

EVIDENCE OF CORRUPTION OF THE F-35 BURLINGTON BASING PROCESS

Derived from the

U. S. AIR FORCE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD OF THE F-35A OPERATIONAL BASING SELECTION PROCESS 2009-2013

SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY'S INTERFERENCE IN THE F-35 BASING DECISION

Cray to Clark (3-12-10) "Vermont Senator Patrick Leahy, who, as one of the most senior members of the U.S. Senate Appropriations Defense Subcommittee and Co-Chair of the Senate National Guard Caucus, has led a decades' long effort to ensure that the Vermont Air National Guard has the finest facilities, equipment, and training, and, in doing so, position Vermont to compete well for this important aspect of our national defense system." #40700

Bacon to Blankenship (7-27-10) "**I heard from Sen Leahy's staff today** and they are looking at a 9 Aug date to meeting here in DC. The point of this meeting is to get all players together (Burlington ANG, ACC, and Air Staff) to [sic] all to the personal staffers (JP Dowd and Will Goodman) about noise abatement as it relates to the city of Burlington, VT... Sounds like Burlington already has all the answers. Pooter has been working this issue for a while." #43700

Ormsby to ACC/A8F (8-3-10) "**Sen Leahy's office is requesting** that we send an O-4 to O-6 level rep to attend an F-35 noise abatement meeting in DC on 9 Aug." #43700

Bacon to Chatman (8-3-10) "I've been tasked to provide representatives to attend a meeting on Capitol Hill regarding Noise Abatement Procedures, specifically aimed at Burlington, VT. Several staffers, **at the request of Sen Leahy**, have asked that we, along with representatives from Burlington VT and ACC, sit down to discuss what is being done to address noise concerns from the local populace." #43777

Engelman to Chatman (8-9-10) "I have sent an email to my "bosses." I have suggested that we let IEI know that staffers are asking about things, and what they might hear from Burlington Guard folks may not be the same as what IEI tells them. (I have been told that we need to do a bit of a noise 101, and discussion of what the noise contours at these installations really mean before the draft documents are released.)" #43777

Bacon to Engelman (9-30-10) "**I just got back from an engagement on Capitol Hill with members of Sen Leahy's staff** concerning F-35 Noise Abatement procedures." #44974

Ferguson to Yonkers (10-5-10) "Just a quick update on a 30 Sep Congressional contact by Col Lowell Nelson. He joined Maj Bacon from FMBL to **meet with members of Sen Leahy's** (VT) staff: Mr JP Dowd, Legislative Director, and Congressional Fellow, Will Goodman. Over the last few weeks **they've expressed interest in the noise contours that will be included** in the Draft EIS for the F-35 Ops, which will including [sic] Burlington ANGB as a preferred alternative. **Sen Leahy wants** to support us in managing the expectations of constituents in the Burlington area who may be concerned about increased noise from an F-35 beddown. The specific

points of the discussion in the meeting were the accuracy and relevancy of the F-35 noise data being used to project noise contours. **They wanted to make sure we weren't "rushing" the EIS when better information might be available soon.** Col Nelson indicated this was unlikely but he would check; we've since confirmed that there is no pending information that would cause a change to the F-35 noise calculation, and we're preparing an email for FMBL to forward to that effect. Col Nelson reported a positive meeting overall, with Sen Leahy's staff trying to ensure smooth progress on the EIS. V/R Kathy." #45629

Nelson to Etter (10-5-10) "Attached is correspondence about the **recent meetings with Sen Leahy's staff** on F-35 noise." #45630

Ferguson to Leahy staffers (10-5-10) "We appreciate the opportunity to meet with you on 30 Sep to discuss our shared concern for the most accurate information for the public in the Draft EIS for F-35A Operations basing. As discussed in our meeting, **the draft EIS is being developed with the latest available information about noise emissions of the F-35A, obtained at the April 08 data collection conducted at Edwards AFB with the F-35 AA-1, and using local course rules and operational limitations as currently observed at Burlington ANGB. After consultation with our experts here at the Pentagon, they confirmed that there is no near term expectation of additional data on the F-35A, and there would be no reason to delay the Draft EIS. Additionally, they advised us that the noise contours published in the Draft EIS would not change in the Final EIS. It should be noted that the noise contours to be released in the EIS are projections, based on information about an aircraft still in development, to facilitate informed decision-making. The actual noise contours at a selected beddown location would not be realistically available until the production F-35A aircraft are operating at a location and local flight rules are finalized and in use.**" #45631

Goodman to Caputo (10-8-10) "We're looking for your and Baz's thoughts on this letter. We'd really appreciate edits and comments. Given the cold shoulder we've gotten from big AF, we're thinking this may be the way to go...do you have thoughts on that?" #45119

Caputo to Goodman (10-15-10) "Based on my conversations with Sheryl Parker yesterday, I think I can convince ACC and the Air Staff that using 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 issues that arise." #45119

Leahy to Donley (11-9-10) "I was pleased that the Air Force selected the Air National Guard Station in Burlington, Vermont as one of the Air Force's preferred locations for initial basing of an F-35 Joint Strike Fighter squadron....As the Air Force prepares the initial final draft EIS for release, **I wanted to urge you to delay the EIS until the Air Force incorporates the latest flight profile data for the F-35 which is known as 'Karnes 3'....By incorporating the 'Karnes 3' flight profiles into the draft EIS, the Air Force may be able to demonstrate to local communities that the F-35 can depart and recover at noise levels less than those generated when the aircraft operated at full power....I understand this request may further delay the current F-35 timeline, but given the overall delay of the F-35 program, we should not rush to publish less accurate and more alarmist information when the public would be better served by a minor delay and more accurate F-35 flight profile data. The potentially beneficial operational information in the 'Karnes 3' profiles far outweighs any cost of further delaying the release of the EIS.**" #45651 and 46121

Nelson to Taylor (11-10-10) [Researchers' note: this email is commenting on **Senator Leahy's letter to Secretary Donley**]: "This is virtually the same message that I got from VT staffers in my visit with them. I presume at that point somebody had made them aware of pending Karnes 3. They mentioned that they would send a "letter of concern" but this seems a little stronger than that." #45693

Zander to Rezac (11-15-10) "**Sen Leahy sent a letter requesting the AF delay release of the draft F-35 EIS.** We are in the process of preparing a response. Currently there is no certified data available that would support a decision to delay release of the Draft EIS—whatever discussed with the TAG needs to correspond with what we provide Sen Leahy." #46118

Rezac to Dockery (11-15-10) "SECAF has recently (dated 9 Nov 10) received a letter from Sen Leahy 'urging the Air force to delay the EIS until the latest flight profile data for the F-35, known as "Karnes 3", can be incorporated'." #46118

Engelman to Chatman (11-16-10) "Wanted to keep you informed on a few things happening with Vermont ANG, Vermont Senator Leahy, availability of "Karnes 3" and also discuss where we are on things again.... Now in addition to that we have a letter from Senator Leahy urging the AF to "delay the EIS and incorporate the latest flight profile data for the F-35 which is known as "Karnes 3." Now I suspect the AF will not want to delay the EIS, however I have been asked to assess when "Karnes 3" might be available, and if it will make any real difference in the contours. You will note the similarity of this request to comments from Maj Gen Etter from NGB....There also seems to be some difference in opinion on the degree of comprehensiveness...information from Joe Czech at Wyle that indicates that any proposed changes were based on a limited data set, 1 sim run per profile." #45731

Engelman to Penland (11-18-10) "**This meeting has been set up because of the Statement Maj Gen Etter made at the SBESG about changing the power setting, and Sen Leahy's letter about delaying the EIS for Karnes 3 flight profile updates.**" #45857

Reed to Nelson (11-18-10) [Researchers' note: this email is regarding a response letter to Leahy]: "I also think it is important to clarify (in 3rd para) that the projected contours are likely to change once we have operating experience and the particular AFB's AICUZ gets updated (i.e., they are always modeled noise contours that tend to change over time, but not truly a projected versus actual situation)." #45937

Reed to Loschinsky (11-18-10) "...the proposed response to Senator Leahy ... we intentionally left the answer a bit open-ended and did not commit to any COA..." #45937

Penland to Bush (11-18-10) "**I don't know how you use Karnes 3 for one place and Karnes 2 for all others?!? Seems like we would be setting ourselves up for a legal challenge.**" #45943

Baldy to SAF/LL (11-24-10) "Background: **Senator Leahy wrote to the SECAF expressing his concern about releasing the F-35 Operational EIS before the Karnes 3 profile data is incorporated.** For your information...this is coming our (IEI/A7C) way. Lynn is there a Karnes 3 profile that's certified/official?" #45693

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 setting and potentially lower noise. Reduced noise contours

may or may not come to fruition as the speeds changed as well and increases exposure time, so it may be a wash. Karnes 3 was not originally planned to be used in the current/ongoing EISs 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

Caputo to Wright, Cray, Goodrow, Clark, Harris, Finnegan, and Baczewski (4-26-12) "**We may need to get Senator Leahy involved and have his office contact Senator Susan Collins' office**....This is where the Congressional letter below is being originated from. I would be more than happy to get involved. I just need some direction on whether you would like me to go VFR direct to Senator Collins' office or work this through Will Goodman." #51240

Hanson to Smolinsky (6-27-12) "...**got a call this morning from Sen Leahy's office** regarding F-35 basing at Burlington. His first request was for a general breakdown or synopsis of the comments for the basing action, such as the ratio of favorable vs unfavorable (i.e. 80/20, 50/50, etc). They would like this sometime within the next week or so, if possible. His second request was for a copy of the basing scoresheet matrix for Burlington." #53419

Racasner to Meyer (7-10-12) "Wanted to pass to you the below response SAF/PAO provided to Reporter John Briggs (Burlington Free Press) on the F-35A Scoring. **Sen Leahy has been supportive and would probably like to see the response provided.**" #53554

Leahy, Sanders, Welch to Donley (7-11-12) "We ask, as you consider the decision of whether to deploy the F-35 to the Vermont National Guard, that the Air Force look favorably on these and other noise abatement measures." #53562

Engelman to Black (9-11-12) "I appreciate you taking the time from your busy schedule to discuss the Part 150 program's ability to help mitigation [of] military aircraft noise. I have pasted the proposed answers to **Senator Leahy's questions** below to make sure I have not overstated anything. Should our lawyers suggest that we include similar language regarding working with the FAA and the airport authority in the Record of Decision (should Burlington be selected), I want to make sure you would be ok with that. If you prefer nothing regarding this be included in the ROD on this issue please let me know." #54620

{The following three email exchanges are part of #55514}

Britt to Jensen (10-19-12) "Will Goodman called me. He heard through the grapevine that the Air Force was getting feedback that the Vermont delegation was not supportive of potentially basing the F-35 in VT. He stated this was coming from as high as the Vice Chief's office. **Sen Leahy wants to ensure the Air Force that this position is not true. The VT delegation is strongly supportive of the Air Force basing the F-35 in Burlington.** I told him you would pass this along to the relevant decision-makers, so in your discussions on this issue, please ensure that this is properly represented."

Jensen to Smolinsky (10-19-12) “Please see below the conversation with Will Goodman, Sen Leahy’s MLA. He wants to make sure the AF leadership knows they want the F-35. I think this is stemming from the article below:...”

Britt to Allen (10-19-12) “Regarding our telecom. Sen Leahy is concerned that the AF may think VT is not in favor of the F-35 being based in VT. However, that is not the feeling of the delegation.” #55514

Britt to Pleus (10-19-12) “Will Goodman, MLA for Sen Leahy, called me today and asked that I share a concern from Sen Leahy. There is a vocal group in VT who is not in favor of basing the F-35 in Burlington, however, this view is not shared with the VT delegation. On the contrary, the VT delegation is strongly supportive of basing the F-35 in Burlington. Sen Leahy will bring this up in his telecon with SECAF on 25 Oct and I told Will that I would pass this onto the CSAF as well. He understands the basing process and Burlington will be scored, however they’re scored, but he is concerned about the perception this vocal minority might have on strategic Air Force decisions.” #55544

Jensen to Smolinsky (11-15-12) “Senator Leahy has requested a follow up to the information provided in a previous request back in July (see email below) with the total number of comments received by the Air Force (including and counting petition signatures as individual comments). There is no need to characterize whether comments were positive or negative—just looking for the total.” #56018

Oliver to Kilbourn (11-15-12) “Col Kilbourn - Looks like Sen Leahy has a question regarding the number of comments received from the folks in the Burlington area. The actual task is below. We’ll need an answer by COB today, though; we have lots of stuff going on tomorrow and we’ll be all out of the office for a good portion of the day. Nick provided similar numbers several months ago (see email at the very bottom). Hopefully this is an easy one to answer.” #56018

Goodman to Drew (12-12-12) “I wanted to be sure that you received Senator Leahy’s response to the Stop the F-35 protest that occurred outside his Burlington office this evening.” *[Researchers’ note: the 12-12-12 public comments of Senator Leahy were attached in full].* #56561

Stefanek (no “to” line) (12-13-12) “...approximately 100 people opposed to the F-35 in Burlington staged a protest at Sen Leahy’s office. The Senator “refused” to meet with the opponents and issued the following statement.... “Any objective review of the public record clearly shows that these issues have received extensive public discussion and review over the last year. Now the Air Force is weighing the evidence and Vermonters’ views and suggestions. They will reach a decision in the months ahead.” #56577

Air Force Congressional Contact Report (1-16-13)

Hill contacts: Will Goodman (MLA Sen Leahy, D-VT), David Weinstein (MLA Sen Sanders, I-VT), 2x Staffers for Rep Welch (D-VT-01)

AF Contacts: Col Frank Freeman (SAF/IEI), Mr Mark Pohlmeier (A8PB), Mr Teran Judd (A8PB)

Subject: F-35 and KC-46 Candidate Scoresheets Discrepancies for Burlington AGS

Summaries: “...MLA requested a discussion as to **why the F-35 Candidate scoresheet and KC-46 Candidate scoresheet contained discrepancies between the environmental scores.** This discrepancy was not an error, but a product of different models consistently and systematically applied to their enterprises. When the Strategic Basing process began (F-35 Ops 1 and Ops 3 were among the very first), environmental criteria of noise and encroachment were **validated based on forecasted trends (FAA Part 150).** The Strategic Basing process now uses actual environmental conditions. This is particularly important as the VT CODEL faces strong opposition to basing the F-35 in Burlington due to environmental concerns. In the end, the SecAF chose Burlington as the Preferred Alternative after reviewing the ACC site survey reported environmental concerns with Burlington AGS. The CODEL was pleased with the explanation.

Sen Leahy’s office called this meeting to address concerns with the F-35 and KC-46 candidate scoresheet discrepancies. A8PB explained the 3-stage Strategic Basing Process (SBP): Criteria, Candidate, and Preferred and Reasonable Alternative Selection (P&RA), which ultimately leads to EIS and Record of Decision (ROD) documentation. The F-35 candidate basing selection data call used FAA Part 150-0 rule-sets, where forecasted trends in encroachment and noise contours could be utilized. The SBP, however, has now evolved to capture actual noise and environmental trends. The KC-46 utilized this updated process, and resulted in a lower environmental score for Burlington. The concern centers on opposition to basing the F-35 at Burlington. Should citizens note this discrepancy, they could point to a flawed process, tie up the basing decision in litigation, and possibly prevent the AF from allocating F-35 at Burlington.

The briefing team answered the criteria was applied systematically and consistently across each enterprise. The answers are different, but not incorrect. This was a product of a new, more mature modeling system. Furthermore, the AF recognizes the mass data call as an imperfect science. The Candidate phase screened the candidates with site survey teams to bring ground truth. Burlington was recognized as an encroachment risk. This information was presented to the SecAf with all the information in aggregate, and the location was still selected for F-35. Finally during the data call they scored so high, changing their environmental candidate scoresheet would not have moved them away from the final selection phase.” #56929

Wilder to Bush (1-17-13) “BLUF: SAF IEI met with Sen Leahy’s office and had the following concern – **AF may be misinterpreting FAA and HUD guidance/regs wrt noise contours and characterization in the Draft EIS needlessly limiting or negatively misstating impact.** How should we convey to ACC to make sure they either address or provide sufficient analytical supporting info (or do we direct to engage with HUD and FAA through consultations [sic]? Thoughts?” #56905

Engelman to Kilbourn (1-22-13)

“Apparently someone from Leahy’s office made this comment. HUD, FAA, and DOD use the same compatibility criteria. I still need to add a little bit more regarding what we have in the EIS, and I was going to add something at the end that says if they can point us to the specific section(s) that they feel we have mis-interpreted FAA and HUD guidance we will take a look at it. (Without them pointing us to the section that they feel mis-interprets the guidance we can’t really look at it.” #56930

Command Messages F35A: (written by VTANG) – “Questions We Hope We Don’t Get:

3) **Do you know of any improprieties that Senator Leahy had his hands in that would have affected basing decisions in Vermont’s favor?” #58254**

{The following seven emails all relate to Leahy’s concern that 65% of comments received were opposed to the basing}

Bryan to McFadden, Saldivar, Purvis (6-11-13)

“FYI - this article from the Burlington Free Press about the F-35 is creating a stir and **Sen. Leahy’s office is concerned and pushing all the buttons they can to find out what is going on**. If you can find anything or hear anything through AF PA please let me know. Article below.” #59447

McGhee to Kilbourn (6-11-13) “Thanks Mike—we’re working a response ... FYSA ... **Mr. Germanos received a call from Sen Leahy’s office directly**. He was on the phone while I was in his office.” #59549

Britt to Smolinsky (6-11-13) “**Sen Leahy’s office reviewed the comments** in the updated EIS and has confirmed the 80% ratio based on the comments appended. So they’re scratching their heads—where are the additional comments that lead to the 65% opposed accounting? Or is Mr. Germanos misquoted? I need to respond to Sen Leahy’s office ASAP, or better, I’d like to get the right SME on a telecom with Will Goodman.” #59549

McGhee to Ferguson (6-12-13) “**Sen Leahy’s office dialed in direct to Mr Germanos yesterday evening** and discussed the matter to learn more background; according to ACC, the **Senator’s staffer was hoping that the article was wrong and the document was correct (i.e., that we found more supportive comments vs opposing comments to the Burlington location....** It is also important to know that, even with the correction, Sen Leahy’s staffer, while they understood the conversation with ACC, **expressed concern with how ACC counted comments and derived at [sic] our numbers**. That is, Sen Leahy’s staffer believed Air Force should have counted “X” signatures on a petition called “Save the Air National Guard” as “X” comments in support of the basing at Burlington. Instead, ACC counted the overall petition as one supportive comment.” #59459

Ferguson to Welsh, Bridges (6-12-13) “Sen Leahy’s staff called direct to Mr Germanos at ACC yesterday afternoon to discuss the matter. ACC/A7N reports that Sen Leahy’s office was hoping the newspaper article was wrong and that the Air Force document was still correct. After Mr Germanos explained that the article was correct and the Revised Draft EIS did in fact contain an error, **the Senator’s office felt the Air Force should have characterized some of the public comments differently, which would reflect more community support....**” #59483

Howe to Robinson (6-12-13) “SECAF/CSAF have asked SAF/IE for explanation of an item in the PA Morning Report today regarding an error in the draft F-35 Ops EIS (draft is out now for public comment). **It states that 80% of comments in the first public comment period favored the ANG beddown at Burlington, 20% opposed. Accurate numbers are 35% supported, 65% opposed.** Article appeared in yesterday’s Burlington Free Press stating AF had put out erroneous information. Looks like admin error (correct data was published in two separate places in the 3-in thick draft EIS). Our project officer is accurately quoted in the

article saying the error was found before the revised report was issued and was supposed to be fixed, but was not. **Sen. Leahy's staffer inquiry is a complicating factor – they like the erroneous numbers.**” #59489

Oshiba to Byers (6-13-13) **“Sen Leahy's office called ACC AO direct yesterday to discuss the matter....I spoke with Col Kilbourn today, and they're scrambling to provide answers—should have something ready by tomorrow. In addition, you'll note the CSAF's remark below: ‘Thanks Kathy. Actually pretty tough to explain how the mistake was actually made - it's a pretty big difference.’”** #59520

Engelman to Nash (8-20-13) **“FYI, I let Nick know that Leahy was asking LL for dates. He has identified (below) that those dates are optimistic, which is what we had heard from Col Kilbourn at the BRRP- so caveating any dates would be a good thing to do.”** #62062

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

Poulos to Will (9-5-13) “They cancelled the meeting as I was walking in the door. Mr. Pohlmeier said there wasn’t enough polish on the slides to drag everybody through another review. They were going to have an internal phone call with ACC today and reschedule the BRRP. **There is a strong speculation that the ANG is the leak to Sen Leahy’s office.** Not sure how we’ll overcome that one, but Mr. P said he wasted way too much time, prepping the CSAF, so he’s going to be keeping the slides “close hold” from here on. He asked if we knew of the unknown phone guest. I told him we only got his name after the fact, and that the guy had called us offering his assistance (last Thursday). Lastly, Mr. P asked us if we knew of any noise mitigation strategies that BVT could employ if selected. Maj Gen Cray (TAG-VT) said that 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. He also asked about FAR Part 150 applications and the FAA’s role in mitigation. I’m working with Rick Thomas in NGB/A7 to get good answer on both of these. More to follow.” #62375

Bush to Kilbourn (9-11-13). “**In response to a Sen Leahy inquiry (Sept 2012)....** Attached are the emails from Mr. Blackwell of FAA that provided A7CII the content of a response to Sen. Leahy regarding the FAA’s part 150 program; Mr. Blackwell’s response to Lynn E’s email requesting he make sure that the folks at the airport were aware of what was said; and the response to inquiry that was prepared. We do not know if this was ever sent to Sen Leahy’s staff.” #62526

Germanos to Kilbourn (9-13-13) “**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

Nichols to Owen (9-23-13) “Are you tracking this timeline for CONUS F-35 (Ops 1 and 3)? Please see below and attached. **Considering all the issues we have had with Senator Leahy’s staff here in FMBL....**” #62708

Stefanek to Robins (9-26-2013). “**You may want to call Senator Leahy’s office direct and let him know this article is riddled with inaccuracies.**” [*Researchers’ note: she then criticizes the press article.*]” #62919

Caputo to Baczewski, Clark, Harris (9-26-13) “FYI... **Alex Carnes has been working with Will Goodman and I think is taking over his position.** I was put in touch with him from working with Brian Lowe, Mayor Weinberger’s new asst. **Alex has reached out to me on multiple occasions asking EIS questions and requesting information on safety statistics, etc. I just wanted to ensure you all knew I was communicating with him....I will keep you all posted.**” #62927

~~~~~  
~~~~~

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) “**Woooooow! 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 non-withstanding).** 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

~~~~~  
~~~~~

## VERMONT AIR NATIONAL GUARD INTERFERENCE IN THE F-35 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-emphasize 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 the Vermont Air National Guard 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"

Allen, John J. Jr - Col USAF SAF/IE, Senior Military Assistant, Asst Sec AF - Installations, Environment, & Logistics

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

Bacon, Christopher A - Maj USAF SAF/FMBL, Congressional Appropriations Liaison

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

Baldy, Shawn - Civ USAF SAF/FMBL

Barradell, Luke A - CDR USN AETC JSF/FIT

Black, Elliott - Deputy Director, FAA Airport Planning and Programming (APP-2)

Blankenship, Jeffrey A - Maj USAF ACC/CCX "Blank"

Bridges, Timothy K - SES USAF SAF/IEI

Britt, Kerry D - Lt Col USAF SAF/FMBL, Congressional Appropriations Liaison

Bryan, Ian B - LtCol USAF

Byers, Timothy A - Maj Gen USAF AF/A7CI

Bush, Jack - Civ GS-14 USAF AF/A7CIB

Carnes, Alex - Office of U.S. Senator Patrick Leahy, Vermont

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/A30-BA

Clark, Joel A - Col USAF ANG 158 FW

Copans, Jon - Office of Representative Peter Welsh, Vermont

Cray, Steven A - Maj Gen USAF NGVT, Adjutant General, Vermont

Czech, Joseph J - Wyle, Principal Engineer

DeVine, Linda A - CARDNO TEC

Dittmyre, Bruce A - Civ USAF ACC/A8BA

Donley, Michael - Secretary of the Air Force

Downing, Micah - Blue Ridge Research

Drambruskas, Paul G - Maj USAF/ACC/A3TO
Drew, Thomas - NFG US NG VT ARNG
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
Etter, William H - Maj Gen USAF NGB/CF, Assistant to the Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, for National Guard matters
Faaborg, Anthony M - Maj USAF ANG NGB/A7AD
Ferguson, Kathleen I - SES USAF HQ SAF/IE, Assistant Secretary of AF for Installation, Logistics & Environment
Finnegan, Daniel P - LtCol USAF ANG 158 MXS/CC
Fick, Douglas E - Col USAF ANG 158 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
Hanson, Jeremy R - Lt Col USAF SAF/FMBL
Harris, Richard N - BGen USAF NGVT
Heavener, Troy S - Maj USAF ACC AFLOA/JACE-FSC
Holland, James P - Civ USAF SAF/IEI, Deputy for Installation Policy
Hostage, Mike - Gen, USAF/ACC/CC, Commander of Air Combat Command
Howe, Dave C - Brig Gen, USAF ACC/A7
Jackman, Thomas W - Col USAF ANG 158 FW/CV
Jensen, Jason D - Maj USAF SAF/FMBL
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)
Leahy, Patrick - United States Senator, Vermont
LeClair, Michael A - CTR USAF ACC/A5FO
Loschinskey, Jason J - Maj SAF/IEI
Marek, Kevin P - Civ USAF ANG NGB/A7AM
Martin, James F - Maj Gen USAF SAF/FMB
McFadden, Nahaku A - Col USAF NGB-CF
McGhee, Michael F - Civ USAF SAF/IEE
Meyer, Michael W - Maj USAF SAF/PAX
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
Ormsby, Charles D (PhD) - Lt Col, USAF, Executive Officer, Directorate of Requirements
Oshiba, Edwin H - Col USAF AF/A7CI
Owen, John E - LtCol USAF SAF/LL
Parker, Sheryl K - Civ USAF HQ AF ACC/A7PS, Environmental Analysis Project Manager
Patriarca, Gene - Civ USAF AF/A7CIB
Penland, Michael W - Civ USAF AF/A30-BR, AF Chief Operational Basing "Pappy"
Pennington, Steven - Civ USAF AF/A30-B
Pleus, Scott L - Col USAF AF/CC "Rolls"
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"
Purvis, Shannon M - Maj USAF NG NGB
Racasner, Tonya A - Civ USAF SAF/PAO
Reed, Les - Civ USAF SAF/GCN
Rezac, Craig - LtCol USAF ANG NGB/A7A

Robins, Benjamin S - LtCol USAF/LLP

Robinson, Lori J - LtGen USAF ACC/CV, Vice Commander of Air Combat Command

Rose, Kathy L - CARDNO TEC, Principal

Russell, Floyd M III - GS-15 USAF AFLOA JACE/FSC

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

Saldivar, Randy L - Maj USAF NG NGB

Sample, James - Ctr USAF AF/A30-BAR

Sanders, Bernie - United States Senator, Vermont

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

Smolinsky, Frank - Civ USAF SAF/IE

Spacy, Bradley D - Col USAF SAF/LLS

Spencer, Kimberly - Tsgt USAF AF/CC

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

Taylor, Scott T - LtCol USAF AF/A8PB

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

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

Tracy, John - Office of U.S. Senator Patrick Leahy, Vermont

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

Weinstein, David - Senior Policy Advisor, Office of U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, Vermont

Welch, Peter - United States Representative, Vermont

Welsh, Mark A III - Gen USAF AF/CC, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force

Wilder, David P - Lt Col USAF HAF A7CIB

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

Zander, Steven W - Ctr USAF SAF/IEI