

56065 From Jack Bush 11/16/12 Contradictory statements within EIS analysis of range and impact areas

56076 from Penland to Teresa Rudolph 11/16/12 Has any one suggested more noise modeling? She replies..**sees problem with guard going on air ...creating expectations. "who knows what will do to noise.....could make worse somewhere else.**

56079 TO Donnelly... And 50 or so more people Starts out Mr Secretary and Chief, BLUF: EIS and ROD delayed

56127 11/19-20/12 Finnegan Bush And Noise Encroachment Mgmt Lynn Engleman Must Read- Finnegan explains how VANG can do "mitigaton" measures Noise Encroachment Mgmt **Lynn Engleman complaining about Finnegan assumptions that making power/climb fuel changes for F16 will be same for F35 "Of course they didn't bother to see where the noise did increase".**

Says first time Burlington SAW noise contours for F16 was when the baseline came out for Burlington alternative. Then adds. "Go home and drink heavily" Penland copied on this conversation emails.. "not to mention we were told they tried to do some of this stuff in simulator and it didn't work.

56567 Engleman to Germanos 12/14/12 3:03 Pm
Air guard reporting in news F35 does not use afterburner to take off EIS does not really state how many various take offs.... questions being asked-- "it would be really bad if they can't operate that way."

Germanos to Engleman 12/14/12 2:08 PM
latest ops update shows 1 %, this equates to 2 Afterburner take offs per month.

Engleman to Germanos 12/14/12
I checked with Wyle they say modeled at 5% Afterburner 95% mil power (we need to double check)

56570 Engleman to Penland 12/14/12 12:23 PM
Subject: RE: confusion on Burlington; Before Karnes (which shouldn't have change % of departure on afterburner) **But if it changed it's because ANG wanted it changed.**

56587 confusion.....(my word)
1 Nick Germanos says 1% Afterburner
2 Modeled with 5% Afterburner
3 Wyle did noise analysis for basing departures 9% AB

56591-56593 Guard may not want to take off with afterburner but until sure what plane can do--- 5% with 95 mil power

56682 Engleman to Germanos 12/19/12
Operations tables used for noise modeling 8099 field ops now drops to 5486 with F35 can find no obvious reason

56684 Concerns,,, operational assumptions baseline noise data

56698 Tables for F35 baseline noise contours

56817 Kevin Peter to Germanos
-24 Ops table and assumptions...how they arrived at 260 days (lets use 260 for all)

56841 Engleman to Jen Kilbourne 1/3/12 3:46 pm Official request for Ops tables and Assumptions F
Engleman says EIS Shows substantial reduction in airfield operations; F16 RAP tasker and the draft F35 RAP tasker do not appear to reflect this difference

Nick Germanos summarizes what ops table and assumptions are...

Penland to James Sample 1/4/2013 11:21...so reduced ops due to more activity in SIM- **what happens when SIM funding is cut?**

56874 Caputo 1/10/13 Harris wants data for developing noise contours
Thinks delay the data for developing noise contours to Harris as **will only add confusion of ignorant SOB's fighting the bed down.** Finnegan agrees delay sharing data until after bed down ROD

56903 Memo for ACC Assumptions in EIS for F35

56930 mentions analyzing range data and impacts

56959 ACC response to OPS EIS Assumptions from Andrew Chamblee to General Counsel Kohns

56960 Jack Bush to Germanos 1/25/13 Burlington AGS is consulting with Historic Resources for effects of listing in National Historic Register

56961 Germanos to Bush 1/25/13 Yes...including summarize consultations within SOW in the modification

Bush to Germanos 1/25/13 10:15 am I was reminded today to ensure results of relevant Historic consultations addressed in revised EIS. Then Bush gives specific example...for 106 Places on National Historic register.....

57032 2/24/13 Manipulation of data?
Handshake deal between ops reps to use same and higher estimates of training days in order to increase F35 training days.

57043 2/5/13
This reply illustrated how much informed conjecture went into the assumptions

57045 2/5/13
"no continuity to explain the rationale" for "30% reduction of F35 vs F16 flight operations."

57050
"EIS assumptions present a best case scenario for noise modeling." Guard has repeatedly stated that EIS was a *worst case* scenario

57051 2/5/13
"if our actual operations differ substantially from our assumptions, we risk legal action which will impact our operations. While we have a responsibility for thoroughness with every NEPA action, these large basing actions receive increased scrutiny and challenges and the opposition to the F35 has been more coordinated and vocal than most." "If you think this is still the best information available (30% reduction), we'll note it as a risk in our assumptions..."

57052 1/23/13
Questions and answers about training assumptions re: reduced # of operations of F35s vs F16s.
"the bottom line is that the numbers in the EIS are based on a template we sent to all 6 bases in early 2010..." "best estimates" "best guess by the experts...2.5 years ago..."

57055 2/6/13 EIS rewrite?
"What would happen to the EIS if we told them to re-write it for worst case on parody with current F16 ops?"

57061 2/6/13
"Need clarification regarding expected F35 use in approved range airspace"
Ans: None of the flight profiles have changed...such as the arbitrary operations above 23,000 cutoff mentioned in EIS

57076 2/6/13
From Bush: First portion redacted then:
Range capabilities discussed: "all six of the current ops candidate bases have adequate ranges and airspace nearby to accomplish all other require training done on a daily basis." "No changes need to existing airspace" See other comments.

57082 2/6/13
Pressure to split ROD from BTV so Hill can proceed with basing preparations.
"so that Burlington/range/sim/noise issues don't delay Hill"
because fielding timelines don't require a decision for a while. Waiting until we have better fidelity in squadron size, AC/RC mix, and training requirements may actually make delaying this decision palatable to leadership. It is the smart thing to do, and no one can argue with that...

(Reviewer remark: except for Sen. Patrick Leahy!)

57095 2/7/13
Discussion about moving F35s to other guard bases due to BTV legal action.

If SECAF agrees to separate the Ops ROD decision (we are recommending to COMACC that he support that position) the immediate follow on question re Burlington is "If not now, when?"

If Burlington and legal action does occur, is the AF going to fight it, in which case you would want to make the decision earlier. Or, can we fight it but also send ops 2 to another base waiting for the Burlington issue to be resolved then send assets to Burlington. Or, you could temporarily bypass Burlington and go to USAFE and then come back to Burlington.

57102 2/8/13
Discussion of costs for F35 basing at McEntire & Jacksonville - BOTH far less than BTV

McEntire:
in each of the seven aircraft maintenance bays to provide 28/270V DC power. The total cost of all the projects to support the F-35A beddown is estimated at \$1.175M in O&M construction costs, including design costs.

Jacksonville

cost of all the projects to support the F-35A beddown is estimated at \$415K in O&M construction costs, in addition to \$35K in design costs, for a total cost of \$450K.

57110 2/12/13

Questions re: Reduced SIMS usage (and more flight operations than predicted?)

change from the last RTM. Besides these few areas, I don't see anything in this RTM that would indicate a move toward more simulators, in fact the new change allows you to do less sims if you've flown more than required.

This seems to follow the pattern that we hear JPO/ACC leadership saying they will do more in the sim, but their written requirements don't seem to match. Am I missing something?

57116 2008 (requested as background info for range issues.)

Memo re: changes to Major Range and Test Facility

57119 2007 DOD Directive (requested as background info for range issues.)

Memo re: MRTFB

57130 2/4/13

Training days for ANG discussion (260 operations assumption)

57136 2/14/13 "newly identified, unresolved airspace training requirements"

It has come to my attention that ACC has requested that a suspension of work be issued for this project until at least 1-Jan-2013 due to newly identified, unresolved airspace training requirements and questions about the basing criteria. I understand the ACC Project Manager (Nicholas Germanos) or the Corps POC (Shellie Sullo) has advise HB&A of this situation.

The following docs are about controversy concerning F-35 flight altitude

58024

58027

58030

58042

58044

58046

58049

58070

58031 reaction to Boston Globe article

58059 Nooooo . . . not 60 minutes. we need to rethink this decision (this was a response to a cooperative email campaign from Burlington VT, Tucson AZ and Beaufort SC asking 60 minutes to report projected negative F35 impacts on these densely populated residential communities)

58061

58062

58064

58068

58069

58183

58184

native american nations need to call to ensure no comment

58067 58151 58153 58157 58158 58159 ...58167 58169 58175 58177

58076 further legal action is probable once a ROD regarding Burlington is signed (dated April 17, 2013)

58077 58140 58143 58145 58147 58150 **58178** 58190 change the paragraph where we put McEntire as environmentally preferred

58178 the real no action alternative ... which is not "do nothing."

58081 58083 58088 58095 58121 **58131** historic property request for VT conditional concurrence and response

58203 Shaw Georgia airspace: fewer missions higher altitudes

58212-AR58213 Privileged document withheld

58219 Hill and McIntire are overwhelmingly more environmentally preferable

58228-AR58229 Privileged document withheld

58232 My full comment did not get in--**this one is not going to get prettier no matter how much more we try to clean it up**, by Lynn Engleman, Noise Encroachment Management

58240 and AR58254 VTANG Command messages F-35: talking points including list of "questions we hope we don't get"

58246 response to comments inadequate

58277 AR58339 we are not looking for further substantive review, but require your review to ensure your comments are adequately addressed to enable public release of the EIS

58279-AR58282 Privileged document withheld

58327-AR58338 Privileged document withheld

58339 Privileged

58377 part is privileged. rest lists problems with revised draft EIS

58382 Privileged

58387 260 days per year not a true statement; a huge risk going forward; but changing that will require a redo of the noise analysis

EIS is still misleading about number of training days; **replaced original inaccurate statement with another inaccurate statement**

58392-AR58393 Privileged document withheld

58406 to 58431 and AR58438 AR58531-AR58535: 260 days assumed but recognized as not accurate for apples to apples comparison but VT ANG said 265 days

58440 and AR58462 AR58481 AR58503 AR58506 AR58509 Indian nation consultation summary

58465 inaccurate report to General Harris on noise effects

58468 their NIOSH noise table differs from our NIOSH noise table

58476 F-35 nuclear capability and nuclear weapons systems in Vermont question looking for neutral statement

58477 and AR58478 number of public comments on each side

58613 Shoshone Tribal concerns

58643 summary of changes to responses to comments to EIS

58652 responses to Richard Joseph's noise report: no direct response

58665-AR58666 Privileged Document Withheld

58667-AR58670 Privileged Document Withheld

58693 noise modeling questions: does it measure effect on structures?

58787 JSF airspace analysis process

58834 privileged document withheld

58842 airspace requirements

58884 noise modeling: no effect of noise on structures

58990 changed environmentally preferred from no action alternative to McIntire and why

I reviewed 60,000 to 61,000 and did not find anything. After the first 200 items, a report of which I sent previously, this section is almost entirely emails from the public to Germanos, (and most of them oppose the basing).

60012 and 60019: a letter from four South Burlington City Councilors that raised the issue of outdated noise health effect studies was not answered.

60020 a letter from a veteran saying citations should be enough and do not have to put thousand people out of their homes was not answered.

60027 first hand observation of children in noise zone

60035 and 60036 60042, 44, 46, 48 outreach to Tribes in WI and ME (Also did we contact the Tribes to request that these sovereign nations object? is it too late for them to object?) Also says there will be no impact to historic properties. Was that true?

60051 decision to not attend public meeting a good one! regarding BFP article about SB reversing decision

60058 process suspect

60079 no EIS in 2006 when external fuel tanks and use of afterburner

60085 60090 Lt Col Finnegan attempts to interfere with email comments

60092 and 60102 children at greater risk

60094 60098 60195 VTANG Capt Gookin calls for response to opponents statements about health impacts; is VTANG participating in civilian decision making? admission by Germanos that noise effects on children is inadequate

60112 and 60116 EIS says 55 dB DNL is needed for adequate margin of safety but EIS fails to give 55 dB DNL contour line; also 770 people are in 75 dB DNL contour and EIS fails to state recognition of its violation of its own health standard; also EIS omits 2011 WHO report; also EIS omits 2009 WHO report certain subgroups of children at particular risk from noise; also EPA point about children's ear canal and 20 dB difference; also cognitive impairment below 65 dB DNL

60122 noise and crash zones

60123 veteran letter hearing loss

60125 cognitive development of children

60126 pages missing from hard and soft copies of EIS

60130 noise data something is wrong with noise data

60132 disinclined to support creating a new dataset for additional higher fidelity acoustic data as this would affect technical underpinnings of F-35 basing effort

60134 only tasks on critical path to meet Record of Decision date (so are other tasks not being accomplished)

60141 realtor concern about unfit for residential use and accident potential zone for Winooski

60144 new resident and refugee trauma in refugee city of Burlington

60146 Ben Cohen points unanswered including cognitive impairment of children

60147 effect on Seniors by 80 year old unanswered

60161 only very old studies on cognitive impairment of children included, EIS fails to mention that health effects are cumulative, EIS fails to say how many children are in noise zone, fails to mention long term adverse consequences on children, out of date studies, harming children is incompatible with mission to defend,

60177 EIS says 55 dB is level to assure no health damage but EIS fails to give 55 contour

61000-62000. A large segment of the records in my assignment were copies of the public comments for the REIS

61560 - 7/7/2013 SIGNIFICANT ENTRY***

Chart describing basing criteria, (mission, environment, capacity), projects a negative financial impact for the region as a result of the basing

61577 - 7/18/2013

Breakdown of airspace scoring

61579 Range and Aerospace Attributes Chart

61588 - 7/18/2013

Memo asking for specifics why Burlington was the preferred site.

61597 - 7/18/2013

"My brain bleeds just thinking" about the pending lawsuits

61626 - 7/22/2013

61641, 61690 - 7/23/2013

Response by AF to Rosanne's email about the false info on the "Green Ribbon" group's postcard campaign.

61696/61699 - 7/25/2013 SIGNIFICANT ENTRY***

Finnegan asks why no EIS done for increase in AB use in 2006

"Question is not relevant to the F-35 Basing EIS

61712

Comments from VTANG re: errors/inconsistencies in REIS

61726

Chart notes Burlington high risk of litigation
Preferred alternatives selected in July 2010, 2 years before EIS assessment
Incorrectly states length of BIA runway as 9,009
Burlington – threat of legal action very high

61907 - 8/27/2013

Discussing Jimmy Leas request for info:
"if we had mitigation measures." Seems to acknowledge that there aren't any.

61916 - 8/8/2013

Discussion of airspace requirements and its inclusion in the EIS

61978

Edits to responses to FEIS comment

62071 [informational] Hope to complete any litigation in time so we don't have to bed down at another location—at least until mid 2015 before we need to discuss.

62123 Airspace and range complaints by an anti- Vermont speaker at meeting

62125 Comparing ranges and airspace

62136 Mr Horace Shaw's comments seem credible.

62137 Horace's "seem credible" comments in a letter to Germanos

62144 Horace's comments not adequately addressed in EIS

62145 Horace's comments already addressed in EIS

62151 Response to Horace

62154 Re Horace's comment

62158 AF vulnerable to lawsuit. List of issues on which Burlington is suing or will likely sue.

62185 Range issues

62293 Burlington decision had nothing to do with airspace. **We can't claim Burlington has the best airspace.** If we don't have other reasons besides airspace we should rethink who should be picked.
Airspace data on the 6 bases

62303 Notes from Leahy's call to Gen Welsh

62342 Delete columns relating to airspace and range. These topics were 50% of the scoring back in 2009

62389 [informational]Caputo's fairly longlist of possible mitigation steps

62394 Brig Gen Harris thinks **safety is (or is one of) the AF highest priorities in peacetime *only***

62417 [informational]_More on Caputo's mitigation steps

62436 manpower (cost?) issues at different bases compared

62486 SIGNIFICANT ENTRY

Mitigation? "the results of the EIS indicate Burlington is the wrong answer of all the alternatives".
Why would you think that the noise at Burlington can be addressed with mitigation? Outside of purchase and relocation of those affected, I don't know what could be done."

62507 mitigation, F-16 baseline

62512 Mitigation "small decrease (in DNL) but not enough to solve the issues", F-16 baseline, gaming the system

62544 Guidance given to show as yellow on "population exposed" (later overturned to red) Attempt to manipulate data (?)

62577 Airspace. Burlington has best airspace? Seeking reasons why the Secretary would select Burlington

62590 Airspace

62611 Composite materials beyond the scope of the EIS.

62723 Acknowledges Burl has shortest runway length

62727 Will have to address questions opponents raised about runway, crash and fire risk, composite materials, minimal flying hours.

62759 Germanos acknowledges FAA buy outs in So Burl done where noise and "housing market effect" was greatest. Table 3.10-3 skews the data on acreage.

62766 Cara M JohnsonGS14 USAF agrees with Rosanne: Burlington is not the right choice.

62808 Changes to the EIS on noise ratings should be discussed "over the phone"

62875 Caputo tells Joan Shannon that without the F-35 VTANG will have no mission.

62885 Range issues—cost, how close, unlike AF, guard does not usually own range, no EW range at Burlington, not sustainable option, etc.

62888 Range issue: AF/A30 told us not to consider emitters etc. as part of the basing decision.

62948 9/27/13

62957 9/27/13 Projected hours by 2020 – 700,000

62963 9/27/13 Memo asking how (did we) come up with overall noise ratings?

62961 Chart showing Burlington highest noise score out of all sites.

64637 there is a HAF briefing that goes into detail about the various options (bases) and shows the pro and cons for each. It's a good reference.

64764) they mention receiving my email and attachments, as well as your email (and others). They also mention that "safety" is one issue mentioned in the comments received.

64771 is all about crashes and response to it. they specifically mention composite fires and cite some of the past accidents. say **"it is doubtful mutual aid partners are fully trained in responding to incidents with composite materials.**

65064 is a paper laying out why Burlington (and Hill) were selected and the other bases were not. Very good info

**65108: SIGNIFICANT ENTRY:
Program manager disagrees with Burlington being chosen**

65148: Briefing on why Burlington chosen

65168: Burlington chosen as preferred alternative in 2010

65180: Site Survey for Jacksonville, FL (17 Dec 2009)

65218: Site Survey for McEntire, SC (7 Jan 2010)

65253: chart with Basing Comparison Analysis

65255: Site Survey for Burlington, VT (20 Nov 2009)

65329: another version of the ANG Basing Comparison Analysis

65331: from AF Congressional liaison: "Either way the decision goes down, this is going to be bad"

65337: another version of the Basing Comparison Analysis

65344: AF action officer response when asked to craft an answer: "Can't answer the question 'Why did the AF choose Burlington AGS when the EIS clearly showed more people would be affected by the noise of the F-35?'" And, later, "AF is not going to mitigate the noise"

65356: mentions Burlington media's letter to the White House; also discusses Dumont's letter on safety related to crash with composite materials

65361: states that Lt Col Caravello cannot be considered an authoritative source on crashes/fire responses; cites NEPA requirements

65370: talk about NEPA requirements in relation to composites

66026 SIGNIFICANT ENTRY: Astounding confession of NEPA problems