GO-1

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Walsh Family
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 4:37 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: I oppose the F-35 in VT

Mr. Germanos,

I am opposed to the basing of the F35 in Vermont because of the potential harm to the physical and emotional wellbeing of thousands of children, environmental harm, and the degradation of the standard of living for thousands of Winooski and South Burlington residents.

I am writing to request a brief extension of the Public Comment period, based upon the fact that at least 100 pages of important information were not released until nearly 3 weeks after the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement was released. Given that this section included substantive questions that people were asking, and the important information given by the Air Force in response to those questions, we believe that it is only reasonable to offer people ample time to consider that information. Please extend the Public Comment period to offer the public 45 days starting from the date that the FULL Revised DEIS was released, rather than May 31st, the date on which the incomplete Revised DEIS was released. GP-15
As you know, there is great controversy over this basing in our community. It is essential that Vermont citizens be given the most complete opportunity to read, understand, and respond to the information being released by the Air Force. It's crucial that the process by which this decision is made be free of further error.

Thank you,
Rebecca Walsh

Sent from my iPhone

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Sara Volk
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: I oppose the basing of F-35A's in Burlington

Mr. Germanos,

I kindly wish for my voice to be heard or my opinion counted regarding the basing of the F-35A's in Burlington, VT.

I strongly OPPOSE the basing of F-35A's in Burlington for the following reasons:

1- Property value losses for homeowners within the sound area SO-1
2- Detrimental health affects due to the noise level that the F-35A's generate NO-16
3- Design flaws and safety concerns related to the newness of this aircraft & the statistical results of crashes & incidents associated SA-1
4- The fudged reporting that put Burlington in the top ideal sites list when it is clearly not the best choice (or even close) by geographical choice & population. PA-1

I urge you to do the right thing. And very clearly the basing of F-35A's in Burlington, VT IS NOT THE RIGHT THING!!

Sincerely,

Sara Volk

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

G0-1

From: Richard Joseph
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 4:57 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: comment to revised DEIS

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I oppose in the strongest possible terms the basing of the F-35 in Burlington, because, according to the DEIS, the World Health Organization, and the dictates of common decency, the proposed basing would result in unacceptable harm to our community. We have a residential community here with many vulnerable people--children, elderly, recent immigrants from war-torn regions, people struggling with PTSD, people of very modest means among others. My opposition is based on the following considerations.

1. The revised DEIS fails to include reference to the past decade of scientific research on the health effects of F-35 level noise pollution, and thereby greatly underestimated the ill effects of the F-35. NO-16
2. This community is already struggling to cope with the heavy impact of F-16 noise and will have great difficulty with a plane that is much louder,
3. In response to an outpouring of citizen opposition, the Winooski City Council in a 5-0 vote on July 12, 2013, asked that Burlington be removed from consideration on the first round of basing decisions.
4. Children's health and cognitive abilities will be negatively impacted with life-long consequences (WHO Burden of Disease from Environmental Noise, 2011), thereby placing the Guard in direct, unending conflict with parents whose primary responsibility is to protect their children.
5. Numerous studies have shown that children are at especially high risk for hearing loss when chronically exposed to extreme noise. NO-13
6. There will be an increased risk of cardio-vascular disease for children and adults. (WHO, Burden of Disease from Environmental Noise, 2011). As WHO explains, this means increased risk of loss of healthy years of life, of loss of productivity, and increased risk of premature death for those in the noise zone.
7. Data provided by a respected professional real estate appraiser has demonstrated an average 15% decline in property values for those homes newly placed in the 65 dB DNL contour and thus stigmatized as "unsuitable for residential use". That amounts to an average loss of $33,500 per home. One select group-- those unfortunate enough to live in the noise zone (most of whom are of modest means)--would alone suffer this huge loss. Wealthy neighborhoods by contrast would suffer no loss in value because they are located outside the noise contour. The Air Force has made no offer of compensation to those subject to great financial loss as a result of the basing. SO-9
8. The area subject to the greatest impact contains most of the locally available affordable housing.
9. The crash risk of a new, little tested plane is far too great for a densely populated residential area. SA-1
10. The economic benefits, as explained in the DEIS, are very modest and are vastly out weighed by the loss in property values and tax base (approximately $100 million), the destruction of neighborhoods, loss of quality of life, and by the human and economic costs associated with the health impact.
11. It strains credulity to argue, as some do, that the air defense of the the North Eastern portion of the United States must of necessity be based at a commercial airport surrounded by densely populated residential communities in Burlington Vermont.

The harm to the people of this community that would result from basing the F35 here is so significant and so obvious and so out of proportion to any imagined benefit to the community, that only a breakdown of responsible, rational decision making could have led to the designation of Burlington as a preferred location. It is widely suspected here that improper political influence is responsible for this otherwise incomprehensible designation.

Therefore, for all the stated reasons, I ask the Air Force to remove Burlington from consideration from this and all future rounds of basing decisions for the F-35.

I also urge the Air Force to extend the comment period because a significant part of the revised DEIS was initially omitted.

Sincerely,

Richard Joseph

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

GO-1

From: Catherine Tarrant
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 4:58 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: BRING the F35 to VERMONT

Please consider the money expensed to get people to oppose the F-35 to Vermont...they must not realize what it takes to defend this great nation of ours...

Thank you for your service to our country.

Catherine Tarrant

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Henry Ralph Carse
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 4:58 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: OPPOSITION TO F-35 A FIGHTER JETS

Mr. Nicholas Germanos
HQ ACC/A7PS
129 Andrews Street, Suite 332
Langley AFB, VA 23665-2769
nicholas.germanos@langley.af.mil

Dear Mr. Germanos

I am writing to you because I oppose the basing of F-35A planes in Burlington Vermont.
I am deeply concerned about the environmental impact, especially the noise impact of these planes, and especially on residents of Winooski, Vermont, which is under the projected flight path.
Please do everything in your poser to prevent the basing of these planes in the Burlington area.
Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Sincerely,
Henry R. Carse

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Catherine Tarrant
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:00 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: PLEASE BRING THE F35 TO VERMONT!

VERMONT NEEDS THE F-35!

Please consider the money expensed to get people to oppose the F-35 to Vermont...they must not realize what it takes to defend this great nation of ours...

Catherine Tarrant

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Gordon Winters
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:03 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: VT F35

Mr. Nicholas Germanos

HQ ACC/A7PS

129 Andrews St. Suite 337

Langley AFB, VA 23665-9900

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I am writing to SUPPORT the basing of the F-35's at the Burlington Airport in Burlington, VT. Franklin County, where I reside, is home to many Guard members who are active members of their communities. Vermonters are proud of the Vermont Air Guard and its 67 years of history. It is critical that Vermont maintain the 1,100 high quality jobs that the Air Guard provides. A loss of this number of jobs given Vermont's small population would be incredibly difficult economically.

Again, I strongly SUPPORT the basing of the F-35's in Vermont.

Thank you,

Gordon Winters

GO-1

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Maloney, Linda M
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:10 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: No F-35s in Burlington, Vermont, please!

Dear Mr. Germanos,

Wherever I go, when people hear I am from Vermont, they wax enthusiastic about the beauty of this little state. Here in the Green Mountains, we refuse to pollute our views with billboards.

Now you are proposing to pollute our skies with F-35s. The noise pollution they will bring (and yes, we know they *will* use afterburners) is intolerable. NO-1

If a natural disaster were to deprive 8,000 Americans of their homes, the nation would be in an uproar and would rush to their rescue. Yet you propose to make 8,000 homes in our community unlivable. How is that right?

Please, I beg you, choose some other location for the F-35s (if they must be built at all), and leave Vermont in the peace it has chosen.

Sincerely,
(Rev.) Linda M. Maloney+

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Kristine Harootunian
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:14 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35s in Vermont

Hello, I am writing to voice my opinion on the possible basing of the f-35s in South Burlington. As a homeowner on the neighboring town of Winooski, an outdoor enthusiast, ad a teacher, I am against the basing of the F-35s in our vicinity. Based on the available data, I am mostly concerned that the decision to rank Vermont highly for the jets is not based on the quantitative and qualitative data, but on political motives. I would have more confidence if I felt that this process had been more transparent, and logical. Additionally, the current planes do disrupt many aspects of life, most significanlty communication ranging from phone calls to courses at UVM having to be stopped because of the resulting jet noise. PA-1

Thanks for your interest,
Kristine Harootunian

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Jason Achilich
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:25 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: South Burlington Basing of f-35

Hello,

After all the talk in Vermont around the f-35's, I wanted to share my thoughts.

I am against the basing here.

The disruption to our air space, population density at both ends of the runway, and public and private education facilities in the immediate range of the airport all go into my opinion.

I live in Winooski, directly in the flight path of most of the planes landing at BVT. I bought here with full knowledge of the air traffic; a louder plane that has of yet (to my research) shown itself to be reliable at landing and take off, were not.

I also teach at an alternative school for emotionally challenged children close to the flight path. Multiple times a day, we need to stop our classes to allow the noise to subside. At minimal the disruption is a challenge to refocus from, worst case it is a trigger for a student.

Thank you,

Jason Achilich

--

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Regina Bailey
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:25 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: I am opposed to the basing of the F35 in Vermont

GO-1

Dean Mr. Germanos,

I live and own a home in Winooski, Vermont. I have been disturbed by the thought that the F-35 will be based near my home in South Burlington. Vermont should not be the site selected by the Air Force. I am opposed to the basing of the F35 in Vermont. I am in agreement with many other citizens of Vermont that there should be a brief extension of the Public Comment period.

At least 100 pages of important information were not released until nearly 3 weeks after the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement was released. Given that this section included substantive questions that people were asking, and the important information given by the Air Force in response to those questions, we believe that it is only reasonable to offer people ample time to consider that information. Please extend the Public Comment period to offer the public 45 days starting from the date that the FULL Revised DEIS was released, rather than May 31st, the date on which the incomplete Revised DEIS was released. As you know, there is great controversy over this basing in our community. It is essential that Vermont citizens be given the most complete opportunity to read, understand, and respond to the information being released by the Air Force. It's crucial that the process by which this decision is made be free of further error. GP-15

I hope you will consider my request favorably.

Sincerely,

Regina Bailey

Mr. Nicholas Germanos,
F-35A Operational Basing Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Project Manager,
HQ ACC/A7PS, 129 Andrews Street, Suite 337
Langley AFB, VA 23665-2769

GO-1

Genese Grill

July 5, 2013

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I am writing to you to express my deep concerns regarding the potential basing of the F-35A at the Burlington Air Guard Station in Vermont. As the Environmental Impact Statement and the most recent reports on the feasibility of this project have clearly demonstrated, the purported benefits of the F35A being based here have been exaggerated, while the problems it will bring have been underestimated and in most cases, ignored altogether.

Upwards of 6-7 thousand families will find their homes unlivable due to the noise impact of these jets, and the Burlington and Winooski infrastructures have no viable plans—in a housing market that is already at zero vacancy—for replacing these lost homes. Further, the surrounding areas are already negatively impacted by noise from planes. As a Community College of Vermont instructor, I repeatedly have been forced to halt class discussions or lectures while planes passed overhead. The basing of the F-35's in Burlington, will only make this situation more unbearable.

It is particularly disturbing that our local and regional elected officials have, for the most part, flagrantly ignored the overwhelming outcry of a majority of the citizens and that important information was either covered up or neglectfully misrepresented by earlier reports on the possible impacts of these jets. It seems clear that a few politicians are engaged in selling the livability of Burlington and Winooski, destroying thousands of people's lives, for some negligible personal or political gain.

Thank you for considering the concerns of the people who will have to live with the impacts of these jets. Yours Sincerely,

Genese Grill, PhD

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

GO-1

From: Kate McCarthy
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:28 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Cc: Brian Shupe
Subject: Comments on the Revised Draft USAF F-35A Operational Basing EIS - from Vermont Natural Resources Council
Attachments: VNRC-F-35 opposition letter.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Mr. Germanos,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on this EIS. Attached please find comments from the Vermont Natural Resources Council opposing the basing of F-35s at the Burlington International Airport.

Sincerely,
Kate McCarthy

GO-1

Submitted via email

July 15, 2013

Mr. Nick Germanos
F-35A EIS Project Manager
HQ ACC/A7NS, 129 Andrews Street, Suite 332
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia 23665-2769

Dear Mr. Germanos,

The Vermont Natural Resources Council (VNRC) is the state's oldest environmental advocacy organization, with a 50-year history of advocating for Vermont's environment, sustainable communities, and a strong economy. We are writing to express our opposition to basing F-35 fighter jets at the Burlington International Airport for the following reasons:

Impacts from F-35s would undermine the region's supply of affordable housing.
The Revised Draft EIS (May 2013) states that a significant number of households near to the airport would be affected if the F-35 fighter jets were based at the Burlington International Airport: a total of 2,963 under Scenario 1, and 3,410 under Scenario 2, increasing the number of affected households by 51% and 73%, respectively.[2] These homes, many of which are owner-occupied, single family dwellings, represent an important part of the affordable housing supply in this area – supply that would diminish if residents had to be relocated due to increased noise or safety concerns.

Chittenden County has a limited supply of affordable housing, and low-income area residents will be disproportionately affected by either basing scenario.
Affordable housing is essential in Chittenden County, where the median value of owner-occupied housing is 24% higher than in the rest of Vermont.[3] Furthermore, over 30% of homeowners, and well over half of renters, pay more than 30% of their income on housing expenses – making them "housing burdened" according to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.[4] Compromising the quality of the affected housing by basing the F-35s at Burlington International Airport would exacerbate affordability issues – in the process, impacting those with the least financial room to spare.

Low income residents would be disproportionately impacted by decibel levels exceeding 65 dB DNL in either Scenario 1 or 2; this further underscores the impact on affordable housing. The Revised Draft EIS (May 2013) states that under Scenario 1, there would be a 45% increase in the number of people affected among the general population, but a *130% increase in the number of the area's low income residents affected.* Under

Printed on 100% post-consumer recycled paper, processed chlorine free.
9 Bailey Avenue • Montpelier, Vermont 05602
PHONE 802/223 2328 • FAX 802/223 0287 • WEB www.vnrc.org • EMAIL info@vnrc.org

Scenario 2, there would be a 68% increase in the general population affected, but over double that – 164% - among the area's low income population.[4]

Basing the F-35s near existing neighborhoods runs counter to state goals and policies.
The state of Vermont has long promoted compact land use, affordable housing, energy efficiency, and the development of strong communities through its goals and policies. (Indeed, the city of Burlington's model for affordable housing, developed under then-mayor Bernie Sanders, is replicated worldwide.[5]) This is more than tradition: the promotion of Smart Growth is codified in state statute, and reinforced by state investments. The potentially affected areas represent some of the few compact, urban neighborhoods in an otherwise rural state, and basing fighter jets nearby undermines the land use pattern that we, as a state, are trying to promote.

Furthermore, making these neighborhoods unsuitable for residential use runs counter to the state's transportation, affordable housing and energy goals: neighborhood residents who currently walk, take transit, or whose children walk to school will likely be forced into their cars, leading to more driving, less exercise, and increased carbon emissions.

Maintaining compact, affordable housing options has environmental benefits.
A healthy environment and strong communities go hand in hand: compact settlement in the tradition of Vermont's downtowns and villages reduces residential sprawl into undeveloped areas, ensures lower-carbon transportation options, and allows residents to build equity and financial security through homeownership. It also takes pressure off of natural resource areas, ensuring their continued existence for farming, forestry, and recreation – key elements of Vermont's economy.

We recognize the importance of jobs in this region, as well as the many positive contributions of the Vermont Air National Guard to our economy, our communities, and our security, but, on balance, oppose the addition of F-35s to the Vermont Air National Guard Base.

We cannot have a strong environment, strong communities or a strong economy unless people have access to decent, affordable housing. Basing F-35 fighter jets at this location risks undermining the region's supply of affordable housing that is accessible to jobs and transit. Because of this, and for the reasons mentioned above, we oppose the basing of F-35 fighter jets at the Burlington International Airport.

Sincerely,

Brian Shupe, AICP
Executive Director

[1] Draft EIS (May 2013) – Tables BR3.2-8 and BR3.2-14, "Off Airport Noise Exposure."
[2] http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/50/50007.html - Median value of owner-occupied units in Chittenden County: $263,200. In Vermont: $213,000.
[3] http://www.housingdata.org/profile/resultsMain.php?county=007000
[4] Draft EIS (May 2013) – Table BR3.12-4 and Table BR3.12-5, "Total Minority and Low-Income Populations Affected…"
[5] http://digital.vpr.net/post/stoddard-brenda-torpy-global-vermonter

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Matthew Ennis
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:34 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: oppositon to F-35s in Burlington VT

I am against basing F35s in Burlington VT. I live in Winooski and the F16s are already too loud. This country spends a disproportional amount of money on the US military. The veterans need support, but the military industrial complex should be scaled back. Thsnks.

Matthew Ennis

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

G0-1

From: imwren
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:36 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Please Send F-35 Planes to a Remote Air Base

Dear Mr. Germanos:

Because I reside in a town close enough to Burlington International Airport (BTV) that I can hear F-16s take off, I am writing to express my opposition to the basing of an F-35 fleet there.

As a seven-year member of my Town Council -- known as a Selectboard here in New England -- I received a formal introduction to the F-35 selection process and possible outcomes from the military during an event targeting elected officials several years ago.

I have also read and heard much about the possible impacts on our economy, environment, health and well-being in the interim.

Misinformation abounds -- both on the streets and in the press. The EIS itself should contain more up-to-date data, for example, on the health effects of aircraft noise levels and on housing impacts. NO-16

I am dismayed that such a densely populated area as ours -- in the most populous county in our state (by far) -- would still be in the running at this stage, given the noise levels, crash footprint, etc.

Won't you please re-examine your data and decision-making process and send these planes elsewhere?

Thank you for your consideration!

Irene Wrenner
Town of Essex Selectman

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Amy
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:37 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Against the F-35s

I grew up on White Street, right next to my grandparents and down the street from my aunts, uncles and cousins. I always thought some day, I too, would be so lucky as to live so close to my family. Last October, my boyfriend and I started looking for our first home to buy. There were a few for sale near my family (the only homes in South Burlington in our price range) Unfortunately, due to the possibility of the F-35s, we decided not to buy a house in one of the many neighborhoods surrounding the airport. Growing up, the F-16s were tolerable, but the F-35s are said to be three times louder, we were worried the noise would be too much. Why buy our first home in a neighborhood that may soon be deemed unlivable, due to noise. We were also worried if we bought a house there, and ever wanted to move, we would not be able to sell it. Many of the people who support the F-35s say "why live near the airport if you are worried about noise," well, some people were here before the F-16s, and I wanted to be near those people. We ended up buying a home in another neighborhood, but I still have my parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins homes and lives to worry about. I am against the F-35s coming to Vermont.

Amy Quenneville

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Guthrie MacCannon
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:38 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Comment on the F35 Basing

Dear Mr. Germanos,
I have heard the National Guard's arguments for the F35's, I have listened as they have passionately defended the idea that this plane will help economic growth in Chittenden and create jobs. I have heard their threats to pull out of said county if the basing is too strongly opposed. I have listened with equal attention to the arguments from the opposition, that the noise will create an uninhabitable environment, and that they're pollution will be to much. I have taken to heart and considered all of these point, but I have some questions too ask of my own.
Is it really worth it to improve the lives of a few people by paying them to upkeep a machine that's sole purpose is to fly cross the ocean (or too wherever) and take the lives of many others? Even if we except this monstrosity of a machine, can we really entrust it to the care of an organization that appears to be unable to write an accurate report? We may gain a slightly boosted economy, but at what cost?
Thank you for your time,
Guthrie

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

GS-1

From: Justin
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:42 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35's In Vermont

My wife and I are in support of the F-35's in Vermont. The upgrade would be great for the area and the economy. We really would like to see them come to Vermont.

Thank you for your time.
Justin & Billie Jo Rocque

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

GS-1

From: Tim Mishkit
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:46 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35

I lived at the end of one of the main runways at the Burlington int. airport for over 20 years . The airport noise was never a problem it is something u get used to. I feel the noise there is from the aircraft is a cost of freedom those opposed should get over it or move out. Tim Mishkit

Sent from my iPhone

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Jeanne Riley
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:48 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35

Sent from my iPad. I am so in favor of the f35s coming to Burlington. Jobs, and peace of mind knowing our country is a little safer knowing our green Mountain boys are flying.

Thank you.

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

GS-1

From: debmcdowell
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:48 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35 basing in Vermont

I would like to add my voice in support of basing the F35 in Burlington,Vermont. We live in South Burlington and the jets often go over head. In addition, my husband at his work place, hears the planes as well, as they fly over head twice a day. So we are as a family personally affected by the noise of the jets. But to our way of thinking, the noise is easily overlooked because it is a sound you understand and comes at expected times of day. To us, the more important issue is the need for these jobs in Vermont and these planes for our national security. Please continue to consider our area during your basing decision. Thank you for considering these comments. Deborah McDowell

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Christina Dague
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:49 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: NO F-35 in Vermont

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I am writing to express my concern and disapproval of basing the F-35 planes in Vermont.

I am primarily against these planes because veterans and their families are suffering from severe loss of benefits to pay for other military expenditures including these planes. Veterans have already paid with their service to this country and should not be asked to sacrifice again.

I also understand that the US government signed a contract to purchase these F-35s when they were still a "concept plane" and there have been many unforeseen setbacks and difficulties in the manufacturing of these planes. The current F16s in Vermont have logged thousands of hours of flight time and are therefore some of the safest planes around. I do not wish to have the kinks worked out of the F35s in a densely populated area of Vermont. The likelihood of a crash is significantly higher than with the current F-16s SA-8

Finally, I am concerned about public safety from the noise these planes will generate. Already, entire neighborhoods around the Burlington airport have been demolished, now considered uninhabitable thanks to the decision to use afterburner on the F16s that currently fly our skies.

Many Vermonters are very proud of the role the Green Mountain Boys played in patrolling the skies on September 11. Their quick response time to NYC on that day is still something I hear mentioned. However, I am fundamentally opposed to the F-35 plane in general which many military and government officials seem to agree is a disastrous waste of money. Even our own Sen. Patrick Leahy outlined his opposition to the plane in general, before stating that if the program does go through, it should at least benefit Vermont. I know that most of the work on these planes is required to be done at the manufacturer, so there will not be local airplane maintenance jobs associated with them. I see no benefit to Vermont nor to this great nation.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Christina Moore

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Stephen Murphy
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:50 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35 basing in VT & possible extension of public comment

Please mark me down as favoring basing of the F-35 wherever the Air Force decides is best. If that is here in Burlington VT, terrific. I live in Williston pretty much in the F-16 flight path. I do not find having to pause a TV program or a verbal conversation for a few seconds a few times a week to be a hardship at all. I am glad they are here.

As to the requests that the Air Force extend the public comment period, I say baloney. There has been plenty of time for comment. It is time for a decision.

Thank you for your time and for your service, military or no.

Stephen Murphy

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Fred Sargeant
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:53 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35 Basing at the VTANG BTV facility

I'd like to add my voice to those supporting the eventual basing of the F-35 at the VTANG base in Burlington, VT.

One need to only look at the anti-American, anti-Vermont governmental institutions and anti-public non-profits record of the tens of purported Vermonters that form the core of the anti-F-35 activists and the other longtime chronically complaining Vermont "activists" who've signed onto the anti-F-35 effort, who number in the few hundreds, to see that this is another of their usual ineffective, whiny campaigns.

Similarly, a little research into the people from away who presume to weigh in on a Vermont issue will reveal similar anti-American activist ties.

Fred Sargeant

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Ann
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:53 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35's at VTANG

I am all in favor of the F-35's coming to VTANG in South Burlington,VT.. I was one of the few who opposed the F4's coming, because of the noise. At the time the airport was my backyard neighbor. No one from any city or town jumped on the bandwagon on either side. The F-4's are louder during take off then the 35's. The Burlington International Airport has since 1991 purchased many homes along Airport Drive, knock the house down, chop the trees down and the next street hears what we did. No sound barriers have been put in place. As for Winooski, they knew the airport was there along with the noise, however they decided to build in the flight pattern. That is their problem, not the Air Guard's. On September 11,2001 it was with pride all of VT had with the quick response and continued support for New York City. We need the best squadron for our VTANG! They have proven time and time again how they are ready for not only what VT needs, but also what the nation needs.
Please send the F35's to us we are ready and proud to get them.
Respectfully,
Ann Kalinoski

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Mecha C. Zilla
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 5:55 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Opposed to F-35 Basing in Burlington

Feedback from:
Clayton Clark

I am a USAF veteran opposed to the placement of the F-35 at the Burlington Airport. Although I believe the noise will be an issue, as it has been for the F-16's, the primary reason I am opposed to this placement is because the F-35 is not consistent with the values of many Vermonters, myself included.

Polling has shown that Vermont has staunchly opposed US military actions over the past decade. I can not envision many scenarios where Vermonters will be happy with how the F-35 will be used. There will continue to be tension between the Vermont Air National Guard and Vermonters who oppose offensive (vs. defensive) military action. The US Air Force can expect that city and state leaders will attempt to block operations of the F-35 through the local regulatory process. Our statewide elected officials in support of the F-35 are betraying their own voting records/public comments against military action with their support, which I do not believe represents the majority of Vermonters.

The F-35 is an unnecessary waste of US tax dollars. If it is to exist at all, it should be placed in communities that support aggressive and offensive military actions that undermine our nation's security and contribute to negative perceptions of the U.S. abroad.

James Marc Leas
Attorney at Law
Registered Patent Lawyer

July 15, 2013

Mr. Nicholas Germanos
HQ ACC/A7PS
129 Andrews St., Suite 337
Langley AFB, VA 23665-2769

Ms. Kathleen Ferguson
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations – SAF-IEI
1665 Air Force Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330-1665

RE: **Why basing the F-35 at Burlington Airport is Illegal under US and International Law Regarding Human Shields**

Dear Mr. Germans and Ms. Ferguson:

In a letter dated July 13, 2013, I stated that basing the F-35 at Burlington Airport is illegal under the Geneva Conventions prohibition against use of civilians as human shields. In the present letter I provide further legal basis from the US Supreme Court and from a law review article in *Military Review*.

The US Senate ratified the Geneva Conventions in 1955.

In Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, the US Supreme Court said, "For the reasons that follow, we conclude that the military commission convened to try Hamdan lacks power to proceed because its structure and procedures violate both the UCMJ and the Geneva Conventions."

Thus, the Supreme Court recognized the Geneva Conventions as part of US law. There can be no question that ratified treaties and customary international law are recognized as part of US law under Article VI of the US Constitution.

An article, "Targeting Decisions Regarding Human Shields," by Captain Daniel P. Schoenekase, U.S. Army National Guard, published in *Military Review*, September -October 2004, incorporated herein by reference, describes the law regarding human shields and the requirement for US military personnel to observe the law. After the following extended excerpts from the article I present some conclusions:

Definition and Classification
Human shields are noncombatants whose presence protects certain objects or

areas from attack. The use of human shields is illegal under international humanitarian law. Considering the political ramifications of striking targets where human shields are present, it might be beneficial to specify the types of human shields employed.[1]

Proximity human shields. Proximity human shields, by their proximity to a legitimate military target, present such likelihood for collateral damage that a military planner would have to consider their presence before striking a target, **as for an example, Iraqi air defenses located in an otherwise civilian neighborhood**. Usually, proximity human shields have not been coerced to participate or have not volunteered to shield defenses. Sometimes, the enemy accomplishes countertargeting **by bringing the potential object of the attack to areas where human shields are present**.

. . .

Applicable International Humanitarian Law

Various provisions of treaties and protocols under international humanitarian law prohibit the use of human shields by a party to a conflict. . . .Article 28 of Geneva Convention IV, relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, makes the practice of employing human shields illegal as a matter of international humanitarian law, stating that "the presence of a protected person may not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations."[19]

Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions, Article 51(7)–Protection of the Civilian Population, which contains the key rule regarding human shields, states, "**The presence** or movements **of the civilian population or individual civilians shall not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations, in particular in attempts to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield, favor or impede military operations**. The parties to the conflict shall not direct the movement of the civilian population or individual civilians in order to attempt to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield military objectives." [20] This provision applies to passive and active human shields whether they are considered proximity, involuntary, or voluntary human shields. Article 51 notably does not excuse considering the presence of human shields during the targeting process. [21]

Article 52(2), General Protection of Civilian Objects, states that attacks shall be limited strictly to military objectives and defines military objectives as "those objects which by their nature, location, purpose or use make an effective contribution to military action and whose total or partial destruction, capture or neutralization, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage."[22] Article 52(1) says, "Civilian objects are all objects which are not military objectives as defined in paragraph 2."[23]

Article 58, Precautions Against the Effects of Attacks, creates a duty against the passive creation of proximity human shields: "Parties to a conflict, to the

extent feasible, shall remove the civilian population and material under their control from the vicinity of military objectives, **avoid locating military objectives within or proximate to densely populated areas**, and take other necessary precautions to **safeguard the civilian population** and civilian objects under their control against the dangers of military operations."[24]

The United States is not a signatory to Additional Protocol I and, thus, not bound by it, but the United States has accepted many of its provisions as customary international law and, therefore, adheres to its norms.[25] In 1987, U.S. State Department Deputy Legal Advisor Michael J. Matheson enumerated many of the principles in Additional Protocol I that the U.S. considers customary international law, including Articles 51 and 52.[26] The 1998 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) has the jurisdiction to prosecute **war crimes**, including "utilizing the presence of a civilian or other protected person to render certain points, areas, or military forces immune from military objectives."[27]

Targeting Principles

Given the modern nature of war and the transition of most societies to an industrialized economy with urban centers as their focal point, it seems likely that legitimate military targets will be located near civilians or civilian objects simply out of efficiency or because of urban growth. The Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocol I still mandate a duty on a party to a conflict to remove civilians from such an area, but that might not be practical in all situations.

...

Targets protected by human shields might still be attacked subject to the attacking party's obligations under international law to minimize collateral damage. Collateral damage usually occurs when attacks targeting military objectives cause civilian casualties and damage to civilian objects. It often occurs when military targets are located in urban areas.[29]

...

The Rome Statute for the ICC lists "extensive destruction and appropriation of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly" as a grave breach.[32]

Principle of discrimination (distinction). Commanders must distinguish civilians and civilian objects from combatants and military objects under the principle of discrimination. Civilians enjoy immunity insofar as they "enjoy general protection against dangers arising from military operations" and "shall not be the object of attack."[33] The principle of discrimination is codified in Additional Protocol I, Articles 51(4-5) and 57(2)(a)(i), which prohibit indiscriminate attacks.[34] Attacks must be directed at specific military objectives and cannot "employ a method or means of combat which cannot be directed at a specific military objective."[35] Examples of indiscriminate attacks are carpet bombing and Iraqi Scud launches during Operation Desert Storm.

...

> **Principle of proportionality.** The U.S. Army's definition of the principle of proportionality states that the "anticipated loss of life and damage to property incidental to attacks must not be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage expected to be gained."[37] This definition is clearly based on Additional Protocol I, Article 51(5)(b), which states that when collateral damage is expected or unavoidable, it must be proportionate to the military advantages of striking the target.[38]

Conclusions

It is not out of the question that when a country is engaged in wars that it may find its own territory under attack at some point. In view of the recent use of currently based F-16s in Burlington to attack other countries, the Vermont Air National Guard Station became a military target in the ongoing global war in which both sides are targeting the other in various places.

The basing of more first-strike attack weapons, like the stealth F-35, at the Burlington airport would make the airport a more important military target and would make the airport a target for a wider range of potential enemies than it is now. The kind of enemies for which stealth is a factor may have substantially greater military capabilities than for an aircraft that lacks stealth. Military facilities in the US equipped with such stealth first-strike attack weapons must be considered to be military targets.

The basing of the stealth first-strike F-35s at the Vermont Air National Guard Station would make the Burlington airport a legitimate military target for potential enemies. Because of the dense population adjacent to the Burlington airport, this basing of the F-35 would violate provisions of international and US law, including Article 28 of Geneva Convention IV and Articles 51 and 58 of Additional Protocol I that make the use of human shields a war crime.

The Air Force EIS should be further revised to address the environmental, health, safety, and legal consequences of making families in neighborhoods adjacent to the Burlington airport into human shields. It should also be revised to include the consequences to them of being collateral damage if the Burlington airport is targeted with a military attack in the ongoing wars in which the US is engaged. It should also describe the economic effects in the aftermath of such an attack. The time for considering these consequences is now, in the Air Force draft Environmental Impact Statement, before a basing decision is reached.

Thank you very much for considering these points. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

/James Marc Leas/

James Marc Leas

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Marcella Gange
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: I am opposed to the basing of the F35 in Burlington VT

Dear Sir,
I am opposed to the basing of the F£% in Burlington, VT. I realize that you will receive many such emails today but I wish to add my voice to those who raise their concerns at the way in which this basing will disproportionately affect the poorer and more marginalized members of our community and at the potential health risks to our children and other community members. With an apparently flawed selection process and so many unanswered questions, it is surely time to strike Burlington from the list of possible bases.
Thank you and with respect,
Marcella Gange

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

GO-1

From: Eric Hauser
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 6:03 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Opposed to basing the F-35 at Vermont's Burlington International Airport

Dear Mr. Germanos,

As a resident and home owner in Winooski, Vermont, I am writing to register my opposition to basing the F-35 at Burlington International Airport in Burlington, Vermont.

I am opposed to the F-35s in Burlington for the following reasons:

1) The predicted noise levels have shown to cause cognitive impairment in children in the noise zone NO-12

2) Safety. Basing this jet in the most populous area of Vermont does not make sense. Taking off and landing next to thousands of residences poses grave risk to those homes if a crash occurred. SA-1

3) Several schools are located within the 65 db DNL zone and would be negatively impacted by high noise levels. NO-11

4) The threat to local property values. SO-1

5) As the Air Force report informs us, there are several potential sites that are better suited to the F-35 basing.

I thank you for reviewing my comments and for recording them as being AGAINST the F-35 in BTV.

Sincerely,

Eric Hauser
Home owner,

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: andrea kenney
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 6:19 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: I am in support of basing the F35 in Burlington, VT

I think/hope the jet noise will be monitored and the mission will be a good one for the VTANG!
Andrea Kenney

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Constance Kent
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 6:22 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35 Comment

Dear Sir,

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed F-35s in Burlington. I am a resident of Burlington, and I work in Williston, where we frequently hear the F-16s overhead. The F-16s are not just unpleasantly loud. They also decrease productivity, as conversations must stop every time they fly over. You simply cannot hear a person speaking next to you over the noise. These disturbances are probably less than a minute (although they seem much longer), but I shudder to think how much that will increase with the increased noise from the F-35s. Not only will the sound reach you sooner and take longer to fade away, but the sheer noise itself will be unbearable. Being forced to listen to the sound of the F-16s is bad enough, and I cannot imagine (nor do I want to) the volume that will come from the F-35s.

I understand that progress is essential to our national security, but the quality of life sacrifice that this will cause is unreasonable.

Regards,
Constance Kent

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Mary Fillmore
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 6:42 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35 Basing in Burlington, VT

Dear Mr. Germanos:

I am opposed to the basing of the F-35 in Burlington, Vermont. The basis on which the Air Force has proposed Burlington as its top choice is admittedly faulty. Anyone who drives to the Burlington airport can see that it is in a densely populated airport. I live just outside the uninhabitable zone, but the level of noise is already sufficient to stop my talking on the phone or having an outdoor conversation. Apart from that, I am concerned about accidents with this new and relatively untried aircraft.

If the F-35, the most expensive piece of hardware ever built, must be deployed, it belongs in a desert or similar location, not in a metropolitan area. Please prevent this very unfortunate decision from going further. In addition, I wish to request a brief extension of the Public Comment period, based upon the fact that at least 100 pages of important information were not released until nearly 3 weeks after the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement was released. Given that this section included substantive questions that people were asking, and the important information given by the Air Force in response to those questions, we believe that it is only reasonable to offer people ample time to consider that information. Please extend the Public Comment period to offer the public 45 days starting from the date that the FULL Revised DEIS was released, rather than May 31st, the date on which the incomplete Revised DEIS was released. As you know, there is great controversy over this basing in our community. It is essential that Vermont citizens be given the most complete opportunity to read, understand, and respond to the information being released by the Air Force. It's crucial that the process by which this decision is made be free of further error. GP-15

Thank you,

Mary Fillmore

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Gerry Hine
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 6:44 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Please register our disapproval of the F35s in Vermont. Our home is in Winooski and bringing these jets to Burlington Airport will destroy our neighborhood. Sue & Gerry Hine

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Guy Derry
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 6:50 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: please do not base f-35s in burlington

Nick,

I love the city I live in (burlington, vt)... it happens to be the only real city we actually have in our state. I live about a mile from the airport and the F-16s are already crazy loud! I think it's super important for us to maintain a strong air force presence... but not with such a heavy ticket on the noise pollution factor for all the residential folks who live here. We have so much boonie territory up here - why not base the planes somewhere with less people living all around the take-off and landing zone?

Coming from a big military family, I can only say that you guys are doing great things for our country and I love and respect every last one of you.... but we got to maintain balance between civilian and national security interests/measures.

That's my two cents...
all the best,

-Guy

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Jeanne Weikert
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 2:55 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Do NOT ruin quality of Vermont life

As a person who loves Vermont and its unique quality of life I am writing to request that you NOT bring the F-35's to the Burlington location.

There is absolutely NO reason that the quality of life and subsequent reduction of real estate value need to be held hostage to an airplane. SO-1

Please consider the popular uprising that you are causing with this unfortunate choice. Certainly a compromise that is less destructive is possible. The relatively small financial benefit it brings to the area will be quickly lost in the destruction of more important things that involve people's homes and eardrums.

Jeanne Weikert

Sent from my iPad

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Susan Alden
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 3:08 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: No F-35s in BTV!

Please, DO NOT base F-35s in BTV and destroy more decent housing and nice neighborhoods.

Ike was right. "Beware the military - industrial complex".
Put them somewhere else, and better yet, stop building them. Stick with the F-16s which are much too loud, but proven for maneuverability and relative safety, and can be repaired here.

thank you, Susan B Alden, .

July 15, 2013 via email

Mr. Nicholas Germanos
HQ ACC/A7PS
129 Andrews St. Suite 337
Langley AFB VA 23665-9900

Mr. Germanos,

I am writing to support the basing of the F35 with the Vermont Air National Guard.

We recognize there are those who are opposed to the basing of the F35 in Vermont and that there are some negative conditions that come with any military installation. I support the basing on many levels 1) it needs to be somewhere and the infrastructure and personnel are already here, 2) it is a major employer in the relatively small Vermont economy, 3) it provides valuable support to the Burlington International Airport which further benefits the overall Vermont economy.

Basing of the next generation military aircraft with the VTANG represents not only recognition of the past 67 years of service, but commits the resources necessary to continue to make this fighter wing viable for the next 40 years.

Sincerely,

RB Klinkenberg

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Chris Reardon
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 3:04 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35 Burlington VT

First time writing about the issue.

Myself and my family are all for basing the F35 in Burlington.

National security comes first!

I don't live near the Airport, but if I did I would expect to hear planes taking off, duh!

I'm sure the folks complaining don't care about the noise their vacation jet makes on the way to Orlando to take the kids to see Mickey Mouse. And indeed, the FedEx jet that takes off around suppertime is probably the loudest of all.... Why are these consumers not complaining about their delivery service??

Plenty of Vermont has quiet airspace. These vocal opponents should move, or buy earplugs.

Please base these jets in Vermont.

Chris Reardon

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Steve Mack
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 2:40 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35's @ 158th FW Burlington, Vermont

Nick,
As a retired member of the 158th FW CES at Burlington, Vermont, I would like to express my support for basing the F-35's at Burlington. I base my support on thee following criteria.
1) Where the jets will take off will have little to no impact on the civilian population that borders the Burlington International Air Port. There are very few residential homes close at hand.
2) This community has withstood the noise level of F-16's for a number of years and in the past have undertaken the noise level of the old dual engine F-4's that were stationed at Burlington in the past. I assure you the noise level of the F-4's was much greater.
3) The social and military impact the 158th has on the community and the whole Northeast region. Socially, as a civil function for the state of Vermont, the 158th has been a major component during civil disasters i.e. Ice Storm 1998, Hurricanes Irene and Most recently Sandy. The jobs of the Active contingent that maintains the base on a full time basis and the 1100 traditional members who commute from all parts of Vermont and bordering New York have to be considered. The community benefits economically from the members who travel i.e. hotels/motels/restaurants.This brings in a great amount of revenue to the locality.
Militarily, the 158th FW is the only protection left in the Northeast corridor. The F-16 is a great aircraft and has proven itself over time, but it has outlived its time and won't meet the demands of the current threats that lay ahead. The F-35 on the other hand will serve us well for some time to come.

As Iv'ed said I'm a retired member of the 158th FW who for a number of years has traveled over to Vermont to assist the mission of the 158th. Its vital mission of civil assistance and military security in the region. I'm not trying to be rude to Vermonters, but they are quite close minded and don't want to go out of the box. They are more concerned on their gay rites rather than how the loss of the 158th FW would impact their community for the sake of a little noise. We miss our base here at Plattsburgh, New York that didn't withstand the BRAC committee back in the 90's. Our community was devastated financially for a number of years. We would welcome the noise that we've missed for so long and of course the economical support PA-5 the FW would bring to Plattsburgh, New York.

On the bright side I am glad it is the ultimate decision of the Federal Government and Home Land Security in basing the the F-35's for the best interest of our nation and not a few whiningVermonters.
Therefore I am expressing my full support for basing the F-35's at Burlington, Vermont.
Thank you

Respectfully,

TsgT. Albert S. Mack (RET) 158th FW CES

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: mtier62513
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 2:52 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: No F-35's

Dear SIr:

I strongly object to the basing of F-35's in Burlington. Vermont is known as a peaceful and profoundly human place in which to live. We are famous for progressive legislation that encourages inclusiveness, peace and equality. We are famous for our green pastures and our Vermont village patterns that all preserve special senses of place. We are not known for jobs at all cost, we do not allow heavy industry to pollute our air or demeaning living conditions to dispirit our population. Basing the F-35 will diminish the livability and sense of community for both Winooski and adjacent areas of Burlington. Already 50 year old communities are being bought up and demolished. So called progress and jobs are on the march, all at the expense of our communities. I am reminded of the misguided urban renewal of the late 60's and 70's that flattened the places from where we all came. Please, not again.

Martin Tierney

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: colleen.deignan
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 2:11 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I'm writing to submit my comment - I oppose the basing of F-35A's in Burlington because I believe that it supports the military industrial complex, which I strongly oppose.

Sincerely,

Colleen Deignan

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: George Chaffee
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 2:13 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35 The Wrong Plane for VT

The vetting of this plane has been mismanaged from the beginning and should not be permitted to set its wheels at BTV. It is the costliest fighter plane ever and cannot meet the safety and sound standards promised by its supporters. I live 1.5 mi. from BTV and the F-16 drills already rattle chinaware and make telephone conversations impossible in my home. I am completely discouraged by the certainty of significantly more noise from the F-35.

I hereby express my total opposition to bedding this plane In Burlington, VT.

Sincerely yours,

George A. Chaffee

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: thebatline
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 2:17 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: N O ! F35's in Burlington, VT

Good day,
Please consider this an urgent request to whomever it concerns regarding the basing of the F35's at the Burlington International Airport in South Burlington, Vermont.

South Burlington is a highly populated city with the airport and National Guard Base in extremely close proximity to residences.

Please note the following concerns:

At this time, due to the F16's already based at the airport and the buyout of the properties due to noise level, there are many abandoned, vandalized houses that have been purchased, but not torn down. Many have been empty for several years. There are many more homes on "the list" to be purchased and abandoned.

This is causing concern with squatters, crime, drugs, etc. at these abandoned house sites. Property values have declined in the city area due to this. Many first-time-buyer homes are no longer available due to these neighborhoods now being "on the list". These were clean, neat, well-cared for middle class neighborhoods that are now undesirable, due to the abandoned properties nearby. Property values of existing homes are jeopardized due to buyers not wanting to move to S.Burlington because of the planes SO-1

With the F-35's coming in, there will be more of the above.

There is also the concern for safety. Why have fighter jets based in the most densely populated areas of the state of Vermont? SA-1
If there was a crash, or malfunction (piece or a missle falling off of the plane as had happened in the past with the F16 here) the chance of loss of lives is great. Is this what the Air Force wants for citizens of the United States? Why not have the ANG of Vermont fly out of Plattsburgh Air Force base or have a new program that doesn't include loud, dangerous fighter jets here, jeapordizing lives and ruining the housing economy of the area?

There is a much, much higher percentage of citizens in the city and in the surrounding area that DO NOT SUPPORT these new planes being based here. In this democratic society that we live in , do we not have a voice??!

Please listen to the people. And, if you would, please pass this request on to whomever it needs to go to. We all certainly appreciate it.

Thank you.

The Battaline family of South Burlington and Essex, Vermont

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Sandy Barney [barn2sj@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 2:18 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35

Hello,
I am a Burlington resident and I have major concerns about basing the F-35s in our county. I have worked at a school close to the airport. When the F-16s fly over, all instruction and/or conversation has to end until they have all (sometimes 4 planes) have flown over. I have also seen the number of middle income homes that need to be sold because they are in the flight zone with high noise. Besides the noise and the inconvenience the impact on the new construction in Winooski will be devastating to the life style and income of the community. That community has worked hard to create new businesses, new homes and a setting that welcomes immigrants as well as young middle income families. These people will not have the means to relocate because these planes increase the unlivable space in the path of their noise. Please let us do the right thing and choose to locate the F-35s outside of a residential area in the United States.
Thank you
Sandy Barney

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: nina miller
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 2:26 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Cc: millyardboard@googlegroups.com
Subject: Winooski VT-- Falls Historic District

July 15, 2013

Transmitted via email to :Nicholas Germanos nicholas.germanos@langley.af.mil

Mr. Nicholas Germanos
HQACC/A7PS
129 Andrews St. Suite 332
Langely AFB, VA 23665-2769

Dear Sir:

As the legal representatives of the Millyard Condominium Association, located within the Winooski Falls Historic District encompassing both Burlington Vermont and Winooski Vermont, we are deeply committed to the preservation of this unique historic treasure. Unfortunately, we find that your identification and assessment therein of F35 impacts regarding this District has been wholly inadequate. Therefore, as a consulting party, pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.8, we demand your referral of this matter to the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. CR-2

Please advise us when you have completed this important process, including the Advisory Council's findings about this unique historic district.

Sincerely,

Nancy Miller-DeMercurio, Board Member
for Millyard Condominium Association Board of Directors

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Donna Bourne
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 1:25 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Stop F-35 from coming to Burlington, Vermont

I am opposed to the F35 Basing in Vermont because:

1. It will harm 1,500 Vermont children: physically, emotionally and cognitively] NO-12

2. It will lower the home values of 4,000 households] SO-1

3. It will degrade and possibly destroy the quality of life of 8,000 people] GO-3

4. It will risk the lives of thousands of people because of a greater probability of] SA-1 crashes from a warplane with no established safety record

5. It disproportionately negatively affects minorities and low-income people] EJ-1

6. It will pollute our environment] AQ-1

7. The AF says the F-35 will bring environmental harm to our communities

8. The AF says that Burlington is NOT the environmentally preferred base

9. Substantive errors were made in the scoring process] PA-1

10. Substantive errors were made in the Draft EIS] GP-17

11. There are many unanswered questions about the base selection process] PA-1

Sincerely,

Donna Bourne

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: McKittrick, Sr. Patricia E. |
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 1:28 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Opposition to the F35s

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I am writing in opposition to the basing of the F35s in Burlington, VT. Presently, the F16s fly directly over a 45 bed Healthcare facility. The noise from that is already deafening.

I believe the cost is immoral. We need to find a new strategy for peace, violence begets violence.

The 2011 studies on the significant impact on health were not included in the Air Force report. NO-13

Unfortunately, many of the facts about noise mitigation have been misleading.

From what I have read, The Air Force does not recommend the Burlington Airport for many obvious reasons. We are in a densely populated area.

Please take these points into consideration.

Sincerely,

Sr. Pat

GBIC

Good Jobs In A Clean Environment

July 11, 2013

Mr. Nicholas Germanos
HQ ACC/A7PS
129 Andrews St. Suite 337
Langley AFB VA 23665-9900

Mr. Germanos,

As the Regional Economic Development Corporation responsible for serving the value-adding employers in Chittenden County, the Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation (GBIC) strongly supports the basing of the F35 with our Vermont Air National Guard. We recognize that the Air Guard's 1,100 employees represent not only a valuable regional economic asset in the payroll they generate, but also in their inclusion and support for the communities in which they live. Additionally, the value of services that they provide to the Burlington International Airport remains a vital component of BTV's annual budget, allowing significant benefits to area commerce and transit.

After reading the updated Environmental Impact Statement, we feel that our position of support for basing the F35 with the VTANG is strengthened. The sound measures referenced in the EIS reconfirm our initial understanding that the F35 when not flown in afterburner will produce noise comparable to the current F16 operations.

We further understand that the flight operations schedule shows a reduction in flight operations, further mitigating any effects on the community. The VT Air Guard has shown a dedicated and continued respect for the people and neighborhoods that live within their training space, and have used flight and pilot operation changes to lessen impacts on the community; the arrival of the F35 will see the same level of commitment, respect, and professionalism.

GP-1

GBIC is in firm support of basing the F35 with the Vermont Air National Guard after examining the updated Environmental Impact Statement. The basing of the next generation military aircraft with the VTANG represents not only recognition of the past 67 years of service, but commits the resources necessary to continue to make this fighter wing viable for the next 40 years.

Sincerely,

Frank Cioffi

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Bill Stuono
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 1:51 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: EIS Feedback Letter for Burlington International Airport (BIA)
Attachments: Stuono-EIS-Letter-BIA.doc

Dear Mr. Germanos:

Attached is a letter outlining my feedback in regards to the Environmental Impact Study for the basing of the F-35A at Burlington International Airport (BIA). Please consider it in your basing decision, as well as place it on the record.

It is being sent via first class mail, as well.

Thank you so much,

William Stuono

July 14, 2013

Mr. Nicholas Germanos, HQ ACC/A7PS
F-35A Operational Basing Project manager
129 Andrews St., Suite 332
Langley AFB, VA 23665-2769

Dear Mr. Germanos and the U.S. Air Force:

I am writing to highlight significant flaws in the F-35A Operational Basing Environmental Impact Statement, May 2013. Specifically, I will be addressing the proposed basing of the F-35A at Burlington International Airport. I would also like to go on record as opposing the basing of these planes at this location (BIA) because the environmental, health, and housing implications are excessive for the community.

It is worth noting that the effects upon both the number of residents and the number of housing units are far greater at BIA than at all other basing options by a very wide margin.

I would like to mention three important flaws in the EIS:

Heath Impacts of Aircraft Noise:

During the last 13 years there has been a great deal of research regarding the health affects of noise, and most specifically aircraft noise. Why none of these studies are cited in the EIS is baffling and troubling. These studies are both domestic and European, and include the World Health Organization. For reasons I can't understand, only studies from many years ago were included. There is much more information available today. NO-13

The EIS has used outdated information, which makes this statement in the EIS false:

"In summary, there is no scientific basis for a claim that potential health effects exist for aircraft time average sound levels below 75 dB. The potential for noise to affect physiological health, such as the cardiovascular system, has been speculated; however, no unequivocal evidence exists to support such claims (Harris 1997)."

Significant health affects of noise, particularly aircraft noise, are a given and accepted by both the medical and scientific community. As recently as two days ago in a NY Times article, this was stated: NO-16

NYTIMES article July 12, 2013

"Beyond harming hearing, chronic exposure to noise increases the risk of cardiovascular disease. Children in classrooms buffeted by outside noise lag behind, and their teachers report lower job satisfaction. Pervasive background noise may damage the hearing center of babies' developing brains, research has found, possibly leading to auditory and language-related development delays. And though people may assume they have grown accustomed to noise, a constant din, even at low frequencies, often takes a heavy physiological toll. Noise can cause stress even when a person is sleeping.

"There's definite clearly defined cardiovascular impacts such as hypertension," said Robyn Gershon, a professor in epidemiology and biostatistics at the University of California, San Francisco, who has heavily researched urban noise, with a focus on New York City. "Also learning impairment in children, impacts on attention, memory, and worker productivity." Sleep disturbances are also linked to excessive noise, with higher production of stress hormones, which, she noted, can adversely affect the immune system"

On a personal note, I would like to add that I suffer from a medical condition called "hyperacusis". Basically, I am unable to tolerate loud noise and suffer severe and lasting pain from at high-decibel levels. I also often must sleep during daytime hours. Without question, the recent increase in noise of the current F16 operations have severely impacted my own health, and my home is just outside of the 65db DNL contour. Quite frankly, I am suffering by this recent increase in noise level, and have now had to put my own home on the market.

Housing Impacts:

As you probably know, the updated EIS shows significant increases to the impacted housing totals from the original dEIS. The current EIS now uses information from the 2010 Census, while the original dEIS used 2000 data. Nevertheless, it is my observation that these figures are still inaccurate and below actual totals. Having served on the South Burlington Planning Commission until March, 2013, I believe these numbers remain low and population is being undercounted. The EIS also does not account for recent development projects during the last three years, not to mention others that are in the pipeline for approval in South Burlington, Burlington, and Winsooki. This will easily be more than 1,000 additional individuals who will be in the 65db zone. SO-2

This region is the most densely populated area in the entire State of Vermont, and it continues to grow by large numbers. Limiting housing growth in this area will have a major impact upon the local economy. Yet other basing options remain that are more rural, and offer population densities that are much less significant. In my opinion, the F-35A should be based at other locations to minimize negative impact, not maximize it.

Use of Flawed FAA Part 150 Data:

But to me the most important item is that the EIS uses the FAA Part 150 2011 "projected" db DNL contours for comparison with the F-35. This 2011 study was viewed as a "projection", and never accepted as either accurate nor acceptable. These DNL lines show huge increases encompassing many more homes than the 2006 FAA Part 150 report, which only showed 65 db DNL barely around the actual perimeter of the airport. The 2006 report was used for the Airport Acquisition Program. By all accounts, including testimony from the Air Force themselves, the Air Guard has increased noise levels the last few years due to takeoffs with F-16 afterburners, which is likely why this 2011 study shows possible additional impacts. But just because they are making more noise the last few years does not mean it is an acceptable level of noise. When the South Burlington City Council first saw the "projected" 2011 db DNL contour lines, many members were aghast. But now the EIS somehow has taken the position that this is "accepted levels", even though no EIS was done at the time on those increases. The failure of local government and its officials at the time to adequately understand, research, and analyze the 2011 data does not in any way ratify it as being acceptable or endorsed, and it should not be used in the F-35A comparison.

In my opinion, the EIS should be comparing the 2006 FAA Part 150 db DNL noise contours with the F-35A, not the "projected" 2011 study, which has never been studied fully. And noise levels should go back to the 2006 study, because that is what was used when the Councilors approved the Airport Buyout Program. NO-23

In simple conclusion, I urge you to base the F-35A elsewhere, at a location which will have much less significant impacts upon the community. I also ask you to update the EIS with more current information regarding all three items listed above (health impacts, housing implications, and FAA Part 150 reliable and accepted data).

Sincerely,

William Stuono

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Janet Green
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 1:52 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35s

I am writing to say that I oppose the basing of F-35's in the Burlington, VT area. F-16's already patrol the eastern seaboard to keep us safe. Medical experts affirm that very loud noise is dangerous to children. The areas most affected by the F-35 noise contain many, many children, many of them from refugee families who have fled from war zones. This area also includes homeless vets, many of whom are dealing with PTSD. Furthermore, this affected area is middle to low income, and property values are predicted to become lower with the advent of more noise from planes. Please find another location for the F-35's.
Thank you for your attention.
Janet E. Green, Ph.D

GS-1

July 10, 2013

Mr. Nicholas Germanos

HQ ACC/A7PS

129 Andrews Street

Suite 332

Langley AFB, VA 23665-2769

Dear Mr. Germanos:

Please register my whole-hearted support for the initial bed-down of the F-35 at Burlington Air National Guard.

Please see the attached election results which remain the only true poll of public opinion in South Burlington on the issue to date.

The link for these official results (found on the South Burlington City website at the City Clerk's office) is found at:

http://www.sburl.com/vertical/sites/%7BD1A8A14E-F9A2-40BE-A701-417111F9426B%7D/uploads/March_5_2013_election_results.pdf

2 City Council positions were contested in this election and the 2 incumbents who had voted against the F-35 and campaigned on that vote were voted out of office by a WIDE margin. The 2 challengers (myself and Pat Nowak) campaigned as supporters of the F-35 bed-down and won big with a SUPER MAJORITY of 2/3s of South Burlington voters.

These are real facts that represent the voters' will in South Burlington and should be strongly considered in your decision to bed-down the planes.

South Burlington wants the F-35s.

Thank you,

Chris Shaw

Chris Shaw

South Burlington City Councilor, Clerk

S. Burlington Election Results
City Annual Meeting
3/5/2013

City Council 3 year term

	7-1	7-2	7-3	7-4	Total	
Dooley INCUMBENT ANTI-E35	325	267	223	300	1,115	32.96%
Shaw	587	800	355	526	2,268	67.04%

City Council 2 year term

	7-1	7-2	7-3	7-4	Total	
Engels INCUMBENT ANTI E35	312	283	222	307	1,124	33.38%
Nowak	596	782	351	514	2,243	66.62%

School Board 3 year term

	7-1	7-2	7-3	7-4	Total
Lalonde	639	786	430	611	2,466

School Board 2 year term

	7-1	7-2	7-3	7-4	Total
Bugbee	669	809	447	638	2,563

City Ballot
Article II

Article II - City Budget $30,857,877 of which $11,875,719 will be raised by property taxes

	7-1	7-2	7-3	7-4	Total	
Yes	574	599	349	392	1,914	57.24%
No	333	442	235	420	1,430	42.76%
Total ballots cast	907	1,041	584	812	3,344	

School Articles

Article II

Article II - School Budget $42,258,065 PART A

	7-1	7-2	7-3	7-4	Total	
Yes	628	684	374	442	2,128	62.28%
No	298	384	218	389	1,289	37.72%
Total ballots cast	926	1,068	592	831	3,417	

Article III - School Budget $728,686 PART B

	7-1	7-2	7-3	7-4	Total	
Yes	570	610	331	369	1,880	55.59%
No	348	446	256	452	1,502	44.41%
Total ballots cast	918	1,056	587	821	3,382	

city ballots cast	940	1,092	608	842	3,482
total registered voters	3,117	3,299	3,087	2,913	12,416
total active voters	2,812	3,021	2,714	2,628	11,175
percentage of voters	30.16%	33.10%	19.70%	28.90%	28.04%

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: jakeyan
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 12:38 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35 Basing - Burlington, VT - extension requested

To: Nicholas Germanos

Dear Mr. Germanos -

Thank you for the opportunity to have my opinion known in relation to the proposed bedding down of the F35A Stealth Bomber at Burlington International Airport in Burlington, VT.

As my previous e-mails and letters have stated, I AM STRONGLY AND DECIDEDLY AGAINST THIS PROPOSAL. The Air Force study associated with this decision has been shown to be based on faulty information. These errors have been many, and are significant in how they affect the final recommendations of the report. The impacts to the local area have only begun to be re-evaluated.

With this background in mind, please note the request below, as it is very important:

I am writing to request a brief extension of the Public Comment period, based upon the fact that at least 100 pages of important information were not released until nearly 3 weeks after the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement was released. Given that this section included substantive questions that people were asking, and the important information given by the Air Force in response to those questions, we believe that it is only reasonable to offer people ample time to consider that information. Please extend the Public Comment period to offer the public 45 days starting from the date that the FULL Revised DEIS was released, rather than May 31st, the date on which the incomplete Revised DEIS was released. As you know, there is great controversy over this basing in our community. It is essential that Vermont citizens be given the most complete opportunity to read, understand, and respond to the information being released by the Air Force. It's crucial that the process by which this decision is made be free of further error. GP-15

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Best Regards,
Jake Yanulavich

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Marie Davis
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 12:43 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: basing of the F35 in Vermont

Dear Nicolas Germanos

I am completely opposed to the basing of the F35 program in Vermont.

Here are a list of reasons being discussed in my community that I strongly agree with:

1. It will harm 1,500 Vermont children: physically, emotionally and cognitively NO-12

3. It will strongly adversely affect the quality of life of 8,000 people GO-3

4. It will risk the lives of thousands of people because of a greater probability of SA-2 crashes from a warplane with no established safety record

5. It disproportionately negatively affects minorities and low-income people EJ-1

6. It will pollute our environment AQ-1

7. The AF says the F-35 will bring environmental harm to our communities

8. The AF says that Burlington is NOT the environmentally preferred base

9. Substantive errors were made in the scoring process PA-1

10. Substantive errors were made in the Draft EIS GP-17

While I question the validity of the need for this project, I especially believe it does not belong in such a populated area.
In large, we are a community of people that takes pride in our healthy environment, working toward that goal, and even making sacrifices to personal comfort to strive for this ideal.

Thank you for considering the strong voice of opposition for this basing in the decisions made around this issue.

Sincerely,
Marie Davis

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Paul Gaboriault
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 6:37 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35

I support the F35 in So. Burlington Vermont. I have been a resident here for 12 years. Maintaining the air base with the newest equipment available is essential for it's vitality and the security of our nation.

Paul Gaboriault

Sent from my iPhone

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Snow Sharon
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 6:37 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35s in Vermont

I am one of the residents who will live in the area deemed incompatible with the noise from F35s if they are based in Vermont. I love my town and I don't want to see it destroyed by these aircraft.

Sharon Snow

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Stewart Boyd
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 6:40 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Re F35's based in Burlington, VT

Nicholas,

As a past member of the Vermont Air National Guard, I am very pleased that they are being considered for an F-35 assignment. I strongly believe a vast majority of the residents of Chittenden County (which includes the cities of Burlington, South Burlington, Milton, Winooski, Colchester, and Williston) support the deployment of F-35's to the Vermont Air Guard. I hope the final decision is favorable for basing the F-35's at BTV.

Sincerely,

Stewart Boyd

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Josef Watts
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Please don't base F-35s in Burlington, VT

Dear Mr. Germanos,

Please do not base F-35s in Burlington VT. The Air Force's EIS shows that more than 2000 residents will be exposed to noise levels over 65dB. These are people living in modest ranch homes of 900 to 1200 square feet in South Burlington, and residents of older two story homes now converted to apartments in Winooski. This is a significant fraction of the stock of low and moderate income housing in the Burlington area. These homes are attractive to low income residents not only for the cost but also because they are close to shopping and served by the bus system.

These people will be faced with choosing between several bad options. Stay in a house where the noise level is stressful and unhealthy; move to Burlington's already over crowded old north end, or find a cheap, run down rental further from Burlington, beyond the bus lines and manage to acquire an old (run-down) car.

Joe Watts

--
Joe & Donna Watts

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Les and Annie
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 7:49 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Stop the F35A coming to Vermont

Hello there,

I am taking this opportunity to register my vote of NO to the F35's proposed basing in Vermont.

I live about 1 mile away from the runways and even now with the F16's taking off and landing the noise is deafening.

Whilst I am walking my dogs and I happen to be in Dumas Park, South Burlington, when these aircraft take off, they run for cover, it scares the crap out of them and me.

We all know the F35's are even noisier than the F16's and I just do not see the reason for basing them here.

A less populated area would be far better suited to these war planes.

Please acknowledge my valid concerns,

You taxpaying and therefore a contributor to your wages, concerned resident of South Burlington, Vermont,

Les Parker

The Parkers'
Les and Annie

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Donna Papariello
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:08 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35's in Burlington, Vermont

My husband and I are very glad to hear that the F35s might be based at the Air Guard Base at Burlington Int'l Airport, in So. Burlington, Vt.

I hope you choose this site for the planes!!!! I love the sound of Freedom!!~!!

Donna and Gerald Papariello

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Lynn Vera
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:08 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F 35

I am opposed to the F 35's based at our airport I live in Queen City Park So Burl I am a school counselor

--

Lynn Vera, School Counselor

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Danislava Usova
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:14 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35

Mr. Germanos: Please halt plans to station the F-35 stealth bombers at the Vermont Air National Guard base in South Burlington.

The F-35, among many reasons to oppose it, is super loud, will be harmful to our communities, schools and property values, is a record-setting waste of money when we need real jobs programs, and is an aggressive instrument of war.

Sincerely Danislava Usova

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Robert Morse
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:21 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

Dear Sir:

The F-35, among many reasons to oppose it, is super loud, will be harmful to our communities, schools and property values, is a record-setting waste of money when we need real jobs programs, and is an aggressive instrument of war. Please do not allow them to come to Vermont Air National Guard base inSouth Burlington.

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Danica Usova
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:21 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35

I respectfully request that you not allow plans to station the F-35 stealth bombers at the Vermont Air National Guard base in South Burlington.

The F-35, among many reasons to oppose it, is super loud, will be harmful to our communities, schools and property values, is a record-setting waste of money when we need real jobs programs, and is an aggressive instrument of war.

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: G. mattews
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:22 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35

I respectfully request that you not allow plans to station the F-35 stealth bombers at the Vermont Air National Guard base in South Burlington.

The F-35, among many reasons to oppose it, is super loud, will be harmful to our communities, schools and property values, is a record-setting waste of money when we need real jobs programs, and is an aggressive instrument of war.

GO-1

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: schaefersvt
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:24 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35s in South Burlington, VT

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I am writing to let you know I do not support the F-35 bed-down in South Burlington. I have been a resident in South Burlington for 16 years and I work for the South Burlington School District. I believe the negative impacts on the community far out-weigh any possible favorable outcomes.

It seems supporters of the planes have agendas and the reports on the impact on residents has not been forthright. It disappoints me to think elected officials and powerful business people with personal interests would disregard the impact of the planes on the residents living near the airport. They defend the planes by accusing residents who have concerns of being anti-American and saying that they knew what they were getting into when they bought a house by the airport 50 years ago.

I can tell you that when the F-16s take off from the airport, I have to stop teaching because the noise is loud enough to drown me out.

Please don't disregard health concerns and the quality of life of those who live in South Burlington and the surrounding areas. We deserve an unbiased decision that will be in the best interest of the residents, those of us who will have our lives interrupted several times a day by the noise of these planes. There must be a less populated area that would serve as an appropriate home to the planes. GO-3

I hope a decision is made that will be in the best interest of the people who live here.

Sincerely,

Maryellen Schaefer

Sent from my iPhone

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Molly Loomis
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:27 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Opposed to the F-35 in Vermont

Dear Mr. Germanos,

Please mark me down as opposed to basing of F-35 fighters in Vermont. As a Burlington resident, I don't believe the benefits of the program outweigh the costs to the City's quality of life.

Sincerely,
Molly Loomis

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: T. Teresa HAWES
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 8:58 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35s based in Burlington, Vermont

Good evening,

My name is Teresa Hawes. I live and work in Winooski, Vermont. When the F-16s go over our school, I do often have to stop teaching mementarily because of the noise - and I suggest "let's pray for the pilots!" and the students join in willingly. I am proud to have the F-16s nearby and hope the F-35s will come.
Thank you for your haed work, and thank you for protecting us,

Teresa Hawes

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: genese grill
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 9:53 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35's in Burlington VT?

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I am writing to you to express my deep concerns regarding the potential basing of the F-35A at the Burlington Air Guard Station in Vermont. As the Environmental Impact Statement and the most recent reports on the feasibility of this project have clearly demonstrated, the purported benefits of the F35A being based here have been exaggerated, while the problems it will bring have been underestimated and in most cases, ignored altogether.

Upwards of 6- 7 thousand families will find their homes unlivable due to the noise impact of these jets, and the Burlington and Winooski infrastructures have no viable plans—in a housing market that is already at zero vacancy—for replacing these lost homes. Further, the surrounding areas are already negatively impacted by noise from planes. As a Community College of Vermont instructor, I repeatedly have been forced to halt class discussions or lectures while planes passed overhead. The basing of the F-35's in Burlington, will only make this situation more unbearable.

It is particularly disturbing that our local and regional elected officials have, for the most part, flagrantly ignored the overwhelming outcry of a majority of the citizens and that important information was either covered up or neglectfully misrepresented by earlier reports on the possible impacts of these jets. It seems clear that a few politicians are engaged in selling the livability of Burlington and Winooski, destroying thousands of people's lives, for some negligible personal or political gain.

Thank you for considering the concerns of the people who will have to live with the impacts of these jets. Yours Sincerely,

--

Genese Grill, PhD

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

GO-1

From: Emer Feeney |
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 10:14 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Re: I don't want the F-35s to ruin my community in Vermont

Dear Nicholas Germano,

I am an 8th generation Vermonter who lives in South Burlington, where the Air Force is threatening to base their new incredibly costly F-35 jets. I am a librarian who works at the public library in Burlington, Vermont, and the mother of two children. My husband works at the University of Vermont as a physics lecturer. We love our community. It is a beautiful place where people really care about each other.

I firmly oppose the basing of the F-35s here, and will continue to do so. At every level, including the process by which they are being forced on us, the basing of the F-35's here stands in direct contrast to the values of due process, transparency, healthfulness, economic justice, and egalitarian cooperation by a concerned citizenry that have characterized Vermont for the past 200 years.

Frankly, I'm disgusted. This is not what we want here. We're a state that doesn't even allow billboards. Why would we want a bunch of wildly overpriced, wasteful, environmentally unsound, incredibly distruptive, potentially damaging war tools flying around ruining our quality of life and possibly hurting our children? Burlington, VT and Vermont as a whole have been repeatedly named in national rankings as places with high standards of health for women and children, and as places with some of the best quality of life in the country. I don't believe that will continue to be the case if the F-35s come here, to the most densely populated area in the state.

I'm not really sure why the Air Force continues to push the issue of basing the (untested, potentially dangerous, definitely deafening) F-35s in our community when the majority of people here and in the greater Burlington area - again, the most densely populated area in the state- have been in opposition to it. Certainly, it wasn't that long ago that they closed the nearby Plattsburgh, NY air force base stating reasons of economy and the need for greater efficiency. Are we really that much more "strategically favorable" to them such a short time later? None of this seems logical.

Oh, wait - unless you take into account the money to be made by local and national developers once they destroy the oldest and most defined residential community in South Burlington, seeded with our tax-funded buyout money. If this happens, it will mean nothing less than a total collapse of trust in our local government and military. This could be devastating for our community, which is already struggling economically and feeling cynical about the government.

The jobs that will be brought here by the predictable commercialization of the area around the airport are not the kinds of jobs we need. We don't need more low-wage service positions so that we can continue to barely keep our head above the water while catering to the whims of the wealthy. We need government that uses our tax money to help us create stronger communities through education and renewable resource investment, through strengthening the local economy, not funneling our money to the top percent-ers who don't even need it. It's grotesque, and we are not blind to it.

The F-35 profoundly represents many things that are wrong with the government and military today, perhaps nowhere so much as in the way the people who live here are being railroaded by the military-industrial concerns who are intent on pushing it through despite our protests.

However, the people of Vermont are passionate and vocal, and we don't care for it when someone tries to pull the wool over our eyes. If the Air Force continues to press the F-35s on us in collusion with the local developers who stand to gain from its placement here, they will be in for a strong fight.

Thank you for your time,

Emer Pond Feeney

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Loretta Dow Marriott
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 11:01 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Oppose F-35s for BTV

Mr. Germanos,

I oppose initial basing of the F-35 at BTV due to the risk of crashing in this densely populated area. This is not the way to treat a civilian population.

Loretta Marriott

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: plilienv
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2013 11:03 PM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Comment on Basing the F-35s in Burlington Vermont

Mr Nicholas Germanos
HO ACC/A7PS
129 Andrews Street
Suite 332
Langley AFB, VA 23665=2769

Dear Mr Germanos

I am sure you have received many emails regarding why people do not want the F-35s based in the Burlington Vermont area. Therefore I will submit bullet points that are brief and to the point.

The area under consideration is densely populated. The noise of the current af jets is so loud that it is difficult to be outside when they are flying overhead. I am deeply concerned what would happen to the area and citizens if the F-15s, which are louder, were to be stationed in the area. Children in school, businesses, homeowners all within the parameter of the flight path will be adversely effected.

I am sure there is another area in the country that could host these bombers. An area that is not as densely populated.

Thank you for reading this email.
With best, Pat Lilienthal

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: vtirrito
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 6:43 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Re: Please Base the F35's in Burlington Vermont

Hello Nick,

Today I read in the Burlington Free Press the Winooski City Council voted 5 - 0 in stating they wanted Burlington taken off the list to base the F35s at the Burlington International Airport until the USAF / Guard answered more questions regarding noise levels. I mean it really is all about noise or is it? In my previous note I stated I believed the USAF / Guard would take steps to mitigate the noise increase. I guess all of us need to hear what that is now. I still maintain my support for basing F35s in Vermont. NO-1

Let's take the noise off the table.

Victor Tirrito

From: vtirrito
To: "nicholas germanos" <nicholas.germanos@langley.af.mil>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2013 12:46:52 PM
Subject: Please Base the F35's in Burlington Vermont

Nicholas Germanos,

I am not here to debate the noise levels, property values or any other pooh pooh complaints some of my neighbors keep airing. It is my belief the issue is not the noise but the fact these are war planes. I am sure these folks protesting basing the F35s here relish their freedom but think if they support the F35 they are supporting war. Basing the F35 in Vermont is a good strategic defensive move given Vermont's location. I live and work on one of the flight paths in Winooski. F16s regularly fly over my house. Yes they are noisy. Will the F35 be noisier? Yes I am told. Do I care about the noise? I certainly do but believe the US Air Guard with keep it minimized. Do I care about defending our way of life here in the USA? You bet I do an that is why I am in favor and proud of the decision to be basing the F35s in Burlington Vermont.

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: jeanblu Jean Saysani
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 5:03 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Cc: FN-CEQ-OpenGov@ceq.eop.gov
Subject: VTANG DEIS Controversy- YouTube

Mr Germanos

Controversy continues, due to countless errors, in the NEWS, below links and public now knows VTANG scores were an ERROR. If VT had received the correct score in the scoring process, if correct scoping had been done to include contacting the Winooski Mayor, and the four City Council members (which were not sent scoping letters). If "minority groups" had been sent scoping letters in beginning, for their honest opinion such as REFUGEE Resettlement Program and Africans Living in VT, who since last comment period are FEARFUL to say anything due to controversy now, and fearing backlash and hate crimes. The entire DEIS process has been flawed and with Air Force already scandalous reputation, all the errors in FAVOR of getting those aircraft based here, there is NO way the public will ever simply let 7700 people become collateral damage for 333 full time jobs and a lousy, over budget, LM corporate welfare program. Perhaps pressure worked with 26,000 silenced sexual assault victims, Vermonters are not and will not be silent about this scandal. The Air Guard is permitted to launch a misleading media campaign to DOWNPLAY adverse impacts and contacting expert at CDC, twist dEIS health facts and attempt to claim they can "mitigate" and no health risks in 65 dnl zone, undermining AF dEIS report, further tainting the entire process and inflaming the controversy with misrepresentations. People's homes and cars being vandalized, vicious comments, threats on newspaper sites, and fabric of communities being torn apart. Please, Air Force, do as Winooski City recommends, remove VTANG from basing for the F35. The council seats to overturn the City of South Burlingtons opposition was purchased by Leahy's cousin Pomerleau and friends (well documented 23k junket to Eglin) expensive newspaper ads saying home values will not be impacted by 65 dnl zone. This has now gone beyond enviromental injustice, but fueling class warfare! It is now believed the "long arm" of Senator Leahy behind a corrupt basing process to personally benefit his cousin Pomerleau (whether true or not?) It is a scary and disgusting process, that some people are even scared to COMMENT on, for fear his power could put them in danger. Vermont's own Silkwood truly "unbelievable".

http://m.wamc.org/?utm_referrer=#mobile/66919

http://m.youtube.com/watch?v=1eXT2Ny7ZcU&desktop_uri=%2Fwatch%3Fv%3D1eXT2Ny7ZcU

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Chris Varin
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 8:17 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35 - Vermont

There seems to be a small, very vocal, group here in Vermont opposed to basing the F-35 here. I'm part of the generally quiet "middle" that, given the opposition's activity level, think it is important to take the time to write to express that I support continuing the Air Force mission in Vermont, including the planned basing of the F-35. I'm also a life-long resident of the Burlington/South Burlington area.

Sincerely,

Chris A. Varin

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: bonnie.gintis
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:00 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: As a Winooski resident I oppose the F-35

I am writing to let you know I am opposed to the F-35s coming to my community.

I will not repeat the arguments you have heard before. I just want you to know that there are 3 people in my household and we are all opposed. You need to know that the majority of this small city are opposed to the plan to bring more planes to the nearby airport.

Please consider basing them in a rural area, where the lives of so many won't be affected.

Thank you for considering our plight.

Bonnie Gintis, DO, FCA

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: J Ann
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:10 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35

I support the F35 and am a south Burlington,VT resident.

Thank you! Julie Conrad
Sent from my iPhone

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: bob bernier
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:18 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35

My wife and I are for the basing of the F-35's @BTV. We support the F-35 . Thanks

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Mary Tegel
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:19 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Burlington F-35s

Dear Sir:
Please do not site these jets in our region. The noise is unacceptable, however that it means that our country is defended.

There are fewer and fewer places in our world that are quiet. New England has been a haven for much needed for people who wish to escape noisy urban places. Some people choose to love in quiet, rural places and some people chose to visit.

Some of our most cherished artists have found the tranquility of rural New England as a place to create their work. My own uncle sought refuge in new England's uplands when he suffered shell-shock as we called it after WWI.

As a people, we have been losing the places that we need for our health because of the ongoing intrusions of noise.

Please do what you can to protect this important characteristic of this place. I believe that you, yourself, and the people you lead often seek such respite yourselves. The jets we house here are loud enough. Please so not let the new jets take away even more of our precious quiet.

Respectfully,

Mary Tegel

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: susjoli
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:37 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35's in South Burlington, VT

Dear Mr. Germanos,

I am writing to let you know that many people in the South Burlington, VT community do not want F-35's based in the middle of the city (where the airport unfortunately is located) and adjacent to a neighborhood that contains many homes as well as an elementary school. Please reconsider and find a location more appropriate to accommodate the noise levels of F-35's.

Thank you,

Jolyn Wijetunga

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Cheryl Bouchard
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:37 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F35 Opposition

It amazes me that those that are so for bringing the F35s to South Burlington do not live in the area affected. I grew up near the airport and my parents still live there. These are the folks that have the right to voice their opinion, not the others that will not be affected by the noise and health effects. So, please please only take into consideration those that would be affected should the F35s come to VT.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Seth Gillim
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS; sosvt@googlegroups.com; stop-the-f35@googlegroups.com
Subject: F-35 Bed Down at VTANG - OPPOSED

Mr. Germanos,

I have waited to write this letter for a long time, thinking of the perfect reason why the F-35 warplanes should or should not be based at VTANG in Burlington, Vermont. I have read the arguments for and against and listened patiently while my neighbors discussed this issue.

As the deadline for public comments draws near, there are 3 basic reasons why I believe the F-35 should not be based at VTANG.

1. It is bad for my children's health. By now I'm sure you have read the same studies I have: prolonged exposure to loud noises (even in short bursts) leads to cognitive and hearing impairment, decreased learning, increased stress and a whole host of health problems. The job of our armed forces is to protect the most vulnerable among us, not damage them. By basing these warplanes at VTANG, you are doing damage to my children's well-being, intentionally or not. As a parent, it is my duty to protect the health and safety of my children above all else. NO-12
2. It runs contrary to the American Dream. My wife and I saved for 9 years to put the down payment on a house that will fall within the proposed "unfit for residential use" noise contours should the F-35 be based at VTANG. We are a hard-working family that just barely gets by. If we are smart with our money, each month we pay our bills, make sure our girls are well-fed, service our debts, and maybe have a few dollars left over to invest in our modest home in the hopes that by slowly, steadily fixing up our house it will become an asset that we can eventually use to afford college for our girls and retirement. It is a long-term plan. We have entered into an unofficial contract with the rest of American society: work hard, play by the rules, spend your weekends replacing water-heaters and refinishing floors, and after a long while you will have something called equity which is the middle-class equivalent of a savings account. For us, there is no do-over. No pot of money that we can draw on if our home value does not increase. I cannot for the life of me understand why the Air Force would want to embed a plane in the middle of a densely-populated area and risk ruining property values of one of the last places in Chittenden County, Vermont where working families like mine can still afford to buy. Why would you do this to us? Does "mission" really require destroying the financial hopes and dreams of families like mine? SO-9
3. It is not good for the Air Force. I assume that, like any other organization, the Air Force simply wants to successfully do its job with a minimum of interference and harassment. Public opposition to the VTANG bed-down is not sentimental and will not go away: we're talking about the health and safety of our families. Why spend your precious time, energy and resources defending a war plane that so many people do not want in their community? I'm sure you will have a more receptive audience in a community whose livelihoods will not be put at risk by this giant noise machine.

Send these warplanes to a community that wants them.

Sincerely,
Seth Gillim

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Keith Rousseau
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:52 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Burlington F-35 Opposition

Dear Mr. Germanos,

We are both strongly opposed to the AF basing the F-35 fighter jets in Burlington, VT. The side effects seem to great for such a populated area and far too many people will be adversely affected. Please consider a different location.

Sincerely,
Keith & Michelle Rousseau

GS-1

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: John Butler
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35 @ Burlington IAP, VT

Hi Nicholas,

I support the basing of the F-35 at the VTANG Base in Burlington, VT. I have been a long time resident in South Burlington who realizes all the benefits that come with the VTANG.

The non-supporters have been very well organized and more vocal than the supporters who I believe are more numerous than the non-supporters.

Many of the claims against the F-35 are unfounded, partially factual, or negative in nature. This makes me very suspicious of their motives.

John H. Butler

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Jean Brown
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 10:02 AM
To: Seth Gillim
Cc: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS; sosvt@googlegroups.com; stop-the-f35@googlegroups.com
Subject: Re: [SOSVT google group] F-35 Bed Down at VTANG - OPPOSED

dear Seth,

Rather than " send them to a community that wants them" - how about this: "No community should have them."

Why should the F35s be sent to terrorize any community? To inflict harm and to ignore those who have the least among us to fight for their rights.

The power in Congress must not be ignored. Look at where the F35s are being stationed: In Senator Lindsey Graham and Senator John McCain states.

Thanks for all of your efforts, Vermont citizens.

Jean Brown

Sent from jmb

On Jul 13, 2013, at 9:39, Seth Gillim

Mr. Germanos,

I have waited to write this letter for a long time, thinking of the perfect reason why the F-35 warplanes should or should not be based at VTANG in Burlington, Vermont. I have read the arguments for and against and listened patiently while my neighbors discussed this issue.

As the deadline for public comments draws near, there are 3 basic reasons why I believe the F-35 should not be based at VTANG.

1. It is bad for my children's health. By now I'm sure you have read the same studies I have: prolonged exposure to loud noises (even in short bursts) leads to cognitive and hearing impairment, decreased learning, increased stress and a whole host of health problems. The job of our armed forces is to protect the most vulnerable among us, not damage them. By basing these warplanes at VTANG, you are doing damage to my children's well-being, intentionally or not. As a parent, it is my duty to protect the health and safety of my children above all else. NO-12

2. It runs contrary to the American Dream. My wife and I saved for 9 years to put the down payment on a house that will fall within the proposed "unfit for residential use" noise contours should the F-35 be based at VTANG. We are a hard-working family that just barely gets by. If we are smart with our money, each month we pay our bills, make sure our girls are well-fed, service our debts, and maybe have a few dollars left over to invest in our modest home in the hopes that by slowly, steadily fixing up our house it will become an asset that we can eventually use to afford college for our girls and retirement. It is a long-term plan. We have entered into an unofficial contract with the rest of American society: work hard, play by the rules, spend your weekends replacing water-heaters and refinishing floors, and SO-9

after a long while you will have something called equity which is the middle-class equivalent of a savings account. For us, there is no do-over. No pot of money that we can draw on if our home value does not increase. I cannot for the life of me understand why the Air Force would want to embed a plane in the middle of a densely-populated area and risk ruining property values of one of the last places in Chittenden County, Vermont where working families like mine can still afford to buy. Why would you do this to us? Does "mission" really require destroying the financial hopes and dreams of families like mine?

3. It is not good for the Air Force. I assume that, like any other organization, the Air Force simply wants to successfully do its job with a minimum of interference and harassment. Public opposition to the VTANG bed-down is not sentimental and will not go away: we're talking about the health and safety of our families. Why spend your precious time, energy and resources defending a war plane that so many people do not want in their community? I'm sure you will have a more receptive audience in a community whose livelihoods will not be put at risk by this giant noise machine.

Send these warplanes to a community that wants them.

Sincerely,

Seth Gillim

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Luchini, Walter
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 10:18 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Cc: wjluchini@gmail.com
Subject: Burlington, VT F-35s

Burlington, VT seems to be an inappropriate location for the new F-35s.

Please find another base to house these new planes.

Walter J Luchini

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Ekbouvier
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 10:22 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: F-35

Please don't destroy our community by bringing in planes which will mean the categorization by the government of thousands of affordable homes as "unlivable." These are the only moderately priced homes in the entire area. Those displaced will have no place to go. Those close-by but not qualified for the "buy-out" will lose most of what they have put into their homes for decades hoping to retire in them, since they will be very hard to either live in or sell.
Eileen Bouvier

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

GO-1

From: Justin E. Crowther
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 10:24 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Who cares about jet noise.

Hello,

My name is Justin Crowther and I live in Colchester. I am not concerned about noise generated from the F-35...I am a professional touring rock musician. My ears are ringing every night, and I wouldn't have it any other way!

What I do have a problem with is war. The F-35 simply equates to a very expensive killing machine. I believe in world peace. I believe we as Americans have become jaded and very ignorant. My sister-in-law is a school teacher right over the flight path. I am not worried about the noise over the school...I am worried about sending millions of dollars to war machines, and not enough money to her school. The kids are more important than the jets. If we cared enough to teach them about values that can truly change the world, not recruit them and brainwash them in the military, the world would look much different A day may come that we don't need these jets...or any war machines. The absolute worst part of the whole debate is that everyone I talk to that supports the F-35 seems to have no clue about anything else going on in the real world. At least you got a bunch of ignorant supporters...let's face it, how could you go wrong?

I will not stay silent. I do not support you.

Thanks for your time!

Over and Out,

Justin E. Crowther

Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS

From: Carol Morris
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2013 10:34 AM
To: Germanos, Nicholas M Civ USAF HQ ACC/A7NS
Subject: Citizen Statement on Basing of the F35

Greetings Mr. Germanos,

I am writing to you regarding the basing of the F35 in SOUTH BURLINGTON, VERMONT. I am strongly OPPOSED to the base being placed in such a congested residential area. Every other option for this basing will affect considerably fewer people and to my knowledge the few folks who wrote to you during the first statement period concerning the basing at places other than South Burlington were all in favor of those places. Most of the previous statements were about South Burlington and of those the majority were against basing the F35 here.

You may have received a number of postcards from folks who support the basing. Postcards that required nothing more than a stamp. No thought required. The statement sent out with those postcards said that the F35 would be no more noisier than the F16 but the impact statement says otherwise. Did those who sent the postcards in really look into the matter? Do they really understand what basing the F35 here will do to our community?

There are so many reasons why the F35 is wrong for our community.

* Noise levels will increase to a level (3-4 times that of the F16) not compatible for residential use over a large area. That area covers a region that is densely populated with low and moderate income families, including 3300 households for a total of 7700 people. These are folks who can least afford to move out of the zone and with the metro area here having a very low rate of available housing there is no place for them go. Studies cited by the newest DEIS show proof that health problems from exposure in 65+ dB areas include READING, HEARING, MEMORY-RETENTION AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE PROBLEMS. This includes South Burlington's Chamberlain school where the noise level is expected to be 68-70dB. According to a 2010 World Health Organization report 50% of children in high noise areas will suffer cognitive impairment. Health affects for adults have also been shown. This first point alone should be reason enough not to base the F35 in this dense residential area.

* Safety concerns are still a big issue with the F35. It's track record is, at this point, abysmal. It is estimated to be 11 times more likely to crash and because of its design doesn't fly but rather falls when it loses power. Around here that means that it will crash in a residential area SA-2

* There will be a negative environmental impact on the area. Even the DEIS states that basing the F35 here would NOT be "ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE."

* The economic impact of basing the F35 in South Burlington would be negligible or minor. It appears that not basing the F35 here would probably not have much of an impact either. The second statement cannot be confirmed as easily as the Vermont Air National Guard refuses to release that information. However based on the extension of the F16 program for 20 years you can project that if the F35 never comes then the current guard employee level will not be reduced until a considerable number of years in the future. On the other side, if the F35 were to arrive in South Burlington in 5 years then over 7,700 local residents will suffer from:

    * Decrease in quality of life
    * Decrease in home values

GO-3

* Homes will be labeled unsuitable for residential use by our own federal government and thus undesirable and perhaps even unsalable. SO-9

The Air Force has said that the F35 basing will not happen where it's not wanted. I believe you've heard loud and clear that we do NOT want the F35s here. The question is whether the Air Force is independent or under the gun of Mr Patrick Leahy. We know how powerful our senior senator is and our fear is that the choice is not yours, it is his, no matter what the citizen have provided for input.

Based on the DEIS alone there is no clear case for the basing of the F35 jets in South Burlington, Vermont. Coupled with the citizen response a decision to base the jets here cannot, in good conscience, be made.

Please enter my opposition and statement into the permanent record.

Regards,
Carol Morris