

AIR FORCE STATEMENTS EXPRESSING DOUBT ABOUT BASING THE F-35A IN BURLINGTON

Marek to Faaborg (4-5-10) "Have no comments on the environmental sections for the F-35 three locations. **I would question the statement that noise will not be a problem at Burlington, VT.** This will be proven by the follow on scoping meetings and public hearings at Burlington. The airport does not have a big land foot print and sensitive receptors are located not far off the airport runway ends. I am not suggesting changing the statements made in this site survey. The EIAP with final EIS will provide the needed inputs for the decision makers." #40928

{The following three email exchanges are part of #46447}

Unidentified Sender to Penland (12-10-10) "**HAHA! But the toughest part of this exercise is for anyone with integrity is that it IS a freakin' loud aircraft! The only aircraft I have ever flown formation with that I can hear in flight from route position. (Now...forget I said that, and delete this email, and empty your trash. And the double-secret network trash cache, too!)**"

Penland to Spacy (12-10-10) "**Just so you know I'm not the only one who thinks this is an issue!! This is from someone who has flown with them.**"

Spacy to Penland (12-10-10) "Wooooow! Thanks for keeping me in the loop—please keep it up!" #46447

Engelman to Nelson (4-1-11)

"If we are this schedule [sic], we might as well not release till the technical session because it will take at least that long to push it if we are on hold. I have already gotten a phone call from Skid Thomas on this and I told him the plan was to get it out prior to the summit meeting. We need to make sure that everyone understands that these profiles DO NOT dictate how people will fly the plane, they are simply going to model noise.

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), this 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 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.**

The only real changes we can do to shrink the total area of the noise contours vs shift them from short and wide to long and narrow is to do a more or less straight up on end departure and steeper

approaches with shorter final approach. **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

Penland to Dutkus (4-18-11)

"A letter from Sen Leahy from Vermont pushing for use of Karnes 3 is what started us down this road. At the time Karnes 3 was still in development and was showing lower power settings and potentially lower noise. Reduced noise contours may or may not come to fruition as the speeds changed as well and increased exposure time, so it may be a wash. Karnes 3 was not originally planned to be used in the current/ongoing EIS for F35, but as a refinement later on down the road. Sen Leahy somehow found out about it and pushed to include it into OPS EIS that is ongoing.

The other part of the politics is the issue with the city of Valparaiso outside of Eglin. They have sued us once and dropped the lawsuit while we looked at other options. However, when the Eglin SEIS hits the streets it will have the same preferred alternative as before and we assume they will sue us again. That is why we must be able to explain the big difference between the Mineral Wells and Edwards data, as it will come up and we could be accused of cooking the books.

This has far reaching implications as a legal challenge to the Eglin SEIS could put all F35 EISs at risk. This is MGen Weida and Lt Gen Carlisle's concern." #47410

Penland to Chupein (6-6-12) **"So, can we take this opportunity to make a strategic efficient basing decision and rethink putting 18 F-35 out in the middle of nowhere!?"** #52586

{The following six email exchanges are part of #53429 and 53435}

Gersten to Hostage (6-28-12) "A quick update on F-35 environmental issues at Burlington: BLUF: **The ongoing environmental analysis process has identified encroachment issues – both incompatible development and noise – at Burlington. The environmental noise profiles estimate that over 1300 additional homes will be in the 65 db zone. We do not have a good feel for how this will impact Burlington's ultimate F-35 basing status** but expect that the final decision will be made in Oct/Nov 2012 prior to the environmental record of decision.

DETAILS:

Burlington is one of three ANG bases identified as a F-35 candidate base for ANG Ops base 1 and is the preferred alternative. The other ANG bases are Jacksonville AGS and McEntire JNGB. One of the members of the South Burlington City Council publicly 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.**

This finding has generated enormous public response from the City of South Burlington and the Town of Winooski, Vermont. The City Council has submitted a detailed response to the environmental analysis and is engaging Senator Leahy. **SAF/IEI expects a Congressional from Senator Leahy and will explain that the basing candidate list was made on information available at the time."**

Howe to Sabochick (6-28-12) "A5 update to COMACC on **F-35 NEPA process raised matters of noise and incompatible development at Burlington** ... matters that should be expected to evolve over the course of the NEPA process."

Sabochick to Germanos (6-28-12) "Nick, any feedback on this?"

Dryden to Germanos (6-28-12) "**Nows [sic] the time to tell the truth**"

Germanos to Dryden (6-28-12) "Do you want to go down with me to talk with John?" #53429

Edwards to Satori (6-28-12) "There are a few pieces coming together on this one. A8 just indicated that a **former AF officer and now a reporter has a report that shows Burlington was not a very good candidate for the F-35. Environmentally it scored poorly compared to Jacksonville and McEntire. And still it was selected. I am wondering if there is a little CYA starting to emerge. I also wonder if someone is trying to blame ANG for this decision which was not ours. Ric is on a call right now that might shed more light on this but I am getting details from a few different places that are interesting**" #53435

Murr to Bush (8-29-12) "**As to McEntire's score/relative rank. We don't return to the EWL score once the Secretary picks candidate bases. If we did, McEntire would have moved up the list of one squadron bases possibly as high as #2. They were given less than great scores on environmental; our site survey revealed they should have gotten a maximum score.**" #54372

Ettenson to Pennington (9-10-12) "I confess I am surprised not heard any of this in basing meetings—maybe it has been a churn at lower levels?. The Green Mt folks are strongly independent. I presume they do not want the noise? **And, it appears that this is a first in my basing experience where the community does not support the Guard. Interesting dynamics at the state (Senate) level?"** #54609

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

Yonkers to Wolters (9-12-12) "I would suggest at the appropriate time a visit to Burlington to dispel the accusations being made in this letter and try to gain some control of the outcome. **Frankly, if the 'community' at large is so diametrically opposed to the JSF at Burlington – (or other AF missions) – it should give us pause on this decision.** Part of what is not being said – or communicated here – is that just because Burlington is high on the score – it is not a foregone conclusion that the AF will put the mission there. In my mind, this is the crux of the discussion with the Chief – and **what our plan B will be vice Burlington** – and what are the pro's and con's." #54655

Kohns to Engelman (9-26-12) "Do we have something on noise effects and health if/when the Board finds out that 65 dB isn't good for you?" #54809

AF/CV comment (9-20-12) "This may sound naïve but setting the scoring issue aside, do we really want/have to base F-35s at a base where the community doesn't want them when there are so many other communities that do? Worth a discussion. I think we have one scheduled." #55318

{The following five email exchanges are part of #55754}

Penland to Engelman (10-18-12) "Mr Pennington has been told this week by ANG guys at Burlington that they plan to do partial fuel and reduced throttle takeoffs. I remember a discussion when we were doing Karnes 3 about fuel loads. Did they model reduced fuel loads? If they did, I never remember any discussion of takeoffs in other than mil or A/B, do you??"

Engelman to Penland (10-22-12) "No, it will depend on the contractor. This question becomes does it really reduce noise that much and what is the trade off for training. I know the Guard person wanted to do something different from traditional operations from the beginning but we wanted repeatable process by which we developed the flight profiles as was discussed when we set up the Karnes 3 effort. Additionally because we didn't have performance information relative to the aircraft we were leery of making any assumptions.

Is the Guard willing to conduct all their training with less than full tanks, does anyone understand consumption of this aircraft. (e.g. F22 gets 20 minutes without external stores when not in super cruise). While there is the argument for the simulator, have the guard folks ever flown their entire training sortie in the simulator (which, oh wait, they don't know what it is til later on) so they understand what the fuel consumption is? How will taking off with less than full fuel, effect training efficiencies and need for refueling during the training? Seems like to me there are other questions than the noise.

If we go down this route then the whole encroachment argument that we have to train like we fight goes out the window. When will Guard pilots get experience using full AB if they don't do it at their

home base. Perhaps this a discussion that has to take place on all training and specifically on this issue at the ANG/A3 types - **are we willing to not train like we fight just to fit aircraft in place when there are “reasonable alternatives“ for that location.**

If we actually had some facts and figures for this aircraft, real time, we could fund an optimization modeling effort that looks at trading off fuel, noise and training time, looking at various flight tracks, as well as fuel load.“

Penland to Engelman (10-22-12) **“I think the ANG is grasping at straws trying to figure out what they will say when Burlington sues us. We also heard that the way the F-16s fly out of Burlington was not working in the F-35 sim right now.**

Engelman to Penland (10-22-12) **“Without information it is hard to know if this will reduce noise, and if they do go up to full power then where does the noise increase - away from the base? all sorts of details that should be thought about before we go down this road. Sigh.“**

Penland to Engelman (10-26-12) **“Just heard from the F-35 guys at Eglin and they strongly do not recommend any partial fuel load takeoffs.“ #55754**

Drambruskas to Flood (10-22-12) **“Big picture question: do we want to change/update the criteria in the middle of the EIS/basing process? Will that open up the USAF to potential legal issues with VT, etc/ unnecessarily? (i.e. ‘We knew you were covering something up, look, they changed the criteria for the next bases....’) Is it desired/required to keep it consistent across all of the basing decisions?“ #55765**

Thomas to Villemaire (10-29-12) **“...If we need to spend \$200M plus to retrofit Burlington, we could spend money more cost effectively elsewhere. Who is pushing this? We need to get the ACC based safety mindset aligned with SAF/IE. This mindset will kill the ANG out of fighters. ANGRC will need to vet this concept against the FAA and hold those making that approach accountable to Congress.“ #55769**

Robins to Freeman (1-18-13)

“VT CODEL (Sen Leahy/Sen Sanders/Rep Welch) Staffer visit to discuss F-35/KC-46 Environmental scoring discrepancy on Candidate scoresheets

` Led by Sen Leahy’s staff (Will Goodman) ; FMBL, LLP, A8PB, IEI office call

` **CODEL wanted to know why F-35 was the first Strategic Basing Program action we undertook, and the environmental data call utilized ‘forecasted’ noise and encroachment measures (2011)**

‘ **KC-46 was about the 200th basing action we had done, and the process had evolved. Now we use ‘actual’ noise and encroachment models.**

` **During F-35, the ANG was optimistic that their encroachment could be rolled back, but we don’t do that now**

Burlington scored so high, regardless, it's doubtful they would have made candidate grouping should the envmt score been 0

More importantly, **site survey teams visited Burlington and captured the ground truth** for Burlington's environmental issues. The **SecAF** was well aware of these conditions, considered it with all the other information in aggregate, and **still picked Burlington as the Preferred Alternative**

ANALYSIS: **CODEL staffers were happy, relieved, and very supportive of answers provided**" #56950

Chupein to "Lothar" (no date) "We recently briefed A3/5 on the F-35 Ops EIS, and he questioned us on the ops assumptions. We posed the questions to your basing shop in ACC/A5B and received the attached response. **It is a reasonable reply, but it illustrates how much guess work went into the assumptions.**

As you know, if our actual operations differ substantially from our assumptions, we will likely be sued which will impact our operations. This is especially risky with this EIS, because there are groups strongly opposed to the F-35 and the EIS assumptions present a best case scenario for noise modeling.

I'd like your thoughts on the basic premise that F-35's will conduct ~20% less airfield operations per year than the F-16s they are replacing. If you think this is still our best guess, we'll note it as a risk in our assumptions and move forward. If you think we will not achieve that level of reduction, we'll task it back to ACC for further analysis." #57050

Murr to Pohlmeier (2-7-13)

"...Attached are the slides we prepared to increase COMACC's SA for the SECAF basing update. **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?" For Burlington w/o legal action you can delay as late as FY16 [no MILCON, O&M only, FAA July 20; EIS will be 3 years old]:**

If not Burlington then when for McEntire or JAX? We are working that but no MILCON required at McEntire, flow their B52 aircraft to B30 unit, minimum transition cost, someone would have to pick up ACA unit at Homestead so that will have to be worked

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, we can 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 get to USAFE and then come back to Burlington.**

Depending on proposed course of action the timing of Ops 3 decision varies but I think you can safely say a year to staff options and not delay Ops 3 beddown.

I can begin working this question more formally but may spook the herd. Your call." #57095

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

F-35 Ops EIS HAF/ACC Telecon and Follow-on Discussion, 28 March 2013

“1. A telecon was led by Mr Pohlmeier (HAF/A8PB) and Col Ed Oshiba (HAF/A7CI) on the afternoon of Thursday, 28 March 2013. The purpose of the telecon was to initiate HAF-ACC discussion regarding HAF’s findings and directions on its preliminary security and policy review of the draft final F-35 Ops EIS. *{A list of attendees follows, and the general directions regarding required documentation}*

4. After the telecon with HAF/SAF ended, ACC participants **discussed the contents of the preliminary draft Record of Decision, which states that the environmentally preferred alternatives are Hill AFB (24 total F-35 scenario) and McEntire ANG Base (18 total F-35 aircraft), for the ACC and ANG basing decisions, respectively. Due to the overwhelming evidence provided by the EIS documentation, A7P proposed the ROD recommendation to be structured around Hill and McEntire for the decision maker. To make the position, A5B needed to discuss the basis/reasoning for identifying Burlington ANG Base as the preferred ANG basing alternative in basing scoring model. ACC/5B leadership indicated that there is no operational benefit of Burlington ANG base over McEntire ANG base, and that Burlington scored higher than McEntire overall due to incorrect scoring (Burlington scored higher than it should have been and McEntire was scored lower than it should have been regarding encroachment and development) during the initial enterprise wide look. Furthermore, ACC/A5B provided information that the reasoning is that its older F-16 (Block 30 versions) would have to be replaced before McEntire and other ANG based, newer F-16 aircraft. Discussions revealed that there would be minimal costs to relocating the Block 50 F-16 from McEntire to Burlington if the decision was made for the OPS 3 basing at McEntire.**

5. The matter was breeched to ACC/A5B leadership as to how to proceed regarding the identification of the ANG operationally preferred alternative. Mr Murr indicated that **he would have a follow-on discussion with Mr Pohlmeir [sic] regarding the preference of McEntire over Burlington.** Once input is provided, ACC/A7PS will direct completion of the draft ROD, and submit to HAF/A7CI for review.”
#57838

DRAFT REVIEW DOCUMENT OF “Environmentally Preferred Alternative” in the EIS

“The environmentally preferred alternative for Air National Guard (ANG) basing locations is McEntire ANG Scenario 1 (18 total F-35A aircraft). This ANG represents the greatest decrease in the amount of acres, population, households, and receptors exposed to noise levels 65 dB DNL and greater when compared to either its baseline or No-Action Alternative. This is also true when you compare McEntire ANG Scenario 1 among the other two ANG basing locations and their associated scenarios.

Basis of Decision (Note to reviewers: **While the EIS has, by overwhelming evidence, proven McEntire ANG to be the environmentally preferred alternative, Burlington AGS was previously identified as the preferred alternative. The EIS team is unable to craft justification language or rationale to continue supporting Burlington as the preferred alternative. Please provide information/evidence that may be used in the ROD to justify a decision that transcends the environmental evidence presented in the EIS.** #57909

Dryden to Murr (4-1-13) “**Per our discussion following last Thursday’s (28 March 13) telecon with HAF, request inputs from your follow-on conversation with Mr Pohlmeier, AF/A8PB, regarding advice on**

the identification of McEntire vice Burlington ANG basing that aligns the environmentally preferred alternative with the operationally preferred alternative. We cannot proceed with completion of the draft ROD until this advice is received. A MFR reflecting the main points of the HAF/ACC 28 March 13 telecon and follow-on discussion is attached for your continued information and use." #57919

{The following three email exchanges are part of #57921}

Murr to King (4-4-13) **"Were you aware that (according to ACC/A7P) the EIS indicates that McEntire is the "environmentally preferred alternative?" Does the AF care? From an ACC perspective and an operational perspective, I am pretty certain we do not care."**

Murr to Pohlmeier (4-4-13). "I need to modify my earlier email; the DRAFT ROD (extract attached) indicates that McEntire is the "environmentally preferred alternative?" We have been asked to provide rationale for why Burlington was/is selected which we will do based on Ms F brief to Congress Jul 10. I guess my question still stands."

Murr to Dittmyre (4-4-13) "Please prepare a justification for Nick to use in the ROD explaining why Burlington was selected in lieu of the environmentally preferred base of McEntire. Use Ms F's brief from July 10." #57921

Pohlmeier to Penland (4-15-13) "Nooooo...not 60 minutes. **We need to rethink this decision.**" #58059

Germanos to Penland (7-18-13) **"We are looking for the specifics of the model to show how the quantitative scores were arrived at for each of the ANG candidates, for example the 55 max points for RAP, and how each subset of RAP (Proximity, volume, availability) contributes to the 55 points. Even more importantly, we are looking for specifics to mention in the Record of Decision showing operational reasons as to why Burlington is designated as preferred ANG alternative."** #61626

Penland to Sample (7-18-13) **"I think the important thing you need to realize is there really were no "operational reasons as to why Burlington is designated as the preferred ANG alternative". Not from an airspace range perspective anyways."** #61626

Will to Efferson (8-16-13) **"...ACC's intention is to delay the BTV decision until NLT 1QFY16. The rationale for the split is Hill is on a much shorter timeline to get MILCON laid-in. They get their first aircraft in Sep 15. They are late to need and are saying they can't get bogged down in the political/legal issues in BVT. BVT, by contrast, is early to need. The EIS is valid for 5 years, and the jets aren't set to arrive before FY19/20. The lawsuit, combined with the revised noise assessments make BVT politically problematic in the short term. In fact, ACC briefed that both McEntire and Jax are preferred environmental alternatives..."** #62048

Murr to Penland (8-30-13) "With this data, do you now agree among the three ANG candidate bases, although all of them have good airspace for F-35 training, Burlington has the best airspace? **I am seeking reasons why the Secretary did and would select Burlington in lieu of the others.**" #62293

Penland to Murr (8-30-13) "Since we still do not really know exactly what the F-35 is going to need until after OT&E is complete, I wouldn't walk that particular plank. I was just at Eglin and sat through an F-35 capabilities brief from the guys that are flying this jet daily and I just think **there are too many unknowns to say anyone had the "best airspace". I support delaying the decision on Ops 3.** If it is not delayed I will fully support for this round everyone has adequate airspace that meets what you currently think they will need, **but saying anyone has the "best airspace" is just too much of a stretch as this point.**

As to why the Secretary picked Burlington as a preferred alternative before, my understanding is airspace had nothing to do with it and I would avoid trying to make the case now that it does or was why he picked it last time or should this time. If we don't have other good reasons for picking Burlington beyond airspace, we need to think hard about what really should be picked." #62293

Chupein to Penland (8-30-13)

"Pappy's on point. **The decision to identify Burlington as the preferred alternative, by all accounts, had nothing to do with airspace. Nor can we empirically claim that Burlington has the best airspace as we don't have the testing to support the claim. It's not a defensible discriminator. We're advocating to A3/5 leadership to split the Ops 1 and 3 RoDs. Likewise, we're promoting the integrity of the EIS and SB process as a means to consider all reasonable alternatives and to make the best, informed decision. We can't back this in. My recommendation is to avoid unsubstantiated or dubious qualitative statements and let the data stand on its own. Military judgement will account for other considerations."** #62293

~~~~~DOCUMENT SHOWING LEAHY DIRECTED THE AF TO SELECT VTANG~~~~~

Nichols to Martin, Ferguson, Thomas (9-3-13)

"Ma'am/Generals:

**Notes from today's phone conversation between Senator Leahy and General Welsh.**

**-Sen Leahy opened with casual conversation and wanted to be a little more "parochial" concerning F-35**

**-He strongly supports F-35 in Vermont. Tiny vocal minority that is against it. He has received over 200 letters from the group; however, he has over 13k signatures for it**

**-He strongly urges the AF to not delay the RoD in light of the rumor that there would be a two year delay for Ops 3 (ANG)**

**-He understands the rationale of splitting the decision into two RoDs, one for Active Duty and one for ANG but asks for little or no delay in the two RoDs**

- By not delaying the Guard decision affords more planning time prior to delivery of aircraft
- He concluded with a huge compliment of the current TAG and unit. "They are doing a great job and are the most loyal, patriotic people in the world. You would be proud of them and they would not disappoint you if they got the F-35."
- General Welsh explained the current status of the basing process and offered to call Sen Leahy back once he and the SecAF get more information and get closer to making a decision
- Gen Welsh promised he would keep the TAG and Sen Leahy's staff informed of each step as we come to a decision

Tasks:

- FMBL will take lead on informing Sen Leahy's staff about the phone conversation
- Set-up follow-on engagement in late-Sept to mid-Oct with Sen Leahy
- LL will take lead on informing LtGen Clarke, 1 AF/CC, about the phone conversation

VR

George" #62303

~~~~~

Engelman to DeVine (9-4-13) (Responding to Greco LTE) "FYI, note the statements she says the EIS makes. Defining what is compatible means is growing in importance. Compatibility is buzz word that gets used but not explained in NEPA documents, or in AICUZ documents -people are interpreting it all sorts of ways." #62315

{The following seven email exchanges are part of #62342}

Penland to Nash (9-4-13) "We had asked that the last two columns on Table 2-6 be deleted. It looks like they are still there. Did we get a response from ACC that they would not take those out?"

Germanos to Rose (9-4-13) "Any comment on the last two columns of Table 2-6? I thought we had decided that the last two columns were important enough to remain."

Rose to Germanos (9-4-13) "We left the two last columns per mutual decision. They have been there since the draft and to remove it would be suspicious—more importantly— we put those columns in there in the first place as a result of AF input."

Penland to Nash (9-4-13) "It will only serve to confuse the issue when we have to go over to the Hill and explain how we picked one alternative over another."

Germanos to Rose (9-4-13) "Anything to add? I would say the columns in 2-6 are important because they refer to airspace requirements. Not sure why this is a problem."

Rose to Germanos (9-4-13) “Hmm, don’t have anything to add. ACC scored the comment but did not concur with removing the last two columns in Table 2-6. Was inserted by AF request (they indicated they had used that information as part of the alternative identification process) and has been in the previous two versions of the document. **Removal of the columns would only invite comments from the Burlington public and make the impression that the Air Force is hiding something.”**

Penland to Nash (9-4-13) “It will in fact cause an issue, because we will brief our A3O and Mr Pease not to support going forward with EIS ROD if they don’t take out these two columns or delete the table all together. Airspace and Range availability were 50% of the score back in 2009 and our office did the airspace scoring. The information in that chart was not used...We’ve brought this up over and over again for months and unless someone can articulate what that chart means or what those numbers were used for, we are not going to support it going forward. That chart is way too easy for some staffer to pull out and make an issue of why one place was selected over another. It will fall to us to explain it.”
#62342

Bush to Germanos (9-11-13) “The issue will be how we address mitigation for noise in the ROD, if Burlington is picked for Ops 3.” #62486

Dryden to Bush (9-11-13) “**Why would you think that the noise at Burlington can be addressed with mitigation? Outside purchase and relocation of those affected, I don’t know what could be done. The results of the EIS indicates Burlington is the wrong answer of all the alternatives.**” #62486

Germanos to Kilbourn (9-13-2013) “We did show Burlington as “Red” in population exposed....The 12 Sept sheet reflects weights that Lynn and I agreed to yesterday morning, but shows Burlington “yellow” population exposed due to guidance given on 3 Sept (later that same morning, once it was realized that the slides had been released to Sen. Leahy), but turned-over yesterday afternoon.” #62544

Flood to Dambruaskas (9-16-13) “With this data, do you now agree that among the three ANG candidate bases, although all of them have good airspace for F-35 training, Burlington has the best airspace? **I am seeking reasons why the Secretary did and would select Burlington in lieu of others.**” #62577

Germanos to Flood (9-24-13) “**...the bottom line here is that the last Burlington Part 150 done in 2011 is much different than the baseline, due to how the existing F-16 Ops was modeled per the ANG’s inputs (with afterburner use, etc.).** You’ll see from the table you referenced that there is a very large increase in residential land use for proposed 18 PAA (564 residential acres — ANG scenario 1), vs. part 150 (103 residential acres).” #62759

Germanos to Dryden (9-23-13)

“I want to go on record that I respectfully disagree with Col Will’s recommended approach and the points he makes below, part of what we discussed earlier today. There is a socioeconomic effect to Burlington house values within the proposed contours that has already been realized, and this issue must be overcome through the litigation process with the “reverse condemnation” accusation that we’ll have to address/answer. We have history that it was an issue (buy-out program) with the additional F-16 noise - we would be doing the AF senior leadership a disservice if the issue wasn’t included, and if the socio-economic category for Burlington wasn’t rated Yellow.

The second bullet on slide 30 does not “subjectivize” the post-cards — it is a true statement of fact as to what is pre-printed. The bullet is important because it is impossible to determine whether the people who submitted the postcards would still support the beddown if each knew that the pre-printed “similar sound” reason on the postcard was factually inaccurate (health effects notwithstanding). Since the “similar sound” statement on the postcard can be proved to be factually inaccurate (Table BR 3.2-1), I am at loss to understand the Col’s claim that we are “subjectivizing” the point. To not include the bullet would be overtly misleading and intentionally withholding important qualifying information. Additionally, the people who wrote out statements on the “opposing” postcards were not told what to say. Each of these is totally unique.” #62688

Penland to Johnson (9-24-13)

“I just got a phone call this morning from Rosanne Greco from Burlington (retired AF Col who is on the city council). She got my name somehow, not sure where. I really just listened to her but she said they have been made aware of the unique safety/environmental issues when a composite aircraft crashes. I told her I wasn’t an expert in that and couldn’t really comment on it. She also mentioned that they have a lawyer and are prepared to sue us. **Cara, she said what you said, ‘I read the EIS and it leads me to believe that Burlington is not the right choice.’** She also said that the local ANG is contradicting what the EIS is saying and creating confusion on what information they should believe. She said she is concerned that the senior decision makers are not getting their concerns. My only comment to her, that I repeated a couple of times, was that we (AF) has worked very hard to make sure what is in the EIS is the correct information and that it was my job to make sure our leaders have all the operational information, good or bad, so that they can make an informed decision.” #62766

Dryden to Germanos (10-15-13) “Let’s discuss my comments and how we will resolve those comments when you have a chance. **Kathy’s responses substantiate my comments in that they were only inserted at the request of the VANG but have no supporting documentation in the EIS...thus they need to be edited/deleted to accurately portray the facts of the EIS.** You may note my e-mail exchange with Kathy regarding her statement that we have exceeded her contract requirements for editing the ROD. We need to carry the ball from here and I don’t see that as an issue.” #63551

Penland to Chupein (10-31-13) **“We need to think hard before picking Burlington!”** #64401

Germanos to Thies (11-14-13)

"I wish to go on record as stating that the F-35 Ops 3 ROD Basis of Decision paragraph is written in such a manner that based on the information that has been presented regarding the attributes of Burlington AGS in comparison to the other alternative locations, I, if requested, would not recommend that A7 provide topline coordination to ACC/A8 for the F-35A Ops 3 ROD.

My reasoning stems from the statement regarding Burlington presenting "the best mix of infrastructure, airspace, and overall cost to the Air Force." This statement is inaccurate; and the statements concerning Burlington having joint training opportunities and a successful active association are misleading, implying that these factors only apply to Burlington AGS.

Furthermore, I do not feel that Burlington's F-16s being the oldest in the inventory is a valid basis for decision, and that the need to relocate McEntire or Jacksonville aircraft should warrant in the decision, as these locations were and still should be considered viable alternatives. It should be noted that the decision brief also contains an option to realign Burlington aircraft if Burlington is chosen, and there is a cost implied to do so. Furthermore, the statement regarding the disruption of the AF's ability to present essential combat capability to Combatant commanders (implies that this is true if either McEntire or Jacksonville is chosen, but really only applies to McEntire SEAD/DEAD mission) is misleading, as adaptable work-arounds exist and other units have the ability to provide to the Combatant commanders; and statements were made numerous times throughout the decision briefing process that the F-35 version produced by 2020 would have SEAD/DEAD capabilities. Lastly, the "no additional manpower positions for Burlington" is misleading and applies to other locations.

I have no other proposed language that would justify Burlington AGS. However, if military judgment is the reasoning, the AF should plainly say so, and that it overcomes the much higher magnitude of environmental effects at Burlington AGS, which are not mentioned in the draft ROD. I would recommended [sic] topline coordination on the Ops 1 ROD." #65108

Nichols to Pohlmeier (11-19-13)

"If I may vent a little, I too am disappointed but more so in our ability to communicate a consistent message as an AF. Either way the decision goes down, this is going to be bad. Litigation or Congressional scrutiny, each have their own pros/cons. The Secretary has been briefed now 3 times on the issues and I firmly believe he knows exactly what he wants/needs to say today to Sen Leahy irrespective of what's in the prep paper. As an AO caught in the middle trying to relay messaging from multiple offices, all of which are not in agreement on the way forward is not an easy task. Appreciate your patience with me and most importantly our office's responsibility to make sure we don't sever important relationships with CODELs and our Top 2." #65331

Bush to Stefanek (11-20-13) **"A7C cannot answer the question, 'Why did the Air Force choose Burlington AGS when the EIS clearly showed more people would be affected by the noise of the F-35?' The information was in the EIS and the EIS is used to inform the decision maker... Only the decision maker can answer this question." #65344**

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"

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

DeVine, Linda A - CARDNO TEC

Dittmyre, Bruce A - Civ USAF ACC/A8BA

Downing, Micah - Blue Ridge Research

Drambruskas, Paul G - Maj USAF/ACC/A3TO

Dryden, Larry H – Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7PS

Dutkus, Steven A - Col USAF AF/A3O-AT

Edwards, Richard L - Col USAF ANG NGB/A7A, Asset Mgmt Division Chief

Efferson, Randal K - Col NGB/CF, "Juicy"

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

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

Faaborg, Anthony M - Maj USAF ANG NGB/A7AD

Ferguson, Kathleen I – SES USAF HQ SAF/IE, Asst Sec of the AF, Installations, Logistics & Environment

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

Freeman, Frank III - Col USAF SAF/IEI

Gersten, Peter E - Brig Gen USAF/ACC/A5, Director of Plans and Programs “Gunz”

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

Hostage, Mike - Gen, USAF/ACC/CC, Commander of ACC

Howe, Dave C - Brig Gen, USAF ACC/A7

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

Johnson, Cara M - GS-14 USAF/AFLOA/JACE

Kilbourn, Jennifer – Col USAF HQ ACC/A7N

King, Brent - Col USAF ACC/A8B

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

Martin, James F - Maj Gen USAF SAF/FMB

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

Nash, Jay - Ctr USAF AF/A7CIB

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”

Pennington, Steven - Civ USAF AF/A3O-B

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”

Robins, Benjamin S - Lt Col USAF/LLP

Rose, Kathy L – CARDNO TEC, Principal

Sabochick, John G - Civ USAF HQ/ACC/A7P-2

Sample, James - Ctr USAF AF/A3O-BAR

Satori, Peter A - Col USAF ANG NGB/A7, Director, Installations & Mission Set “Puck”

Spacy, Bradley D - Col USAF SAF/LLS

Stefanek, Ann - GS-14 USAF HQ USAF SAF-PA, Media Operations Officer

Thies, Eugene A - GS-14 USAF HQ ACC/A7NB

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

Villemaire, Jason R - Capt USAF ANG 158 CES/CE

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

Wolters, Tod D - Maj Gen USAF SAF/LL

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

Yonkers, Terry A - Hon USAF SAF/IE