D.8.10 Transcript from the Tucson International Airport Air Guard Station Public Hearing Held February 23, 2012, in Tucson, Arizona

U.S. AIR FORCE F-35A TRAINING BASING EIS

PUBLIC HEARING/PUBLIC COMMENTS

BEFORE HEARING OFFICER

COLONEL BRAD ROAN

TUCSON, ARIZONA

FEBRUARY 23, 2012

6:00 P.M.

Reported By: Kimberley W. Gauthier

Certified Reporter

Certification No. 50767

I N D E X

THE AIR FORCE PUBLIC HEARING AND COMMENT SESSION was taken on February 23, 2012, commencing at 6:00 p.m., at the Tucson Jewish Community Center Ballroom, 3800 East River Road, Tucson, Arizona, before Kimberley W. Gauthier, a Certified Reporter in the State of Arizona.

* * *

A P P E A R A N C E S

COLONEL BRAD ROAN
United States Air Force
Judge of Criminal Appeals in Washington, D.C.
Hearing Officer

COLONEL MICHAEL MCGUIRE
Commander, 162nd Fighter Wing
Tucson Air Guard Station

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JON WHEELER
Flight Instructor
Air Education and Training Command

KIM FORNOF
Air Education and Training Command
Project Manager, F-35A Training Basing EIS

and I will apologize up front if I mispronounce some names -- is Mr. John Del Frari, and after that will be Brian Andrews.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

3172 TU

MR. DEL FRARI: My name is John Del Frari, and I am the current president of the 162nd Fighter Wing Minute Man Committee, which is a group of approximately 70 or 80 local citizens and business people that supports the Air National Guard and are their advocates in situations like this in the public forum.

We've heard last night that there are a group of people who don't want the F-35 to come here because of noise concerns, and there are a group of people who want the F-35 to come here because of economic reasons. What I'd like to do tonight is talk about the 162nd Fighter Wing itself.

I've been involved as a Minute Man Committee member for ten years. I have known three wing commanders and interacted with two of them. And each wing commander has said that they have one mission and one goal: The mission is to teach fighter pilots in the F-16 and to make them the best fighter pilots they can make them; and their goal is to have the least negative impact on the Tucson community.

And by that, they're trying to make as little noise as they can and be as good a community citizen as they can possibly be.

One of the things, as far as flying the F-35 in Tucson -- that I haven't heard anybody mention yet -- is that right now 20 percent of the flying time in the F-16 is done in a simulator, and 80 percent is actual flying time. With the F-35, 40 percent of the pilot's time is spent in the simulator, and only 60 percent of his time learning to be a pilot is spent in the actual aircraft.

The dedication of the pilots, the life support personnel, the crew chiefs and the mechanics, I got to spend a day with them out there recently. They will never send up a plane that they don't feel is safe. I can't imagine a pilot in the Wing that would ever fly a plane that he didn't think was safe. They are dedicated to their mission, and there are no compromises, as far as I've seen.

The other thing I'd like to talk about is, there are a number of benefits that the 162nd provides to Tucson. The EMTs and the fire crew that belong here as a part of the 162nd Fighter Wing are the first responders out at TIA in case of an emergency.

The medical wing and the airmen and women out at the Guard are here to deal with emergencies that happen within the state. They're trained to do that. They practice to do that. And just like a motorcycle cop out there, you never want him when he's got the radar gun pointed at you; but when something goes wrong and it's an emergency, they're the people that you're happiest to see.

The other thing I'd like to state is that there are many high school graduates here in the Tucson community that are not ready to go to college, maybe can't afford to go to college, but they have found a home out at the 162nd Fighter Wing. They have learned job skills, they have learned leadership skills, and they make good citizens. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank, you sir.

Mr. Andrews, and then it will be William Valenzuela.

3173 TU

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you. My name is Brian Andrews, and I've been a Tucson resident since 1956. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Recent events that have occurred in Pima County that happened after the draft EIS should be considered. They are significant; they're supportive of a decision to base the F-35 in Tucson

CM-5

with the 162nd Fighter Wing, and they should be included the final EIS.

On February 23rd of this year, the Pima County Board of Supervisors approved the acquisition of 382 acres of land south of Raytheon and Tucson International Airport as a buffer, and importantly, the first step in the creation of an air transportation, aerospace defense employment center in Pima County.

In a February 21st memorandum this year to the board of supervisors, Pima County manager Chuck Huckleberry recommended to the Board to authorize this land acquisition and commit the property to the development of a future aerospace and defense research park, and to ensure that these uses are compatible and contribute to Pima County's ability to become a leader in aerospace and defense industry contracting.

CM-5 cont'd

Additionally, January 19th, 2012, a memorandum to the board of supervisors, Mr. Huckleberry states: "In addition, we need to ensure the Arizona Air National Guard facility that operates from TIA is sustained in the long term and secures appropriate new pilot training missions and activities, particularly as they relate to the new Air Force fighter, the F-35." Our Pima County leaders

have recognized the value of the Air National Guard and its mission economically in the community, and I support their view of the Guard and its mission.

I'm in the construction industry, and in a January 25th, 2012 roadway investments and economic white paper, Pima County proposed investing over $140 million in bond money for a subregional arterial roadway program in support of the development of this aerospace corridor. The Air Guard brings important economic benefits to our community, and we would suffer and be a lesser viable community if they were not here and not functioning.

CM-5 cont'd

Additionally, I've heard many complaints about the noise; the comparative noise levels of the F-35 to the F-16. And I brought a sound meter today, just to put things in perspective for myself. I want to share with that currently you're enduring 70.9 decibels, and I see no discomfort in the room. I believe the nine decibel difference between the F-16 and the F-35 is something we can all live with. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you, sir. Mr. Valenzuela and then Alan Tonelson.

MR. VALENZUELA: Thank you for having me. My name is Bill Valenzuela. I'm a native

3174 TU

Tucsonan. I'm in construction. I'm a member of the Arizona Veteran's Hall of Fame. I've worked real close with the 162nd, and I agree with what the last two fellows have said. I'm past chairman of the Airport Authority.

The airport really needs the 162nd there. The FAA supports the airport by the landing and take-offs. The Air Guard comes in real handy for that. I worked real hard with the 162nd. I'm a military guy. I didn't retire with the military, but I'm a former Marine.

We loved the planes, especially when they saved us with air-to-ground support. We need this plane very bad. I'm in construction. We need the jobs. The city of Tucson needs the jobs. The almighty dollar of foreign countries is going to start coming back to Tucson by us training the foreign pilots. Lord, we need it in Tucson. GE-3

Why can't we work together? Why can't we show the nation that we can work together to get this accomplished some way or another. I don't know how, but if we sit down and talk together, show the country we can do it. I see heads shaking no, but it can be done. The city, Phoenix. You can work anything together in Phoenix. I know it can be done.

Keep shaking your heads, but it can be done. You don't have to be so negative about it. If you read this article on Lightning, about the Arizona aerospace defense industry, it gives you a lot of details and numbers.

Let's try and work together. Forget the negative persons, and -- maybe we can convince them. What if China starts training our enemies? Who is going to give you the right to protest? Right now, thank God, that's why I served. My commander used to say, "Why the hell did we serve our country if it ain't to give the people the right to protest?" I'm proud of being there. So just let's just work together on this. Thank you very much.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Tonelson and then Mr. Ed Verberg. 3175 TU

MR. TONELSON: I guess I'm the first no. But it's not a no to the F-35. I want to make that very clear. We need that airplane. GE-4

I spent some time on the ground back in the early 1950s in combat. I was very grateful for the fighter pilots that came in and probably saved my life more than once.

I live on the northwest side of the city, and the problem I guess I have -- and in talking

to my neighbors -- back in 1950, with very limited equipment, those pilots could find a dime in the field. Why they can't find the flight pattern here with all the equipment they have, I don't know. We're way out of the flight pattern, yet we get lots of flyovers, and that's a concern. We have the noise now. We're not supposed it have it where we are. **NO-62**

With a louder airplane, we're going to have more noise again. We're not supposed to have it where we are. **NO-8**

At least a lot of people in my neighborhood are against this.

And I understand the gentleman that last spoke. It's not like we're going to have it in Tucson or we're not going to have it. There area three other areas being considered. I've got the feeling when the last gentleman spoke, he was saying, Well, we if don't have it here, we're not going to have it. That's not the case. It's just a question of where are you going to put it, where the least amount of environmental impact is going to be. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Verberg and then Mr. Bill Moore. **3176 TU**

MR. VERBERG: Good evening. My name is Ed Verberg, and I'm vice president of the Tucson

Mountains Association. For those of you who don't know, the Tucson Mountains Association is the oldest resident organization in the state of Arizona. 77 years we've been in operation. We addressed a lot of issues over those years. Some of them very difficult issues, not easy to resolve, like this one. We represent over 10,000 residents on the west side, so what I'm saying is not lightly said. We have a number of concerns, but I'll just talk about three of them briefly.

Recreational benefits on the west side, biological resources on the west side and cultural resources on the west side. For those of you who enjoy the west side, you may remember we have Saguaro National Park. For those who are not as familiar, the Sweetwater Preserve, which is over 700 acres of a beautiful strand of Saguaros, with hiking trails, riding trails, we've got Tucson Mountains Park. We have other smaller parks. We have Gates Pass Overlook. People come here just for the scenery. **SO-7**

There's a lot of tourism in our area as a result of all of these benefits. Now if you look at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, what do they do every five years? They do a survey of recreational benefits. Anybody guess how many billions of dollars

are generated by tourism and recreational benefits? It is huge, absolutely huge. And they take that all way down to the county level and sublevel. So we know there are huge recreational benefits. We know there are cultural benefits, both Native American as well as the Civilian Conservation Corps.

These are values on the west side that we treasure. They're important because they bring huge amounts of money here. They bring residents here who want to relocate to Tucson. **SO-7 cont'd**

We are concerned about the noise levels. If you look at the noise pattern, they show it right over the airport. But where does it come? Alan addressed this just a few moments ago. It comes over the Tucson Mountains. And it doesn't come in a straight line. It comes like this, and it comes like this and it comes like that.

As a result of these concerns and many others -- which we have put in a letter, and we'll send a new letter as a part of the process -- our board just last week voted unanimously to oppose the location of F-35 here. We are not opposed to the F-35. We think it's a very important addition to our military. We support that strongly, but we don't believe it belongs in Tucson. Thank you very much. **GE-4**

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Bill Moore, and then Mr. Steve Thu. **3177 TU**

MR. MOORE: That was a nice segue for what I'd like to say. My name is Bill Moore, and I've been here since 1972. I'm a retired military pilot, 11 years in active duty and 14 with the 162nd, so I'm very familiar with all aspects of this issue. I was part of environmental studies when I was stationed at Davis-Monthan. So this is very important. And I'm glad this attention is being paid to it. I'll move on.

Money is what I wanted to talk about first. Everybody loves money. And we don't have a lot going on here in Tucson right now, and our future looks pretty dim in the economy. I'm not here as a politician or anything else. I'm just saying that how many people are aware that the golf tournament is going on right now? I spent a day out there yesterday. That's worth 75,000,000 for the community.

The gem show is worth 100,000,000 to the community. Those are annual things. They could go away in a heartbeat. The -- as a matter of fact, there's been discussion of the gem show spreading out to other areas.

Rather than go that way, I just learned

tonight that the proposed number is 280,000,000 per year on a continuing basis -- obviously it would be increase -- that the Air Guard is going to bring in. And you just can't imagine how much this community would lose if the Air Guard shrunk to almost nothing. The tax base would go away. Your taxes might go up just to support the community as it is now. But I'll move on. Those are just numbers. That's the ugly part. I'll move from that onto a more emotional thing.

The 162nd Fighter Wing is not as much of a military unit as it is a family unit. When I was in the Air Force, I was assigned to a unit. When I joined the 162nd, I joined a family. There's a huge difference. They accepted me. They didn't have to, but they did. It's a big deep community operation and it needs to continue. There's third, maybe even fourth generations, when I retired in 1984, of people that work there. They are born here, they work here and they retire here. And then their grandchildren work here. So it's more than just about an eight percent increase in noise.

The other thing I want to talk about just a little bit is -- other than the history of the unit. Everybody knows what that is at this point.

Everybody had to walk by the wall to come in here. Take a good look going out. It wouldn't be there if it hadn't been for passive people. They're no longer passive people. Israelis are militant. If we continue on this course to deny our military modern extended weapon systems, we will be in trouble. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you, sir. Mr. Thu and then Elizabeth McFarlane. **3178 TU**

MR. THU: Hi, my name is Steve Thu. I was in that first class that trained here in 1970. I was in the very first class. So I've had a relationship with this group for 42 years.

I'm a former fighter pilot. I've flown the F-16 out there for about 10 years. And I know that this unit does everything it possibly can to minimize the impact on the city by changing our flight patterns if we have to, and by, you know, punishing those that sometimes don't follow the flight plans.

I know that one gentleman said that they come from different directions on the northwest. Now sometimes that's true, but it's not because we want to. It's because the air traffic controllers have said, Hey, we've got an airliner over here, go left. Don't go right. The last thing you want to do

is meet them head-on sometime. So a lot of that is safety type concerns and not because we want to do it, not because we want to make that extra noise. It's because we're required to.

I know noise has been a big factor, and I understand that. But there are lots of noises in this city that we don't control. I asked somebody today coming in, I said, what's the decibel level of a Harley motorcycle when it goes by? It's about 110 decibels. You compare that -- I mean, if you're in the northwest, you're not going to close off your streets that go out to Gates Pass and stuff because a motorcycle is driving down it.

And I think that that's the type of thing -- it may be a little noise for a short period of time, but I think it's something we can live with. I know that we need the -- everybody says that we need the F-35, and that's true.

I know a lot of people here probably have sons and daughters that have been over and served in Iraq and Afghanistan. The last thing you want to do is have these guys call up and say, Hey, I need some air support, and we go, We couldn't train these guys, so we have nothing to send down there to help you guys out. So I look at that -- I think we can

work things out.

Yeah, try and send it somewhere else. If the base goes away, we've heard about what kind of money that is for this city that we need. We need the money. I'm in the commercial real estate business and you know, we look at those things pretty hard, and big companies that want to come here look at that pretty hard too. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Ms. McFarlane, and then Mr. Tim Amalong.

3179 TU

MS. McFARLANE: I'm Elizabeth McFarlane, and I'm against the F-35 coming to Tucson, despite my respect for the Air Force. I bought a house closer to the U of A than D-M several years back. No documents mentioned jets or D-M. One year later, it was an unlivable zone, both in terms of noise and safety.

GF-4

Neighbors spoke at length at public hearings against the expansion to no avail. Planes fly right overhead such that if they fall, they would land on my house -- and at very low elevations. It was states at that time they were 15 to 20 miles out and were 3- to 4,000 feet, dropping three degrees towards the base, or about 300 feet over houses two

miles from the base.

The colonel quoted 85 decibels for an A-10 at 1,500 feet. In 2004 we asked, How loud is an A-10 at 500 feet? How many decibels will the F-35 be at 500 feet? Table B-1 does not include the F-35 in this DEIS. Clearly this information is most relevant and should be prominent and not missing from such a document. This DEIS is not ready for comment if it is missing such basic information. NO-19 NP-13

I see the F-35 at 1,000 feet in table TU-3.2-5 is 120 decibels. I think OSHA only allows four seconds per day at this DB level. I also noticed that the threshold of permanent hearing loss is not specified. NO-81

Also, this DEIS does not seem to mention that TIA lacks the ability to load live ordinance. One fear is the F-35 will sneak into D-M, much as Operation Snowbird, Tornados, Harriers, F-16s and F-18s have snuck into D-M, all with no EIS. Also, the high noise zone should extend much further to the northwest along the flight path and should be based on actual noise measurements. DO-30 NO-40 NO-54

I pointed out before the expansion that our property values would go down. My property values have gone down. The DEIS does not mention, for SO-1

example, that I can't add to my house or rebuild if it burns down. I requested compensation in advance. No one has offered me any compensation. I still have only single-pane windows and a swamp cooler. No mitigation has been offered to me, but the DOD JLUS 5-8 admits that it wouldn't work anyway, it's, quote, important to note that single event noise levels at significantly higher decibels will not be fully mitigated. SO-1 cont'd NO-17 SO-32

Citizens in airport expansions tend to suffer more adverse health effects than the rest of the population, like the serious health effects from overhead jets were pointed out before the expansion. The DOD acknowledges JLUS 5-3 that noise is louder at levels -- that louder levels can cause permanent hearing loss, stress, increased blood pressure, sleep deprivation, and decreased ability to concentrate.

I was diagnosed with a life-threatening disease after the expansion -- though cause/effect would be difficult to prove. Maybe pro F-35 people will make money and call us unpatriotic, but these are our homes and our very lives at stake. Louder jets have already harmed me and my neighbors, and no one has helped or seems to care. The old, "it doesn't affect me" attitude seems to prevail. NO-6

The guiding principles in JLUS 1-4, to focus on fair equitable solutions for all effected parties has failed. I'm unaware of effective legal recourse. The F-35 does not belong in a major metropolitan area. Thanks. NO-6 cont'd NO-37

COLONEL ROAN: Mr. Amalong, and then Marshall Brown. 3180 TU

MR. AMALONG: Hi, I'm Tim Amalong. And while I'm pretty technical, I'm not into the numbers and everything else because there's a hypothetical through all this, with the what-ifs. I can kind of tell you, I worked out of Tucson International for 20 years in the aviation industry. I own three businesses on the west ramp. I'm out there every day working, and it's five days a week, sometimes six days a week. I was out there all day today.

And without -- after last night's hearing and a lot of the discussions, I just kind of made a mental note to really look at these F-16s flying in the path and coming in. And I don't think a lot of people -- they say they're really loud and everything else.

When planes are coming into land, they're powered off. They're not powered on, and all these huge decibels. They do flyby's once they go --

get down, sometime they'll do go-rounds. They don't go to full afterburners or anything else. They're just pretty much going, and then they get up to altitude at the end of 1-1, come back around, and they're at low power settings.

So I really encourage anybody and everybody, you can go park by the airport and listen to stuff. It's not like they're really cranking this out all the time. Sometimes when they are heavy they get off the ground and initially they'll power up and you'll hear it, and it's just very instantaneous. Sometimes it's two or three of them taking off, but then it's done.

I have to get an FAA physical for my pilot's license -- I'm a commercial pilot -- every year. My hearing in the last 20 years has been the same. I've been able to pass the test. I'm on the west ramp of Tucson International, which is right -- coming back with the afterburners, they usually use 1-1. And I can tell you my hearing is as good as it was 20 years ago. I'm still getting the same physical and passing the same physical. So for people to say that they're losing their hearing on the flight path of these jets that are backed off of the power is just absurd, in my opinion.

I talked a little bit about the 162nd. I've talked to a lot of the fighter pilots, the maintenance personnel over there. They've got an impeccable maintenance record. They get the best of the best when it comes to the 162nd. They get people who've retired out of the Air Force that have done this their whole life. They know how to do it right. They've got maintenance people that have just tens of thousands of hours of working on these jets.

Obviously, this being a new jet, everybody says, it's like, well, this thing hasn't been proven. You're right. Well, if you think the United States Air Force military is going to let an unsafe aircraft go to anyplace, I don't care if it's in the middle of the desert in New Mexico, or whatever, you're crazy, because they're not.

I mean, the last thing they want this thing to do is go down or have problems. As soon as it does, obviously something is going to be shut down. They ground aircraft and stuff on the commercial side when they have problems. So if there's problems, they're definitely not going to allow it to come here. So I just want to encourage you to, like Mr. Valenzuela said, just -- I know there's a lot of negativities and stuff, people shaking their head and

GE-3

everything else, but just try to work together and we'll get through this. And try to be respectful of each other. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Mr. Brown and then Gary Hunter.

3181 TU

MR. BROWN: Hi, I'm Marshall Brown with the 162nd Minute Man Committee. And I think I can speak for all of us here -- that all of our -- these guys have operated out here for over 50 years safely, without major incident, and what we're looking at is a major impact for our community.

At some point, we've got to stand up as a community and stop pushing things away and saying, "not here." We need the investment in our community. Here these guys are talking about a minimum of a $175,000,000 in construction investment. And not only do to we need that investment for these folks here in this group, it also affects the aerospace industry.

If we don't continue to invest in that, Raytheon and the rest of the aerospace industry is not going to continue to invest in our community. And if those things happen, we're going to wind up running off all the business in this town. It's what continues to develop our tax base. It's what allows us to invest in all these parks and this recreation.

GE-3

We've taken a huge hit on the convention industry because of the effects of the economic downfall that we've had over the past few years. This is a consistent group of folks that will continue to provide economic stability for our community for a long time, and I think that's what we need to focus on above anything else. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. Mr. Hunter and then Rita Ornelas. **3182 TU**

MR. HUNTER: My name is Gary Hunter. One of the first speakers gave us a very important little piece of information, that the sound level in this room is 70 decibels. Now, when an F-35 flies 1,000 feet over us, the decibel level of the F-35 is 121 decibels. That's a difference of 51 decibels. Not a lot, or is it?

Decibel levels are measured on a logarithmic scale. So when that F-35 flies 1,000 feet above us, it's 32 times as loud as the level of this room. I don't know if you can turn this up so that my voice is 32 times as loud as it is right now, but I don't think the audience would appreciate that.

We have many concerns about the draft EIS. Here is just one: page 56 of the executive summary says, quote, In a typical arrival flight **NO-21**

configuration, the F-35A is approximately 22 decibels louder than the F-16C. That means the F-35 is four times as loud as the F-16.

But a recent errata sheets says 22 decibels is wrong. It should be nine decibels. That means the F-35 is only twice as loud as the F-16. Which is right, four times as loud? Twice as loud? **NO-21 cont'd**

Now, these decibel levels were measured at Ocotillo elementary school. Wait a minute. Did I say measured? They weren't measured. Instead, they were generated by a computer model. How accurate is the computer model? Let's compare it with actual decibel levels that were measured that were reported in this Table E2 of the Environmental Impact Statement for Eglin Air Force base. **NO-42**

Now, these are measured decibel levels as published by the Air Force. And what do these say? At 500 feet ATL, the F-35 is 24 decibels louder than the F-16C. That's almost six times as loud. At 1,000 feet AGL, the F-35 is 21 decibels louder than the F-16. That's four times as loud. And that's close to the 22-decibel difference quoted in the executive summary, which the Air Force now says is wrong. Which is right? **NO-21**

There's one way to find out. Bring the **NO-7**

F-35 to Tucson for a series of test flights. Measure the noise. Let the residents of Tucson experience the noise so that they can make up their own minds. And you know what? If the F-35 is as quiet as its supporters claim, then I'll welcome all 72 of them to Tucson. But until the EIS is based on actual noise measurements and not computer-generated numbers the Air Force cannot make an informed decision about the F-35 bed down. Thank you.

NO-7 cont'd
GE-2
NP-13

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Ms. Ornelas, and then Mr. Robin Gomez.

3183 TU

MS. ORNELAS: Hello, everybody. I agree, like everybody else, the F-35 is a great plane once it's ready. Obviously, it's not ready yet. It will be one day. I hope that this community can work together, if it ever does come here. I personally do not believe that it belongs in Tucson because of so much population around not only TIA, but D-M.

GE-4

Why do I say D-M? Because anything that usually comes to TIA we will see at D-M. I live by D-M. I know the noise. I know the disaster that can happen, the closing of the school where I'm at.

I don't know what will happen if the F-35 comes to Tucson. I hope that it goes somewhere else. I hope it does get trained. It will.

Somewhere. I wish that there was a way that we in Tucson could work together. We've been trying to do this. It doesn't seem to happen. It's like everybody is either on one side or another of this issue.

And people don't seem to consider the little people in this town. There's a lot of little people that are going to be affected if this plane comes. Right now, they don't live under what they call not-fit-for-residential-use. But if this plane comes, they will be in there. I'm in there right now, over D-M. It's not a pretty picture. You think your homes have gone down in value? You have no idea what mine is not worth -- not worth.

LU-6

There's a lot of things that are going to happen if this F-35 comes to Tucson. A lot of things. It's not only the noise. It's how it's going to affect the people in this town. Yes, construction is needed. A lot of jobs are needed. But I think there's a lot of talent in Tucson to bring a lot of jobs, a lot of different things to Tucson. There's a lot of people here with great ideas and money, and ways that they can bring people here to bring jobs to Tucson.

And I know that the Air Force will do a good job with the F-35, wherever it's placed, but I

really do not believe that it belongs in Tucson. And I don't know where you all live, but just think of the people where they live. They didn't choose to live under this kind of noise. They have been there for many, many years. And when this kind of noise comes and all of a sudden they're under it, and you say, Well, why don't they just move? I'm sorry. It's not so easy for somebody to move. Has it been easy for any of you to sell your homes when you wanted to? How bad is the economy right now? Yeah, it's going to get worse.

Why can't we work together? I think we can. We just have to figure out a way. Let's come together and make Tucson a greater place than it is right now, because this is a great town to live in. It's a small town with a lot of population. Thank you very much.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Mr. Gomez and then Sandi Eghtesani.

3184 TU

MR. GOMEZ: Good evening. My name is Robin Gomez. I don't believe that it makes common sense to base the loudest and yet unproven Air Force strike fighter in a commercial airport in the middle of a metropolitan area in order to train foreign pilots. It's not logical. **GE-1**

I made a point last night that the DEIS does not appear ready for public input. The noise data is jumping around between what is needed for testing and what might be needed for training. The problem is, other than the testing, both are really unknown at this time. **NP-13**

There's no historical safety data on this unit. A brand-new plane, new technology, skin, frame, engines, avionics, almost any part you can think of. And with no -- having a lot of trouble in the testing, eventually they'll get over that. Then you're going to have to work the bugs out. That's not the kind of plane you bring over a populated area. **SA-12**

The alternatives presented by the EIS are highly selective. They talk two of them, they'll tell you they're uneconomical, the 24 and 48 number of planes. Does that mean we only have the third alternative with the 72? So there's something wrong with how the alternatives have been set up. What about the alternative of beefing up Gila Bend auxiliary field, or Libby airfield to take care of these unproven new fifth-generation aircraft that ought to be -- and we need them, but they ought to be where there's no population until you get enough experience to work those bugs out and you know what's **DO-65** **DO-66** **GE-1**

going on.

What the -- and Mr. Valenzuela, I accept your challenge, I think it's very important. All right? What you saw on there with those three lines, the contour lines, is you saw when you expanded for those 72, you're going to affect 5,127 people automatically. Every realtor in town is going to know that. What's going to happen to those people? They're TIA. I don't know live at TIA, and neither do you, I'm sure.

So what -- that's just by putting in that simple extension. The moment you announce that, those people lose their property values. And it's not only just the property value that you've lost in the recession -- all of us are hoping it will come back one day a little bit. As soon as the realtor tells you that, you're dead, okay, if you want to sell.

The second thing is, you ruin the guy's quality of life. All those people. Now, those are minorities and low-income people, okay? So if you want to do something, it's very easy.

And we've talked a lot around D-M about what can be done, but it's going to cost some money. Why not move it -- go look at some of those houses. Why not move some of those people? Yes, you're going

GE-1 cont'd

SO-1

NO-36

to have to pay, and it's going to cut into your construction business. But you've got to be realistic about the people you're harming in this community. You just can't ignore them. Not everybody lives up here. Remember that. Not everybody lives up here. Okay. Sorry.

COLONEL ROAN: The following speaker will be Hank Peck.

3185 TU

MS. EGHTESANI: Good evening. My name is Sandi Eghtesani. I'm a business woman in Tucson and I'm also on the board of directors for the 162nd Minute Man committee. My statement is as follows: Southern Arizona's aerospace defense industry is one of the largest in the nation, making Tucson a city uniquely suited to support the F-35 aircraft at the airport.

The aerospace and defense industry leads as a major contributor to the regional economy. The industry generates between 5- and 6,000,000,000 in revenues annually from more than 200 companies. Southern Arizona is highly desirable as a location for growth and retention of aerospace defense.

Most importantly, the industry provides high-wage jobs for our residents. The average salary of an aerospace defense worker in southern Arizona is

GE-3

$60,000. Southern Arizona also accounts for 2.3 percent of the entire U.S. aerospace product and the parts manufacturing industry. It offers one of the highest concentrations of aerospace defense workers in the country. One in five jobs in the region is tied to the sector. Aviation and aerospace technology is one of southern Arizona's most substantial economic pillars.

Tucson International Airport is an economic engine, with an estimated 17,000 people employed in the vicinity of the airport, generating a payroll of 800,000,000. At least another -- 800,000,000, correct. I almost had to look at that twice myself. At least another 10,000 people work in the area around the airport, with over 8,000 acres of property.

Tucson International Airport is also one of the largest landowners in the area. Employers at Tucson International Airport account for over 3,500,000,000 in economic impact to southern Arizona, and I support the F-35 wholeheartedly coming to Tucson. Thank you. GE-3

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Mr. Peck and then Chris Tans. 3186 TU

MR. PECK: My name is Hank Peck and I'm

a member of DM50, a business group that supports the air base. I'm also a native Tucsonan, and I grew up in the flight path. And I will tell you that I support -- you can tell by this that I support the F-35. GE-3

When I was a kid, we'd hear those jets and we would run outside because we just loved the sound. We'd look up and we'd identify the planes. It was part of growing up in Tucson, it was something that we were really proud of. We were proud of that base.

One of the things that strikes me as that -- we're asking men and women to put themselves in harm's way every day, and this is an airframe that can protect those men and women. And I know that this is going to go somewhere. I know it's going to go to a base somewhere. But I also know that the preferred bases are going to be in Arizona. These are the conditions that our pilots need for the best training. These are the conditions that they're going to be fighting in. And so I support -- I guess, as a sacrifice, I hear the noise. We all hear the noise. I support -- it's my part of what I can do, I suppose, to support those people that are putting themselves in harm's way so I can enjoy the benefits of my life.

I would also point out economically, the 162nd Fighter Wing has an economic impact of $280,000,000 according to the 2008 Arizona Department of Commerce study. The jobs that it generates -- there's 1,450 Tucsonans employed there, and there's 1,000 of them employed full-time. You know, this is a low-wage town, and those 1,000 jobs, those are jobs that you can raise a family on. So I would suggest that we think about that.

The benefit -- the thing that will harm us are -- is, once again, the history of Tucson saying no. We've got a long history of saying no, and a lot of people know that. And it's one reason why we have the kind of wages and the kind of jobs in this community that we have now. So I say that we say yes to this. I say that we support our airmen. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Chris Tans and Dr. Bierny. **3187 TU**

MS. TANS: My name is Chris Tans. I've lived for 40 years in midtown Tucson. And like many others who have spoken here, I recognize the importance of the training mission of the Air Force, but feel that these -- the F-35s should not be brought in to a major metropolitan area. I happen to live in **GE-1**

the urban core and we hear a lot of the noise.

We know that there will be -- from reports, from various places where comparisons have been made, we know that the F-35 will make a lot of noise. People have been talking about the importance -- you know, we need to be able to raise our families. That's not just a financial issue. We have to have an environment where there's a relative degree of peacefulness.

Somebody brought up Harley Davidsons. We don't want Harley Davidsons running through our streets. And in making choices about where the F-35 should be based, it has to be taken into account that this is a commercial airport serving a city in the boundaries of the city.

And that concern about a commercial airport and a military base shows up in the draft EIS. There's a quote in there, under scenario T3, that's the maximum, the 72 planes. "The projected annual military airfield operation would exceed the maximum number allowed as per agreement with the Tucson Airport Authority." So there is such an agreement. There are issues about these combinations. **CM-2**

I'd like to know what the issues are. What are the concerns of the commercial airport about

the number of military flights going out of it? What is the maximum number that's allowed now?

Some of the alternative bases that are being considered don't have the combination of commercial flights with military flights. We are in the unusual situation of military operations at the commercial airport, plus another Air Force base. So -- I've got 30 seconds. I'll stop ahead of time. Thank you. **CM-2 cont'd**

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. Doctor, and then Joey Flynn.

3188 TU

DR. BIERNY: Good afternoon. Like everybody who has spoken today, I'm very much in favor for the pilots for the F-35 to be trained properly in the right location.

I have several major concerns about it, however. One of them is safety. Single-engine, single-pilot, untested safety is to be established in the middle of a 1,000,000 people city. That does not make too much sense to me. **SA-7 SA-16**

The second one is, of course, the noise. It's not just a little bit loud. It's extremely loud. The -- a few months ago, in February of 2010, my wife and I were walking in our neighborhood, and we heard this really intolerable

military aircraft noise, which we have never heard before. It turns that this was caused by F-18s. The F-35, we understand, is going to be louder than the F-18. **NO-1**

In fact, the next day there were two letters to the editor in the local paper by people -- just regular people; not activists in any sense of the term -- and this is what they said: One of them said it was insanely loud, almost unbearable. You had to cover your ears.

I'd like to be a gracious host to the military, but this is not acceptable. Another one said, Normally I'm not too bothered by aircraft noise, but this shook the windows. If you are talking to someone right next to you, you would have to shout to communicate. If that kind of noise became a regular occurrence in Tucson, I would not be happy. **NO-12 NO-3**

In fact, I recall also two Air Force officers, one a retired lieutenant colonel and wing commander at Davis-Monthan, and a past military consultant who had to put together a pitch for the F-35 back in 2004. Now he says that if he had to do it over again, he would focus more on promoting Davis-Monthan or TIA as a location for quieter missions, such as unmanned aircraft, drones, over attack

aircraft. Noise will be an issue.

Another one, a retired Air Force colonel said that F-35s are too loud for populated areas. The Air Force and Tucson have had a tremendously friendly and mutually beneficial relationship for decades. Ordinarily news of a new flying squadron deployment here would be very well received.

Unfortunately, the Air Force has made a huge blunder in the design of the F-35. It is too loud to be flown near any population center on the continent. These are retired military people. This is the way we feel. There's only one way to find out, to inform the population about the amount of noise that would be caused by the F-35. Flyovers, test flyovers by F-35s. We've been told that this would not happen because there are not enough F-35s. My recommendation would be to wait until they have enough, and to inform the population about how it would affect us. Thank you.

NO-37

GE-2

COLONEL ROAN: Ms. Flynn, and then John Eslinger.

3189 TU

MS. FLYNN: My name is Joey Flynn. I own and operate a law office in the Sam Hughes neighborhood. I think I spend way more of my waking

hours at the office than I do at my home, and I must say that the noise doesn't bother me or affect my concentration, as much as somebody else pointed out, the Harley Davidsons driving through the drive through at the post office next door.

There's been talk today about the money aspect of things, real estate values and the need for -- real estate values going down on the one hand, and income coming into Tucson on the other. I'd kind of like to flip that on its head a little bit for you all, and talk to as another taxpayer in this room. We are all taxpayers as we sit here today. I pay my federal taxes. We pay our state and local taxes. As a taxpayer, I want to see my federal government -- and I know this a lot to ask from the federal government -- but I want to see my federal government spend their money in the smartest way possible. They are shopping for real estate. What are the three things you look for in real estate? Location, location, location.

So looking at this from the other side, Tucson is the perfect location. It's the smartest way, in my view, for the federal government to spend our tax dollars. We've got the -- in terms of location, we've got the best flying weather ever. We have the proximity to the training ranges.

GE-3

Flight hours and jet fuel are expensive. If we're going to spend that kind of money, let's do it an efficient manner and get the most bang for our buck.

And third is the one other people have talked about here, but I think is the most important, and that's the men and women of the 162nd. They fly and maintain more F-16s out there than half the world's small countries couldn't even dream of owning, and they do it efficiently and professionally. And they have a tremendous, tremendous safety record. For the federal government not to look at that safety record and the value that those men and women bring to this project, I think would be a huge mistake.

On the local level, it's the same thing. Those F-16s out of that base aren't getting any younger. And we, as a community -- the Air National Guard is huge employer in this community. We need to see that continue. We need the continued viability of the airway.

Second and third, of course the economic boost that it would bring to us in the short-term through construction and the annual income. And finally, I think the training mission of the Air National Guard serves an important function in our

community. It reminds us here in Tucson, the old Pueblo, those of us in Pima County and as members of the state of Arizona, as residents in the state of Arizona, that we are all part of something that is larger than ourselves. It isn't just about us. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Mr. Eslinger and then Anne Gomez.

3190 TU

MR. ESLINGER: Howdy, I'm John Eslinger, and I'm happy to be here. I just spent three weeks in a real big, cold very communist country. We're lucky to have meetings like this and it isn't because of intellectuals and academians [sic]. It's because of the sacrifices of the people in the military. And their sacrifices are life-changing.

I do respect everyone's opinion, but sometimes I do disagree. It appears to me that many folks here are open to sacrifice to the cause as long as it's somebody else's sacrifice. Let's face it, Tucson International Airport opened in 1948. D-M opened in 1925. Fact: three things change in human history; names, dates and technology. Ain't no doubt in my southern Arizona mind that someone was complaining about airplanes ever since that date, at

both of these airports.

So let's talk about technology. To make an airplane do what it does best, you've got to add some thrust to it. Thrust comes with noise. That's kind of a novel notion. Yep, and you're right, both airports were out in the weeds in the beginning, and that's my point. These airports were here first, and then folks built everything around them, knowing the airport was there.

So when I bought my house, I had to sign a disclaimer that I knew that my house was in the traffic pattern. And some people don't do their planning, but then they blame someone else for the lack of their planning, and that makes me really tired.

This is a free country, and if you don't like it, you have the option to move. Not like where I've just been, where you've got to get permission. So shut your whining and move, if you don't like it. Get used to the fact that life is always full of challenges and hard decisions, and belly up to the bar and take care of them, and leave the rest of us alone.

And one thing I've noticed about whiners; they're always ready to let somebody else

solve their problems. And to the guy last night who said if you like airplanes and noise, well, I'll trade my house with you, well, sir, I live under the traffic pattern, and I ain't going to trade houses with you because I like mine better than yours. So my suggestion is, man up and move. Technology changes. Get used to it. Bring on the F-35. GE-3

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. Anne Gomez and then Mr. Mike Zakis. 3191 TU

MR. GOMEZ: Hi, I'm Ann Gomez, and I came to Tucson in 1947 prior to the inception of the Air Force. It didn't exist until the 60's. So there might have been a Davis-Monthan, but it was not a Davis-Monthan Air Force base, because the Air Force did not exist in those days.

As far as the noise level in that era, there were very few planes that flew over Tucson at that time. They were prop plains, they were certainly -- there were no jets. They didn't put the runway into Davis-Monthan to accommodate jets until 1953.

So this thing about Davis-Monthan existing -- I was here before the Air National Guard. This afternoon, I sat and I watched the rodeo. And two of Colonel McGuire's F-16s flew over the rodeo

grounds. The Arizona Boys Choir was singing. When the plane went over, you couldn't hear a thing.

One of the things I want to deal with is, I'm not sure how you deal with questions, or maybe I ought to pose it as something that's lacking in the EIS, because that's really why we're here. And I look out at these faces, and I wonder how many of you actually live -- I know there is one person who actually lives in the area that's going to be impacted.

But the others of you can look down, or you can look askance. I don't live in the flight path of TIA. But some of the things that are missing are, when I looked up at that F-16 flying over the rodeo grounds, I said but what's missing from the EIS is the relationship of Davis-Monthan and TIA. When we went to the scoping meeting, there was a brochure that said that the F-35 would fly in Davis-Monthan airspace from time to time. But we have no flight paths. We don't know where these planes are going to be flying. You have the noise contours, but notice what's lacking? The high accident potential zone which we have for Davis-Monthan. Thank you very much.

NO-59

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. Mr. Zakis and then Mr. Bill Kelly.

MR. ZAKIS: Hi, there. I'm Iron Mike Zakis. I have an artificial right leg. I've got some new eyes and I've got some new teeth. And people say, wow, what a great attitude you have. And I think Tucson has a an attitude too, an attitude that's tested by how you manage change. That's the only test. If we're not willing to change, then we have a bad attitude. It's going to happen.

3192 TU

I mean, imagine if nothing happens, if nothing changes. What happens if nothing changes? Well, nobody can be born, nobody can die. Children can't grow. You can't get a promotion. Nothing is going to change. Technology changes.

I'm an Air Force Vietnam vet. I spent a year at Vandenberg watching missiles go off. I spent a year in Thailand watching F-4s F take off. I spent a year in South Dakota watching B-52s. You think that F-35 is noisy? You got a ways to go.

NO-9

But I think that the test of Tucson is going to be how it manages change. Somebody said before that Tucson always says no. I think that's true. I think it's because of attitude, because we all have a collective attitude in this room, and all over Tucson. And until we learn how to embrace change, then nothing is going to happen, and that's

not a good thing. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Kelly and then Alan Stein.

3193 TU

MR. KELLY: Good evening, everyone. I'm Bill Kelly. I'm the CFO of Diamond Ventures. I'm a member of the DM50, and I also am a board member of the TREO, the economic development organization for Tucson. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

Basically, I've agreed to the yeses for the F-35s that has been spoken so far. But I'd like to also add a slightly different perspective I don't think we've heard tonight. I've had the good fortune of being the person responsible at Diamond Ventures for economic development, and I get to do deals, and I'm very blessed to do that. GE-3

One deal that I was very involved in was the target.com that came to Tucson. I dealt directly with the Target officials in their selection of Tucson as the location for a million-square-foot Target Internet fulfillment center. It employs hundreds of people. They spent over $100,000,000 on the facility.

And one of the main resources and reasons for them picking Tucson was the labor pool that we have in Tucson. And I'd like to embellish on

that with the quality of the people that we have exiting from the military that we have here in Tucson. We have Davis-Monthan, we have the Air Guard. And one of the reasons why Target selected this location was because of that resource. It's a tremendous resource.

I'm also a squadron -- a civilian squadron commander, and I get to interact directly with the young men and women in the armed services, and they are as well trained, as honest, as hard-working as you can imagine. So we have a resource here that we should take advantage of. And I think that the employment of these young men and women here in Tucson is a resource that if that was not here, we would not be as competitive as we are today.

Target is a Fortune 500 company. It currently has as its number two man in charge of the plant out in Tucson a retired colonel from Davis-Monthan. We are really missing the boat here if we do not keep the F-35 mission and the workforce that is employed out at Davis-Monthan that is associated with that. So thank you very much, and yes to the F-35. GE-3

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. Mr. Stein, and then Terry Holpert.

3194 TU

MR. STEIN: Well, it's quite

interesting following Bill Kelly. I was born in Tucson. I've lived here all my life, except for four years, and I've lived in the central city.

The central city is not what it used to be. The urban core is not what it used to be. The problem with the DEIS is what it doesn't say, as much as what it does say. The issue isn't whether we, as a community, desire the F-35 to be based here for economic reasons, selfish or otherwise. The purpose of this meeting, at least as we were told by the military, was to address the DEIS. The DEIS is filled with speculation, half-baked truths, and simply is based on estimates.

I quote the executive summary. Because the F-35 A is new aircraft, and that it's under development, some data normally used to predict noise, air quality and safety conditions cannot be obtained at this time. That is a critical problem. But yet we as a community, we as citizens, by our government are being told we are here tonight to comment on this. So how can you comment on a document, how can you comment on an aircraft, or anything which is half-baked and which is full of speculation? You cannot.

NP-13

What we do know, which is not speculation, is where this aircraft will be flown.

EJ-4

And what we do know is it would be flown over low-income and minority populations.

We have people here tonight, businessmen, who say, you know, give it a chance. We live in a community. We live in one community. And if you care about those who will be most impacted by this, I'd like to hear somebody talk about it. Where is the mitigation? Where is condemnation procedures? It's not described in the DEIS. It's left for some other day, just like, how noisy is this plane? That's left to some other day.

EJ-4 cont'd

January 30th, 2012, the game gets changed. The noise is different. The decibels are different. We have two elected officials who asked that the F-35A be flown over. Why? They ask so it wouldn't -- we wouldn't be sitting here speculating. And all of us are speculating. Not just me, but every person that's addressed this audience, and each of these fellows in our Air Force. They don't know. Yet we're trying to buy it. We deserve a flyover, and it should happen so we don't speculate, and we know exactly what we bought. Thank you.

GE-2

COLONEL: ROAN: Thank you.

Terry Holpert.

3195 TU

MS. HOLPERT: Thank you. My name is

Terry Holpert. I've lived in Tucson for over 60 years. I was educated here, and I dedicated my career to improving life in Tucson through creating access to high education at the U of A..

I've lived near Broadway and Country Club for almost 40 years. Despite the lure of the foothills, where lots of you who are here tonight live, my husband and I chose to raise or kids in midtown, because we were committed to creating and sustaining a thriving central city. We believe that in order for Tucson to flourish, the core of the city could not be hollow. People needed to, live, work and contribute there. That's what we've tried to do.

I oppose the F-35 in Tucson because it would endanger the health and safety of large numbers of city residents, including people who attend the U of A, work at the U of A and work downtown. We've already heard from the people who live and work in the Tucson mountain area who would also be seriously affected. **GE-4 NO-37**

The F-35 is claimed as the most extensive and the noisiest plane ever produced, with an uncertain safety record, would subject citizens to ear-shattering noise, and the dangers of crashes, and general erosion of the quality of life, from hearing **NO-1 SA-1 NO-36** **NO-6 NO-16**

problems to learning deficits, to high blood pressure, to inability for people to use their own back yards. **NO-6 NO-16 cont'd**

We live in Arizona, where back yards are important. The F-35 is not appropriate for flying over a city of over a million. The city of Tucson, countless business people have invested millions of dollars, their time, their talent, their energy in increasing the viability and livability of central city. It seems like it's crazy to undercut that at this point in time. Thank you. **NO-37** **SO-18**

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Ms. Redding, and then Anita Scales.

MS. REDDING: My name is Mary Redding, and I am here tonight as a concerned citizen. I would like to make a public comment in support of the F-35 coming to the Tucson Air National Guard Station. When you look at the factors that go in to selecting the very best location for a new jet, Tucson has it all. The best airspace in the United Stats. 280 days of sunshine every year, and the proximity to major companies and the aerospace industry. The Barry Goldwater ranges are just west of Tucson, and are the largest air-to-ground complexes in the world. **3196 TU** **GE-3**

History has shown that having the jets in year-round good weather reduces training costs over

the lifetime of the jets. Proximity to major aerospace companies will encourage the development of new technology.

Tucson has the opportunity to become the center for aerospace and technology in the United States at a time when economic growth is desperately needed. As an aerospace center, Tucson will benefit financially from the placement of the jets. It will provide jobs, in turn raising the tax revenue, spending at our local shops, and increase demand in our housing. It will provide indirect jobs through contractors, employees at stores around town, and in the construction industry. **GE-3**

I understand that there is some opposition to this plan. As with all development, there may be small costs that we, as a community, have to pay in order for our community to flourish. After reading the Environmental Impact Statement, as a concerned citizen, I am confident that all burdens to our community are significantly outweighed by the benefits. We look forward to welcoming the F-35 to our community. **GE-3**

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Ms. Scales and then Mr. Peter Collins.

MS. SCALES: My name is Anita Scales. **3197 TU**

I live in midtown, within 300 feet up an illusory 65-decibel line of a contour someone drew on a map without my knowledge a few years ago. Of course, I live on the quiet side of the line. There are over 8,000 residents mentioned in the EIS who will be impacted by the proposed basing of the F-35. These people live within, or near, an illusory line too. But I assert that the line doesn't prevent noise from entering the air on the other side. 8,000 is a fictional number. The line is fiction. Noise spreads. Are these effective people clearly damaged? Who will pay to mitigate their noise? How do you mitigate noise on playgrounds or backyards? How do you mitigate noise for a toddler? How do you mitigate noise in mobile homes? You don't. **NO-11** **NO-76** **EJ-1** **EJ-6**

So are there funds available to purchase blighted and unlivable homes? I have not read nor heard mention of such funds. Some rush to embrace the F-35 so blinded by their enthusiasm that they fail to notice thousands of people who are just collateral damage. The F-35 is unsuitable for Tucson. **SO-11** **GE-4**

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Mr. Collins and Walt Thomas. **3198 TU**

MR. COLLINS: Thank you. I'm Peter

Collins. I have been a resident of Tucson since 1986. I want to address some of the things that have not been addressed, starting with the EIS. I'm a retired Air Force and Air National Guard fighter pilot. I have 3,000 hours of experience in a single-engine airplane, the old single-engine airplanes, the F-100 the A-7 and then the F-16, and I haven't jumped out of one yet.

I have 860 hours of combat time over 235 combat sorties in southeast Asia, and I flew for 21 years. I had an opportunity because of my experience and because of my position I took with Air National Guard Bureau to fly from virtually every Air Force and Air National Guard base in the United States. I was an instructor pilot for over 15 years. I have trained students and I have flown in all the ranges, most every range in the United States.

I came to Tucson from outside, and I came to respect the people who work at the Tucson Air Guard base. They are professionals, they are serious. And everything that has been said about them in a positive manner, I support as a fact. I compare them with the best in the world.

But also I came to Tucson and I saw from an outside perspective the training environment

in Tucson, and I want to address those things in the EIS that address that. First of all, the Air Guard and the Air Force use the ranges out at the Goldwater testing ranges to the west of Tucson. They're not only the largest ranges, but they are also the best for training student pilots. You sit in the back seat of a jet and you train a student. The Goldwater ranges are absolutely the best, with the least impact on people. I have flown in the four different bases that are in the preferred status in this particular study. Tucson is by far better than Phoenix, because of the impact of houses all the way around Luke airbase, and all of the noise problems that I think are going to occur at Luke. I have flown at Boise and at Holloman, I think there are problems with both of those bases.

The approaches to the Tucson airport are on the outskirts of town. They are not over the middle of downtown, and they present much less of an environmental impact than has been addressed here, in my opinion. I believe the safety aspects which have been discussed in the previous meeting about live weapons being flown over Tucson doesn't exist. That hasn't been in the syllabus in the Tucson training manual for many, many years, and the Tucson Guard does

not fly live weapons over downtown Tucson.

The flight patterns involved are not over downtown, they're over the outside edges of Tucson. The impact, I believe, is significantly less than has been expressed by many people here. Thank you. GE-3

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Brad Richards. And then following Mr. Richards, Ellen Jimenez. 3199 TU

MR. RICHARDS: Hi, my name is Brad Richards. In the course of all these comments, I've heard a lot of repeated themes. And one of those is, we've had this long-term -- well, recently but long-term culture of saying no to all these opportunities coming to our community, and that hasn't always been that way. There has been a new insurgence of new leadership in our community. Some of those people have spoken. Some of those people are about to speak. And that culture is changing. I'd like to communicate that to the Air Force.

We are recognizing that the Air Force brings not only valuable jobs, but excellent individuals into our community. Truly upright men and women that have a heart for community service. And let's remember, as a community, some of our very best

citizens here came from their experiences at the Air National Guard and from Davis-Monthan. Some of the greatest community leaders we've had in this community came here because they witnessed that -- that Tucson is a great community. We don't want to undermine that. We'd really like to communicate to the Air Force the leadership that's happening in our community.

You'll hear from some of those excellent individuals today. We're bringing -- we're changing this tide. This isn't going to be a community of no for very much longer. Local organizations are changing that. And we really generally value the defense industry and the military presence here. And let's face it, change is always a difficult thing. We're all going to reach a point in our lives where we want things to stay the same.

But remembering that as people come up and new opportunities need to happen, our populations are growing. These new opportunities need to exist. We're looking at an aircraft that reduces air pollution. You may or may not be aware, but aircraft flying in our airspace produce far less pollution than any vehicles on the ground ever could hope for.

Further, it's a less expensive aircraft

to fly. So we talk about government spending. And I promise you there's no more consummate professionals than people in command positions in aviation. Whether it's civilian or military, safety is always the top concern. They're not going to put a human being in the sky until they're sure that aircraft is as safe as it can possibly be before the wheels leave the ground. Not only for their pilot's safety, but for the people on the ground.

And there's no more consummate professional than that pilot. If his aircraft has an issue, that pilot is 100 percent committed to make sure that aircraft goes does down the safest possible place it can before he leaves it. I've known a lot of pilots and that's their number one concern. The aircraft has trouble, they want to get it away from innocent civilian populations before they ever leave that aircraft.

So I'd like to communicate to the Air Force thank you for the EIS. And remember, this is a draft. We can point out the discrepancies in the draft, or things that haven't been addressed yet. It's a draft. So let's welcome the Air Force. Let them know the value of their presence and communicate to the Air Force there's new leadership coming through

to make this an even more welcoming community to you. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Ms. Jimenez and then Ms. Lee Stanfield.

3200 TU

MS. JIMENEZ: Thank you. My name is Ellen Jimenez. I do work in the tourism industry here in Tucson. I'm chair of the military affairs committee, which is part of the Tucson Chamber of Commerce. The military affairs committee has been supporting our local Tucson military since 1929. So that tells you a little bit about how long our military has been here in Tucson, and how long they've had a support base as well.

A couple of things: my comments are mainly for our Air Force and our military here in Tucson versus the public out here. We want to say thank you. We want to say thank you for offering this hearing. We want to say thank you for your service and thank you for your sacrifices. We also want to say thank you for being here in Tucson and choosing Tucson as your home for the 162nd. And that has actually been here since 1957 as well.

We want to say thank you for our freedom, our freedom of speech and for us being here

today. We would not be here today if it was not for you. We want to say that we appreciate having you as our neighbors. We know that you live among us in our community and in our own neighbors here in Tucson. We want to thank you also for local support, and your many volunteer hours that you do put back into Tucson, whether they're shelters with our minorities, as I am one as well.

The F-35 is a great, great jet to have here in Tucson, and we want it here. The Tucson community does support having it here. And we have -- we also know that the 162nd does an impeccable job of training their pilots, and that you will continue to do so; you have a great history of doing this. So I just want to re-amplify that I support the Air Force. I support its mission, and I support having you here in Tucson. I support having the F-35 here in Tucson. Our community also supports having you here in Tucson. Thank you. **GE-3**

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Ms. Stanfield, and then Mr. Jeffrey Ceasar.

MS. STANFIELD: My name is Lee Stanfield, and I'm going to stick mostly to the DEIS. This DEIS does not address the impacts of F-35s on **3201 TU** **SO-13**

Tucson's economy adequately. It admits that construction jobs resulting from the F-35s constitute less than one percent of the total employment in Pima County, and construction expenditures and the jobs created would be temporary.

It also admits that because the F-35s would displace the current F-16 at TIA, the net increase in pilots and support personnel would be small. However, it says nothing about the loss that the F-35 noise would impose on Tucson leisure and hospitality businesses, which bring 1,400,000,000 annually to our local economy. It fails to analyze the impacts of noise created when two or more F-35s fly in formation or in close proximity to one another, which is almost certainly going to happen, especially since it's an instructional aircraft. This is going to be a training for pilots, and it's a one-pilot aircraft. In order to have an instructor in the sky with this pilot, they'd have to be in another plane. **SO-13 cont'd** **NO-39**

The DEIS mentions the reaction of individuals to a sudden and drastic increase of noise. When noise levels increase abruptly by sixteen fold, as when noise jumps from 50 to 90 decibels, individuals are startled and disturbed. This DEIS tries to minimize this impact in almost all cases. It **NO-24**

describes the decibel levels in terms of a broad average that encompasses 24 hours per day for an entire year. This is not representative.

As a matter of fact, the noise averaging used in this DEIS is totally inappropriate for assessing flyover noise impact on residents. When you average in the quiet time in between all the flyovers for a 24-hour period, it's a blatant attempt to profoundly water down the true noise impact on residents. The insistence on the use of this tool in both this EIS and the current Operation Snowbird EA is an insult to our intelligence. NO-24 cont'd

If your next-door neighbor fired a cannon every two hours for 24 hours, this tool would still assess that impact on you as negligible, a finding of no significant impact. If there would really be no significant impact, then why don't you do a demonstration flyover? GE-2

This EIS should be scrapped and a new one be done only after there's a sufficient amount of time for the F-35 to actually have a track record to determine the safety risk. In addition, the new EIS must be done by a new subcontractor, one with a record of true independence, lack of bias in favor of the Air Force. Two, use appropriate tools. Three, SA-12 NP-32 NP-35

transparency and clarity of explanations regarding procedures and tools. And four, comprehensive coverage of all issues required by NEPA, including cumulative impact. Thank you. NP-35 cont'd NP-36

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. Mr. Ceasar? All right. Then Stanley Abrams, to be followed by Susan Banner.

3202 TU

MR. ABRAMS: My name is Stan Abrams. I'm a businessman here in Tucson. For the record, I served in the Air Force, the Strategic Air Command during the Cold War. When I moved to Tucson in 1960, I also served in the 162nd Fighter Wing for about three years. I'm not going to repeat a lot of things that were said previously, but I will say the following. And I want to go on record as telling you that I live also at Broadway and Country Club. I have a lot of acquaintance with aircraft from Davis-Monthan.

I think the point here is as follows: We can at times agree to disagree. But we have an issue here that is significant for the future of this community. I want to congratulate the Air Force, who has taken a lot of comments about the EIS that probably is not a perfect document. That's shocking. It's not a perfect document. But it is a good

document, and certainly the Air Force has made a serious effort in order to present as much information possible to the people in this community.

I thought about the last comment that I'm about to make as to whether I should say it or not, and I decided that I would. There comes a point in time in which you live your life in a community, in the state and in the nation, when perhaps you have to a step back and think about are you willing to give up and sacrifice a little bit of your comfort in order to make sure that your children and your grandchildren -- of which I have 10 -- have the best possible way to live in a land of freedom? Where they know that they don't have to worry about walking out the door and being in a situation that could threaten their life.

So that's my comment. I'm not a war hawk. I'm not somebody that wants to go, you know, fight wars everywhere. But we are in a world that's dangerous. And I commend the Air Force. My personal experiences in the Air Force were valuable. I was a very young guy. But I ask this community to look at the future, not only economic future, but the future of your own families, your children, grandchildren and whatever else you may have. Thank you.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Ms. Banner and then Helen Bayly.

3203 TU

MS. BANNER: I am also not drunk. I have a bad knee. I believe that the draft EIS is not quite complete. I lived in central Tucson for 13 years. I've operated a bed and breakfast from my house in the Sam Hughes neighborhood mentioned earlier by Joey Flynn, the lawyer. I'm terrifically bothered by the noise that happens every day in my life.

NP-13

NO-8

Last night at one of the meetings, a woman representing the hospitality industry said Randolph park -- Double Tree, excuse me -- she said that in 20 years, no guest had ever complained about the noise. I checked the Double Tree hotel, and all of them in the country are listed as sound proof. I think a lot of us are not sound proof. At least 50 percent of the guests who stay in my house comment and complain about the planes, and I make up stories to cover the noise.

The F-35 is much louder than the F-16. Everybody agrees about that. But please let Tucson be the judge of the noise level by flying one of them over us. And also, tell us how many planes, how many times a day, how many days of the week, of the month, of the year, we'll be subjected to that noise. None of this is outlined in this draft EIS. We also know

NO-1

GE-2

DO-23

the noise level varies depending on cloud cover and precipitation, something that we have once in a while.

Several people at last night's meeting also said they loved the sound of noise. I think that's great for them. One of them was somebody who apparently works on one of the runways, whose businesses are there. I can certainly understand why he would be in favor of noise.

I pulled up some information from a place called McKinley Health and Hearing Center in Illinois. And these are some of the things that they said. If you think you've grown used to a loud noise, it's probably already damaged your hearing. Exposure to a single intense explosion can result in immediate permanent hearing loss. As a general rule, noise may damage your hearing if you have to shout over background noise in order to be heard.

From the draft EIS, these are the words, that subsonic and supersonic aircraft noise -- even though it said this is not true with supersonic -- would increase, potentially reducing recreational uses, environment, enjoyment of the natural setting, that includes my backyard. So we think there's significant information missing about this. Noise associated with training activities would present a

EJ-4

disproportionate -- this is from the EIS -- disproportionate and adverse environmental impact on low-income population in the vicinity of Tucson. I have a couple more things, but that's the essence of it. Thank you.

EJ-4 cont'd

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. We've reached 8:00, which is our scheduled time to complete. However, I believe we can continue on for a little while longer. Again, I can't promise we're going to get to everybody. We've just got too many. But I think until at least 8:30.

3204 TU

MS. BAYLY: Hello, everybody. That's probably 50 decibels. This is a housekeeping remark that the good colonel is permitting me to make before I start my official comments; and that is, I think it's outrageous that A, there is no water provided for the audience tonight. I had to go out the back, beg some of the members of the U.S. Air Force for a sip of any of their water. No, no. It's my personal water. Why don't you walk, you know, 100 yards down there to the drinking fountain. That's one housekeeping point. I am very angry about it.

NP-11

The League of Women Voters requires that public meetings have adequate public notification. The three minutes in a huge population

NP-14

NP-11

like this, per speaker, for two hours on evenings that are in conflict with religious festivals and holy ceremonies is really disgraceful. NP-11 cont'd, NP-28

This is my government agency that doesn't know how to run a public meeting. There's no water supply around for any of you. And three times I've had to get up and be helped by a hero back there. NP-11

All right. Anyway, so it is your duty, Mister Representative of the Government -- and I too can salute. I was a Girl Scout. And by the way, you'd be interested to know, I am a feminist who battled to make sure that women could enter the services. But at the moment, you have to provide drinking water for everybody. And I'll leave it at that for the time being. But I really am very concerned about the dreadful way in which you have failed to organize public meetings. NP-11

Okay. So my name is Helen Bayly, B-a-y-l-y. Thank you for your time. What about the six pilots who were killed this morning over Utah? What happened with their training, their Marines? What happened with their training? They were training in the same landscape to prepare them for fighting, flying helicopters in Afghanistan. But in Afghanistan a month ago, six members of NATO went down, were GE-13

killed when that helicopter went down. GE-13 cont'd

I would like, since we're here, to comment on the DEIS, not to talk about our adulation for this, that and the other. I would like to add to the study, please, those of you who are listening, that studies are of the psychologies of pilots. Why have there been so many F-16 accidents? And I'd like to hear from the guy who trains them all. I have great respect for you. Sorry to point my finger. I add the word respect to everything I say tonight. But there have been a lot of accidents with people who you claim to have trained. GE-24, GE-13

And I would like it to be added to the DEIS, please, with a whole new EIS statement, because we don't know a thing. We have no tables for health studies, danger studies, the airplane itself. We have no knowledge. The whole study needs to be started again. I endorse entirely -- so I don't have to repeat comments -- what Robin Gomez said, what Lee Stanfield said, what the wonderful woman from central Tucson who brings people into education, what she said. I'd like to endorse that, but I'll add to it. NO-63, SA-12

I am on the board of directors of the science fair. Time? All right -- of the science fair, and I bring into town lots of Davis-Monthan

airmen and women in order to run the biggest science fair in Arizona, and we get some of the national prizes.

So with that in mind, I have three minutes. This is important, and so you'll get lots of written information from this. Sorry to go over. I didn't see the lady down there with the signs.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. We are trying to keep time, but please, no personal comments. Jean Dejong, followed by Michael Varney. **3205 TU**

MS. DEJONG: Hi, everyone. I'm glad to see everyone here, and everyone is participating in this democratic process. I just want to do a little bit of history here. In 1978, there was a major crash of the single-engine jet, an A-7 that just missed U of A and Mansfield middle school.

And after that, the Air Force changed the mission at D-M to A-10s and the National Guard that we're talking about today was redirected out to TIA. So that's when the National Guard ended up at TIA, because the National Guard was flying and continues to fly the single-engine jets that are most dangerous to fly over an urban population of now a million people, because they're single engines. If one engines goes, it goes down. And especially a jet **SA-1**

like the F-16 that is highly maneuverable, that the pilot has difficulty maneuvering it. It has to be steadied by a computer. If something happens to that, there's not a lot of control. **SA-1 cont'd**

So you know, for almost 30 years, we have had a midtown Tucson that's been relatively compatible with D-M. And because of that, what I see -- somebody was talking about no, but what I see is you started to see the neighborhoods in midtown Tucson begin to come back to life, begin to flourish. We have million-dollar neighborhoods in the middle of midtown Tucson.

The University of Arizona has gone up in world class stature. The math and science departments place 16th internationally in competitiveness. And the reason that this sort of thing happens is because you create a beautiful environment that people want to move into and live in. We moved here -- and I just wanted to make this point, because I've heard this repeated several times, and I really have a hard time accepting it. The success of the aeronautics industry is not based on the F-35 being here. The success of the aeronautics industry is based on a successful vibrant university. The high tech industries comes here and high paying jobs come

here because you have a vibrant and good educational system. People who are going to come here in high tech industries are not going to come here if they've got a lousy school system.

I have a friend who has a very successful business here in town. She hires her people from the university engineering department. If the stature of that school goes down because you've got F-35s flying overhead and the threat of a single-engine jet crashing again into the city, you may find things change very quickly. SA-1

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. I'm going to ask everybody to mind, as we've got a lot of speakers in a certain amount of time, to watch Brianna up here with the cards, so we can try to say as close as we can on the three minutes.

Mr. Varney, and then Gabriella Mercer.

3206 TU

MR. VARNEY: Good evening. My name is Michael Varney. I'm the president and CEO of the Tucson Metro Chamber. I'm here today to make two statements; one is professional, one is personal. I come before you today on behalf of 1,350 member businesses of the Tucson Metro Chamber and the 105,000 employees represented by those businesses. Given that the sensitivity and consideration already shown by the

Air Force to the environment in the DEIS, the Tucson Metro Chamber supports the location of F-35A lightning at the 162nd Air National Guard facility adjacent to Tucson International Airport. Few locations in the country offer the combination of airspace for military training and favorable weather conditions. The Tucson area has a solid stake in the future of the aerospace and defense industry, which currently generates 5- to $6,000,000,000 a year in revenues in our area. That means jobs, and jobs are badly needed in this recessionary economy. The 162nd Air National Guard Fighter Wing employs 1,450 Tucson area residents. Adding the F-35 to the 162nd's fleet of training aircraft will bring more pilots and more support industries to Tucson and Pima county. GE-3

The construction necessary to receive the F-35 at TIA is estimated to require $175,000,000 in construction contracts, resulting in an increase of around 2,000 badly needed construction jobs for our community and your neighbors. The draft EIS speaks for itself. We believe the 162nd has acquitted itself admirably in demonstrating sensitivity to noise abatement and safety issues. The 162nd and its new fleet of F-35s will continue to be good neighbors.

Now for the personal note. Before

moving to Tucson, I lived in Las Vegas for 14 years. I lived in Summerland, a wonderful and heavily populated area on the west side of the Las Vegas valley. In 2008, FAA, for some reason, changed the departure corridor at McCarran International Airport, the sixth busiest airport in the country, 500 flights a day in and out of McCarran International Airport. Where these flights used to turn left, they were now directed by the FAA to turn right, or west. Hundreds of flights per day right over my house. The mayor and others protested. Noise, accidents. Neighbors protested. The sky was falling. The FAA stood firm.

We noticed the noise for about two or three days. After that, it was wallpaper. Nobody has lost their hearing or grown a third eye. The mountains behind my house are still there. Houses are still being bought and sold. Tourism at Red Rock Canyon is still as high as ever. Life goes on.

The F-35 represents change in Tucson; it's good change. Tucson welcomes the F-35. GE-3

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. Gabriella Mercer, and then Ted Mercer.

3207 TU

MS. MERCER: My name is Gabriella Saucedo Mercer, and I am here in support of the proposed F-35 pilot training center, not only because GE-3

it means jobs for the military, but training for our national defense and security. Having the F-35 training center in our community means jobs, desperately needed jobs, that will be created in support of a training center.

Luke Air Force base and Tucson Air Guard station are uniquely qualified for the training of F-35 pilots. From our exceptional climate to the valuable airspace provided by the Barry Goldwater range and Libby Army airfield. Tucson Air Guard station is considered by many to be exceptionally attractive for future F-35 operations, with its potential to house as many as 72 joint strike fighters. GE-3 cont'd

The fiscal impact on the Arizona -- on the state of Arizona is one of the biggest arguments for bringing the F-35 to Luke and to the Tucson Air Guard station, which is the home of the 162nd Fighter Wing, as many have already said.

Bases in the military station there pump money into our local businesses. It creates tremendous wage-earning jobs for those struggling to find work during these tough economic times. With our high unemployment rate, we need to keep the F-35 here; sustaining our flying mission in Tucson through the

year 2035 and beyond. GE-3 cont'd

Regarding the noise? Well, every day I hear the train go by. My husband promised me that eventually I would get used to the noise. Well, we've been in Tucson since 2004, and I still hear the train, even when I'm asleep. The noise the train makes means that free enterprise and capitalism is working to benefit our economy. As a military mom, the jet noise means freedom.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

3208 TU

MR. MERCER. I'm Ted Mercer. I'm a resident of the City of Tucson, and my wife and I live in the glide path to TIA. Ever since we moved to Tucson, we've been in that glide path. I am certainly not bothered by it. It doesn't bother me at all. In fact, as my wife said, I that's the sound of capitalism at work.

I will say this: The company that I work for spent five years and about ten million dollars developing a noise suppression device for use on the MD-80 commercial airliners. And as a part of that whole process of gaining authorization by the FAA to install that product on those airplanes, we had to go through probably much, much, much more extensive noise testing than is represented by these charts and

envelopes that you have seen so far.

I can tell you this: You could test -- run these kind of noise tests that you've heard requested for another five years, and you would not be any more sure of the results than you are tonight. It depends upon the temperature, the humidity, the barometric pressure, the direction the wind is blowing, the intensity of the wind, and how hard that pilot has his hand on that accelerator. And all of those things will change -- you can fly two identical aircraft, one right behind the other, over the test field and you will get different results. The altitude also plays a role, as does the cloud cover.

So arguing for extensive testing to perfect the decibel level that you're experiencing, it just ain't going to happen. It's a guess, at best, and that's just the reality of it. You're never going to get a perfect guarantee that there is no risk of an airplane falling out of the sky. It happens. In fact, it happens more often with commercial aircraft than it does with military. The military does a wonderful job.

My company is located within a quarter of a mile of the airport runway. We hear those airplanes taking off every morning and every

afternoon. It's a wonderful sound to me. But depending on which direction the wind is blowing, with the intensity of that wind, it can be noisy. That's true.

We heard objections from people who were within proximity to the aircraft, the landing patterns, and so on and so forth. Those people knew when they bought their homes that they were living, or going to live in the glide path of an airport. And probably most of them signed a disclaimer that they recognized the risks associated with that. That's just reality.

The economic impact I think has been touched on. I think we need the jobs in this community. The impact of the loss of those jobs would have a horrible impact upon the economy of this community, which is already struggling to survive. Thank you for your time.

GE-3

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

3209 TU

MR. JOSSERAND: Of course people can adapt to almost anything, but that does not mean adverse stimuli are harmless. Some sincerely claim to not notice any harm from the current overflights. But so many smokers also were sincere in their denial, and it still impacted their health, and many died.

The enthusiasm on the part of those in favor of the much louder F-35 is overwhelmingly economic, although it leaves out large components of a true economic assessment of pros and cons, especially for the long term.

The welfare of the city of Tucson and the University of Arizona -- which was here a long time before the airplanes -- are on a collision course with the noise and safety issues of Davis-Monthan. It's a train wreck that is well under way, but it does not have to continue. Either D-M can buy out the University of Arizona and central Tucson, or reverse its expansion.

In actual fact, brining the F-35 is spending money to make Tucson an unlivable city for now and decades to come, and that does not count the huge cost to health and well being. Proponents make an emotional appeal to patriotism and the fears of terrorism. However, the F-35 does little to fight terrorism.

SO-1
SO-40

Time-tested wisdom enshrined in documents from the Magna Carta to the Constitution discourage making decisions on an emotional basis. Despite that, emotional decision-making has brought us the Patriot Act and the new NDAA, which allows the

president to use the military to detain anyone, even American citizens, indefinitely without charge or counsel or trial.

Abraham Lincoln said, As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned in an era of corruption, and high places will follow, and money and power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the republic is destroyed. I feel more anxiety for the safety of my country now than ever before, even in the midst of war. Abraham Lincoln said that five minutes before he was assassinated.

Please do not take my remarks as an attack on capitalism or on defense. It's true that defense is vital to our freedom and prosperity, but it cannot provide prosperity. It consumes wealth at an enormous rate. Although it ensures our ability to create wealth, it is a net deficit to the national treasury and making it a cash cow is not patriotic.

The F-35 is made in 43 states not by chance. It was an orchestrated maneuver designed to turn the people's combined patriotism and fear into a cash cow. How rich do we have to be? We're the richest nation in the world. No one as ever lived

better than than we do. We can get along.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Maureen Tozzi? And I'm sorry. The one following is a little hard to read. It's Rihl, R-i-h-l.

3210 TU

MS. TOZZI: Hi, I'm Maureen Tozzi. I work in the hospitality industry, but I'm really here to support the 162nd. I'm on the military affairs committee. I'm glad war was brought up, because there are two things we can be guaranteed of; there is war and there is peace. And I'm happy that we will have the 162nd and our allies and that they'll be here in Tucson to support us. You know, it's our allies that we're training, and that's an important thing to keep in mind.

We need to be competitive in Tucson, and change is coming. Let's change the no to let's compromise, because no is not conducive to change. You know, we need to work together.

Additionally, with the F-35, I mean, we're only going to be competitive so long with the F-16. Let's support our military. Bring it home, the F-35 to Tucson, and let's bring change about. Thank you.

GE-3

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Jamie Shrimmer. **3211 TU**

MS. SHRIMMER: I want to thank all of those who have remained behind tonight after the 8:00 time. It's so hard to decide what to say because there's been so much said. But I would like to say that you know, not -- it's not true that everyone wants the F-35, and it's not true that most Tucsonans want the F-35.

It's because most Tucsonans don't even know what the F-35A is. Most Tucsonans are too busy working two jobs and trying to be at home and make food for their children and pay the rent. They don't have time to speculate on what has not happened yet. And if you were to ask the general population, Are you for the F-35 or against it? They don't know. Because it is all speculation. There is no such thing.

What is true in most people's lives is what they do want and they think they should be able to have. Most people want to continue living in their homes. They may have trouble meeting the mortgage, but they want to live in their homes. Most people want to continue living in a home with unbroken window panes. Most people want to be able to sit outside and watch a sunset, or have dinner on the porch or let the kids play outside. **NO-3 NO-16 SO-23**

Most people want to be able to hear the birds and the sounds of nature. Most people want to take a recreational hike when they can. Most people want to see blue skies and not contour trails, and most people want to be able to sleep without disturbance. These is not addressed in the EIS. The quality of life is not there. And I think that the F-16, the F-18, the F-22 has already taken a big bite out of our quality of life. And I don't live in a flight path, yet I hear planes rumbling, flying over me morning, noon and night, and sometimes through the night. They set off car alarms and house alarms. **NO-3 NO-16 SO-23 cont'd**

I live near the elementary school, where there are nights where the children do not get more than an hour of sleep at a time because of planes flying overhead, when we don't even live in flight path, and we live eight miles from the base. I'm afraid the F-35 will take that final bite out of the qualify of life and there will be none left for any of us here. Thank you. **NO-3 NO-8 NO-16**

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you.

Barry Soulvie, and then Barbara Harper will be all the time that we have this evening.

MR. SOULVIE: My name is Barry Soulvie. **3212 TU**
I'm a former member of the 162nd Fighter Wing. I'm

proud to say that. I'm retired and I work in the retiree's office out there, and so obviously I'm pro F-35. GE-3

But I'd like to go back to when I was a little kid. I was born in Tucson. I'm a native. And I've been here a long time. And I remember when I was just a little kid, preschool, and we were involved in World War II. And I remember those airplanes flying over my house, because I lived in the area of Tucson Boulevard and 22nd, and those airplanes would come over my house. And my parents would reassure me that those airplanes were our airplanes, and not somebody else's. And as a little kid, you know, I had some concerns of what you hear about the war, because you didn't really know or fully understand what was going on. So finding out that those airplanes were friendly, they were our plans, that was reassuring to me.

So I watched things evolve at Davis-Monthan. I saw B-24s, B-17s and it evolved and went to B-47s and B-52s. And B-52s were very loud. They also had KC-135s. And I remember very well KC-135s, because those airplanes sitting on the runway at Davis-Monthan, full power with a full load, you could hear those airplanes when they were still on

their takeoff rolling on the ground.

Anyway, this whole thing evolved. And in the mid-'70s, the Air National Guard had a saying that jet noise was the sound of freedom. And I still agree with that, because without that sound of freedom, we wouldn't have the freedoms that we have today. We wouldn't have the privilege of coming here with the opposition, and then those people for the F-35 fighter sit here and have their say.

So I want to say that, you know, with noise comes power, with power comes freedom, because the only way we have our freedom is because we have a strong military. So think about that. And you know what? If you look up in the sky and you see those airplanes up there, those airplanes belong to us, and that's a good thing. That's why we have our freedom. Thank you very much.

COLONEL ROAN: Ms. Harper?

3213 TU

MS. HARPER: Good evening. My name is Barbara Harper. I'm a professional pilot and aviation safety consultant and a flight instructor. As a member of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, and the International Society of Women airline pilots, I'm totally for supporting the F-35A in Tucson. GE-3

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you. We will have

one more speaker. Ms. Abby Road. **3214 TU**

MS. ROAD: Thank you for this accommodation. Earlier tonight I heard somebody say that our population is growing. Really, our population is aging. Our birth rate is down. And as our population ages, people are looking for wonderful places to go and live where they can live out their days peacefully, enjoying the quality of life that they've always looked forward to in their retirement years. People like me may have to be forced to retire maybe much sooner than they ever expected. Being a disabled citizen, I'm home all day.

I try to go outside. I try to sleep. I try not to watch things fall off my walls when the planes go overhead. I call the Air Force base, and I tell them, Wow, that one scared me. That one was really low. And they're not supposed to be so low that I can see the guy waving at me out the window, or read the numbers on the bottom of the plane. It's really frightening.

I think that our quality of life is going to be effected negatively, if bigger, noisier F-35 planes come here, because not only is our population aging -- and I don't know if you realize this; Tucson particularly is a very service-oriented **NO-36**

community. That's because we have a high dropout rate in our schools. We have a lot of people available for very low-income-paying jobs. That's why there's McDonald's on every corner and fast food restaurants and drug stores everywhere, and supermarkets, and little corner quickie mart kind of things, because we're a service-oriented community.

But what we don't have is young people training how to take of our elderly houses. My house is more than 65 years old. It was built around the time that the airport was built. Most of the houses in midtown Tucson are post World War II track homes. A lot of the homes downtown and in the historic district are even older than that. They're made of even more fragile materials.

Young people in the community are not being trained how to do these repairs. So the older people that have been repairing our homes up to this time are retiring, are aging, and there's nobody to fill in and take care of our homes now. So as they're detrimented by the shaking of the planes flying overhead, and the quality of life for the people who are retired, it's time to sit in their yards, like the last -- many speakers tonight have talked about the qualify of life, and the loss of that quality of **NO-12** **NO-36**

life.

I really want the government and the military to please reconsider that Tucson is not a good option for placement for our F-35 system for training, because this is an attractive place. I love snowbirds. I love their money. I want them to keep coming. I think they're a bigger part of our economy, our tourism industry. The beautiful area that we live in needs to be protected in every way possible for future generations. And if you allow a short-term entity like this to come in and destroy everything in the future, we will have no legal recourse in the future to protect ourselves.

So please stand together as a community and keep reiterating your feelings to the government in writing and orally, and to the community. Thank you very much.

COLONEL ROAN: Thank you, ma'am. Again, I apologize that we have run out of time. I thank you for your time and interest in the F-35A training basing EIS proposal.

And again, tonight is not the end of your opportunity to participate in the review process. Written comment sheets are available at the registration table, and you can turn these sheets in

NO-36 cont'd

GE-4

SO-10

in tonight, or mail, or fax them. The mailing address is printed on the comment sheets. The Air Force welcomes public comments in writing at any time during the Environmental Impact Analysis process. But to receive consideration, they must be submitted by March 14th of 2012. Thank you and good night.

(Public Hearing and Oral Comments Concluded at 8:24 p.m.)

D.8.11 Transcript from the Boise Air Terminal Airport Air Guard Station Public Hearing Held February 27, 2012, in Boise, Idaho

STATE OF ARIZONA)
COUNTY OF PIMA)

I, Kimberly W. Gauthier, do hereby certify that the foregoing Transcript of Proceedings constitutes a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings held in the foregoing matter, all done to the best of my skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name this 9th day of March, 2012.

Kimberley W. Gauthier

Kimberley W. Gauthier, RPR
Certified Reporter, Certificate No. 50567

U.S. AIR FORCE F-35A TRAINING BASING EIS PUBLIC HEARING, BOISE AIR GUARD STATION

PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2012

Veterans of Foreign Wars Hall
8931 West Ardene Street
Boise, Idaho

Taken By: Andrea L. Check

APPEARANCES

AIR FORCE PANEL: Colonel MaryBeth Harney
Colonel Mike Nolan
Lieutenant Colonel Jon Wheeler
Jim Holley

AIR FORCE PUBLIC HEARING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2012
6:03 P.M.

COLONEL HARNEY: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. The time is now 6:00 p.m., and we'll go ahead and begin the hearing.

Thank you very much for coming out tonight to this public hearing for the F-35A Training Basing Environmental Impact Statement.

My name is Colonel MaryBeth Harney, and I'll be your hearing officer tonight. I'm a judge on the United States Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals in Washington, D.C., and sometimes I and my colleagues assist with hearings like this.

I don't work for anyone at the Boise Air Guard Station or the Air Education and Training Command. I'm not involved in any way with the development of the Draft EIS, and I don't act as a legal advisor to the Air Force representatives working on this proposal.

My role in the hearing tonight is simply to be an impartial moderator to ensure that we have a fair, orderly, and impartial hearing where you have the opportunity to make comments on the proposal.

Tonight's hearing is being transcribed, verbatim, by Andrea Check, who is seated next to me.

We're here tonight because the Air Force is analyzing the environmental impacts of the proposed establishment of a Pilot Training Center with F-35A training aircraft. The hearing is held in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Protection Act -- or Policy Act, excuse me, NEPA, and regulations published by the Council for Environmental Quality. The purpose of the hearing is to receive your comments on the Draft EIS.

Tonight's hearing is just one of several opportunities for public comment. Please keep in mind that the hearing is not a debate, it's not a vote on the Draft EIS, and it's not a question-and-answer session.

Rather, the hearing is an opportunity for you to express your views and concerns about the adequacy of the environmental analysis and potential environmental impacts associated with the proposal, as well as any issues related to the National Historic Preservation Act process. Comments about other unrelated issues will not assist in the decision-making process.

Okay. During the first part of the hearing,

Air Force representatives will provide you with some information about the project and the environmental impact analysis process.

We have with us tonight Colonel Mike Nolan from the Boise Air Guard Station, and from Air Force Education and Training Command, Lieutenant Colonel Jon Wheeler, and Mr. Jim Holley.

One other thing, if it looks like we're reading to you, it's because we are (laughter). And I apologize for that, but we prepare the presentations in writing to ensure that we cover everything for you and that all of the presentations are the same.

After the briefings, we'll move to the second part of the hearing to take comments from those of you who would like to make a statement on the record tonight.

Your comments, both written and oral, will provide the decision-makers the benefit of your knowledge of the local area and your concerns about the environmental analysis.

At this point, I will now turn the presentation over to Colonel Nolan from the Boise Air Guard Station.

COLONEL NOLAN: Good evening. Welcome. My

name is Mike Nolan. I'm the director of staff for the Idaho Air National Guard right here in Boise, Idaho.

On behalf of the United States Air Force and the Idaho Air National Guard, I'd like to welcome you to the public hearings for the F-35A Training Basing Environmental Impact Statement, which I will refer to as the EIS.

Hopefully you had the opportunity to talk with the many knowledgeable experts staffing the poster stations, and to learn more about the Air Force's proposal, which is to establish a Pilot Training Center with F-35A training aircraft at one or more Air Force and Air National Guard installations. Four alternative locations are evaluated in the EIS, one being Boise Air Guard Station.

Let's begin by reviewing the agenda for tonight. I'll give a brief overview of Boise Air Guard Station, and Lieutenant Colonel Wheeler will discuss the F-35A training program and aircraft.

Next, Mr. Jim Holley will provide an overview of the environmental impact analysis process and the results specific to the Boise Air Guard Station alternative.

The last item on the agenda is the most important, and that's the public comment session, and it's your opportunity to provide information and to make statements for the record.

This is one of three public hearings the Air Force is holding near the Boise Air Guard Station. The Air Force is holding a total of 13 public hearings to ensure the public has ample opportunity to learn about and comment on the F-35A Training Basing EIS.

Before we tell you about the comprehensive EIS process and analyses, I would like to first provide an overview of Boise Air Guard Station, our mission and operations.

Boise Air Guard Station, or Gowen Field, is home to the 124th Fighter Wing of the Idaho Air National Guard, along with the Army National Guard.

Boise Air Guard Station covers the southern half of the Boise Air Terminal Airport and is operated as a joint military/civilian facility. The Boise Air Guard Station consists of an exclusive-use military lease and a joint-use agreement between the City of Boise and the military.

The installation has a rich history dating back to World War II and today is the only joint

military installation in Idaho and the only National Guard facility in the region focused on providing Total Joint Force training.

The mission of the fighter wing is to recruit and properly train Idaho Air National Guardsmen, ensuring well-trained, well-equipped units are available for prompt mobilization during war, and to provide assistance during emergencies.

The fighter wing includes 1400 full- and part-time airmen and supports the 190th Fighter Squadron, which operates and maintains the A-10 Thunderbolt II aircraft. Currently, 18 A-10 aircraft are assigned to Gowen Field. The F-35A aircraft that we're discussing tonight are slated to replace and supplement older aircraft such as the A-10.

This figure shows the training airspace and ranges regularly used by the Boise Air Guard Station. This training airspace includes military operations areas, military training routes, restricted areas, and air traffic control assigned airspace. This map is also available in the handouts that you received this evening.

As part of our ongoing operations and activities, we implement a variety of protective measures to minimize impacts on our region and

environment from training activities. We're proud of those efforts and our achievements.

Because of the many attributes that Boise Air Guard Station offers, our installation is one of four locations under consideration for the siting of an F35-A Pilot Training Center and the aircraft.

I will now turn the presentation over to Lieutenant Colonel Wheeler to discuss the F35-A training program and its aircraft.

Thank you.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WHEELER: Thank you, Colonel Nolan. My name is Lieutenant Colonel Jon Wheeler, and I'm a flight instructor with the Air Education and Training Command.

The F-35A aircraft is an outcome of the Joint Strike Fighter Program, which is a joint, multinational program among the United States Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and nine international partners.

The Joint Strike Fighter Program merged several independent government projects working on next-generation strike aircraft. The goal was to build an affordable universal fighter that would meet the needs of all participants.

Three versions of the strike fighter were

developed to meet the varying operational needs of the military services. The Air Force version of the aircraft is the F35-A, which is the conventional takeoff and landing model of the F-35.

The F-35A is absolutely essential to the nation's securities strategy. It is the newest and most advanced fifth-generation fighter, and is needed to deter and defeat 21st century threats.

The F35-A is intended to be the Air Force's premier strike aircraft through the first half of the 21st century, offering low visibility, close- and long-range air-to-ground and air-to-air capability, enhanced precision strike capability, and sophisticated electronic warfare capabilities.

The multifaceted F-35A would fulfill the wide range of roles and missions currently conducted by F-16 and A-10 aircraft, and would compliment the F-22 aircraft.

The F-35A is more effective than current fighter aircraft in air-to-ground combat, air-to-air combat, reconnaissance, and suppression of enemy air defenses, and has a better range while requiring less logistical support.

Features of the aircraft that make it a cutting-edge aircraft are low visibility,

supportability, and weapons. The F-35A is designed to cost less to operate and support than comparable current-generation aircraft.

The Air Force has evaluated the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed basing of F-35A training aircraft. For more information about the environmental impact analysis process and findings, I will now turn the presentation over to Mr. Jim Holley.

MR. HOLLEY: Was that your idea?

Thank you, Colonel Wheeler. My name is Jim Holley, H-O-L-L-E-Y, and I am with Headquarters Air Education and Training Command. I'm also a project manager for the F-35A Training Basing Environmental Impact Statement.

The Draft EIS was prepared by the Air Force to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. The Draft EIS is an important part of the Air Force's overall commitment to environmental stewardship.

The EIS was initiated in December 2009. An early part of the EIS process included 23 public scoping meetings, five of which were held here in Idaho, to enable the public to provide input on the proposed action, the alternatives under

consideration, and environmental resources and issues to be analyzed.

Government agencies, elected officials, tribes, community and environmental organizations, and individuals, were encouraged to submit comments throughout the scoping period. The comments received were considered in the preparation of this Draft EIS.

The Draft EIS is the result of extensive analyses and consideration of public and agency comments received during the scoping period. It is a complex and comprehensive document, so I would like to provide an overview of what it includes in its findings.

The No-Action Alternative and a Proposed Action are analyzed in the Draft EIS. NEPA requires federal agencies to consider a No-Action Alternative when preparing an EIS.

Under the No-Action Alternative, the establishment of a Pilot Training Center and basing of F-35A aircraft would not take place.

At each alternative location, the No-Action Alternative constitutes baseline or current conditions, and allows the decision-makers to compare the magnitude of the effects of no action to the effects of the proposed action.

As mentioned earlier, the Proposed Action is to establish a Pilot Training Center with associated basing of F-35A training aircraft at one or more Air Force or Air National Guard installations.

Installations with adequate military airspace and facilities are needed to accommodate the training of F-35A pilots and personnel. Training would include the use of flare countermeasures and supersonic flight, as permitted in authorized airspace. Training would also include the use of munitions at approved military ranges, and the use of auxiliary airfields to diversify training.

The Air Force evaluated four basing locations in the Draft EIS. Each location is an alternative for the purpose of this EIS.

Alternative locations are: Boise Air Guard Station, Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico, Luke Air Force Base in Arizona, and Tucson International Airport Air Guard Station in Arizona.

The Air Force evaluated the potential environmental impacts of establishing the F-35A Pilot Training Center and Aircraft Training Squadrons at each of these alternative locations. The Air Force analyzed the impacts of basing in increments of 24 aircraft, from 24 to 144 aircraft, depending on the

capacity, at the candidate installation.

Currently, the Air Force's preferred alternative is to base the Pilot Training Center with 72 F-35A training aircraft at Luke Air Force Base. However, no decisions regarding the proposal will be made until after the environmental impact analysis process is complete.

The environmental analysis for Boise was conducted using three aircraft-basing scenarios, one of which includes joint basing with the A-10 aircraft. As part of the analysis, the Air Force assessed basing between 24 and 72 F-35A training aircraft at Boise Air Guard Station, as shown in this aircraft-basing scenario table right here.

If more than 24 F-35A aircraft were selected for Boise Air Guard Station, the 18 -- the 18 A-10 aircraft currently stationed there would move to another installation. Again, this information is provided in the printed materials you received tonight.

F-35A flight training activities at Boise Air Guard Station would take place in extensive -- or, rather, existing military airspace and ranges. No modifications to airspace would be required, and proposed training activities would be consistent with

existing airspace operations.

The Air Force analyzed potential environmental consequences associated with changes in personnel, construction or renovation of facilities, and new training activities in existing military airspace and ranges, and at Mountain Home Air Force Base here in Idaho.

Specific resource category -- or categories evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement are listed here.

Extensive details about the evaluation of each of these resource areas can be found in the Draft EIS and in the summary fact sheet distributed here tonight.

Public comments received during the scoping period conducted in 2010 mainly concentrated on potential noise impacts on the community, so we would like to spend additional time on that topic here.

This is a noise contour map for areas surrounding Boise Air Guard Station for baseline conditions and for each aircraft-basing scenario.

The blue line indicates baseline or current conditions of 18 A-10 aircraft, and these subsequent contours represent the three aircraft-basing scenarios.

The noise contours reflect the 65-decibel day-night average sound level, or DNL, which is a sound level averaged over a 24-hour period with an adjustment for late-night noises.

65-decibel DNL is a threshold above which certain land uses, such as residential, are not considered compatible by the Federal Aviation Administration or the Air Force, without measures to ensure that interior noise level goals are met.

The Air Force analyzed the noise effects associated with training activities on human annoyance and health, physical effects on structures, and biological, land use, socioeconomic, and cultural resources.

Sound levels were analyzed for noise-sensitive locations, which include local schools, hospitals, and places of worship. The methodology used to assess and quantify noise impacts is more thoroughly described in the Draft EIS, and we encourage you to review it in greater detail.

The analysis indicates that under baseline conditions, 142 off-installation individuals are currently affected by noise levels greater than 65-decibel DNL.

Under the various basing scenarios, the

number of off-installation individuals affected by noise levels greater than 65-decibel DNL would increase by approximately 3,000 individuals to 10,000 individuals.

A small percentage of F-35A aircraft operations would occur after 10:00 p.m. As a result, the likelihood of sleep disturbance, averaged -- averaged among the locations studied, would increase by up to 5 percent under the proposed-basing scenarios.

The number of off-installation persons exposed to outdoor noise levels greater than 80-decibels DNL would range from 0 to 313 persons under Scenario B3. Exposure to noise levels above 80-decibels DNL for eight hours per day over 40 years could increase the risk of partial hearing loss.

As shown previously, this is a map of the training airspace and ranges regularly used here at Boise Air Guard Station.

F-35A training operations would increase subsonic noise levels on areas under training airspace. Noise created by aircraft exceeding the speed of sound, or going supersonic, would increase by less than one sonic boom per day under airspace currently approved for supersonic training.

Noise impacts from inert munitions training at the Mountain Home Range Complex and live munitions training at the Utah Testing and Training Range would be similar to existing conditions and are not expected to be significant.

The Air Force would continue to adhere to all existing FAA and local avoidance procedures, flight restrictions, and scheduling adjustments.

The EIS also provides detailed noise analyses for Mountain Home Air Force Base, which would serve as an auxiliary field for training aircraft. The noise content -- contour map shown here reflects the potential noise impacts from F-35A training aircraft on areas surrounding Mountain Home Air Force Base.

Under all training-basing scenarios there would be an increase of five people or fewer in the number of off-installation individuals affected by noise levels greater than 65-decibel DNL.

The NEPA Process.

At this time, the Air Force has completed the first three steps of the NEPA process. We are now in the fourth step, which is providing the Draft EIS for public review and comment.

This phase is an essential part of the NEPA

process, because it allows you, the public, to review the Draft EIS and comment on the Air Force's analysis of potential environmental affects.

We encourage you to provide your input here tonight, or by March 14th, so that it can be considered for incorporation into the Final EIS.

The Air Force is committed to keeping the community informed throughout the NEPA process. In addition to holding these public hearings, the Air Force has established a website to make it easier for you to find and review environmental documents. The Draft EIS is posted on the website, as well as additional information.

You may also review a hard copy of the Draft EIS by visiting online -- or, correction, by visiting one of five public libraries listed in the NEPA handout you received tonight.

Comments on the Draft EIS may be provided orally or in writing here tonight, or by fax, email, or mailing written comments to this address. All of this information is provided on the comment forms and on the project website.

This concludes the briefing part of the hearing. Thank you for your attention and your attendance.

Colonel Harney?

COLONEL HARNEY: Thank you, Mr. Holley.

So we'll now move into the public comment part of the hearing, and I'll explain how that works.

So I will use the speaker signup cards that those of you who want to speak filled out previously, and I will call people up to the microphone. If you'd like to make an oral comment here tonight and you haven't yet filled out one of these cards, just raise your hand right now, and we'll make sure that you get one to fill out.

Now, if we've heard from all of the -- I think we've got everybody. If we've heard from all of the speakers before 8:00 p.m. tonight, then I'll recess the hearing and Ms. Check and I will remain here at the table until eight o'clock to take your statement, if you decide that you would like to say something on the record here this evening.

Basically, the procedure works like this: Each speaker gets three minutes. When I call your name, come on up to the microphone, and Allison, who's the individual that's handing out the cards, she will start the clock when you're ready.

To help the court reporter, Ms. Check, please begin by stating your name and the name of the

organization, if any, that you represent. It will also help her out a lot if you would spell your last name for her. That's to make sure everything in the record is correct. Please don't provide any other personal information, like your home address or phone number.

Again, your comments are recorded verbatim, and they'll be used to develop a transcript and permanent record of this meeting and will be published in the Final EIS.

Your name will be included, along with your comments, and will be in the Final EIS, but your personal home addresses and phone numbers will not be published in the Final EIS.

Now, of course, you don't have to speak for the full three minutes. And to help you keep track of time, Allison will show you a yellow card when you have about 30 seconds left, and a red card -- so now she's showing you the yellow card -- and then a red card when your time is up (laughter).

So when you see the red card, please go ahead and conclude your comments at that point so that I can call on the next person. You don't need to yield any remaining time to someone else. I'll just move on to the next speaker when you're

finished.

Also, because it takes too much time to set up any individual electronic presentations, we won't do that, but those certainly can be submitted as written comments later on.

Now, tonight's hearing is scheduled, as I said before, to end at 8:00 p.m. If everyone who's signed up has had a chance to do so before that time, I'll ask if any speaker would like another three minutes to expand on your comments.

If you want to do that, just let me know, and we'll put another three minutes back on the clock for you. Again, Ms. Check and I will remain here at the table to take your statement if you decide you want to comment after we recess. I know this sounds a little confusing, but it will all work out, you will get to be heard within the time that we have.

If you want to add something later to your oral comments or you would rather not speak here tonight, you can submit written comments, as indicated previously, at any time up to March 14th, 2012. There is no page limit on written comments, and the Air Force gives equal weight to both oral and written comments, and both become part of the official record and are included in the Final EIS.

Okay. Just a few other reminders, and this is -- some of these will be by way of repetition. Please limit your comments to the Draft EIS that is the purpose of the public comment period.

Second, if you agree with the previous speaker on something, you certainly can say that, but you don't need to use up your time repeating what that person's already said, since it's already in the record.

And, finally, as I mentioned earlier, this isn't a question-and-answer session. It's an opportunity for you to put on the record your views and concerns about the proposal that you want the decision-makers to consider.

Questions that you pose during your comments will become part of the record and will be considered, and after we're done with the formal part of this, Air Force representatives will continue to be available afterwards to discuss things with you.

With that, I will call our first speaker. And, basically, what I'm going to do is I will call the first speaker and then the next name after that so you can kind of get ready to wander up here to the microphone.

So the first speaker is Lieutenant Governor

Brad Little, sir. And after that will be Terry Regelin.

3215 BO

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR LITTLE: Thank you, Colonel.

Well, I -- you know, for the public input part, I think that the Draft EIS pointed out the issues that a lot of us in Idaho are concerned about. We're, obviously, very interested in the mission that -- at this facility out here, given the quality of the people that serve out there in our great airspace. It's going to be a great asset for not only Idaho but for the United States, and, in my mind, also world peace.

But I believe that given the results of the EIS -- well, frankly, first off, I believe that the cost structure that might have been pulled into the EIS, knowing what I know about construction costs here in Idaho, look pretty high to me, but I also believe that the option of the third runway, to address what I believe is the most critical -- what I -- we hear about, is the noise issue is something that we need to continue to look at.

DO-54

NO-20

I realize that the F-35 program is a dynamic -- is a much -- a little more dynamic than we all thought it would be originally. And given the

dynamics of the Defense Department, I think we need to continue to work at where we can get efficiencies in it and where we can address concerns of not only the airport but the local communities, given the noise level.

So I think we need to continue to look at this program and -- but for Idaho, those 2500 jobs is very critical. Because everywhere I go in the Treasure Valley, one of the critical concerns of people are the jobs and the high-quality jobs.

So I agreed with most of the things in the EIS, but I did question the cost structure. And I also believe that there's a little more work that can be done to address the noise concerns of the community.

DO-53

NO-20

So thank you very much. Thank you, Colonel.

COLONEL HARNEY: Terry -- and I apologize if I don't get your name correct. Terry Regelin, followed by Harry Mitchell.

3216 BO

MR. REGELIN: Yes. I, basically -- I've lived here in the Valley a long time, and when I hear these jets and stuff training and the people training and stuff -- I'm a veteran, and without them making noise, I feel I'm losing my freedom.

And it's real plain and simple, I can live

with a lot of noise for these people giving me my freedom to live the way that I do today. I look at the pros and cons of it, and, yes, there is some noise, but we hear jets taking off on a daily basis over this area right here -- every day clear up until 12:30 at night. It's not a constant noise that they're doing.

So to weigh the difference between the pros and the cons, like Brad said, 2500 jobs, the boost of the economy. I don't know of anybody -- I don't, in this room -- that can drop $26 million worth of revenue into our economy. So I don't see anything against it, you know. It's all to our benefit. And the biggest thing of it is, as long as I hear that noise, I know I'm free. GE-3

COLONEL HARNEY: Harry Mitchell. And I would just also like to remind the speakers that as you come up, in order to help the court reporter, if you would say your name and then spell your name.

After Mr. Mitchell we have Monty, I think it's Mericle.

3217 BO

MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. My name is Harry Mitchell, M-I-T-C-H-E-L-L. I'm also a Vietnam vet. I also have a little bit of a hearing problem; some of it caused by a lot of loud noise. I live

southeast of here -- or southwest, rather.

I hear the A-10s coming over all of the time. Those A-10s are like a Volkswagen Bug going by compared to what these A-35s [sic] are. We need to be very concerned about the impact of the noise on our community and the flight paths and the altitudes that these jets will train, not only daytime flights, but nighttime flights.

And I know we've got to get our boys trained. I have a nephew that's 18 years Air Force that's over in Afghanistan right now that keeps these birds in the air. It has nothing to do with hearing about your freedom; it has everything to do with your quality of life.

I love the military, I respect the service you've given to our country, but I want to make doggone sure, that in the community that we live in, that our quality of life is held to a higher standard than in other areas. NO-36

I don't know why these facilities couldn't be done down in Mountain Home. There's a nice Air Force base down there. It's only 40 miles south of here. I understand the issue with having to build housing to accommodate the number of people that will come in for the training, but that's something that GE-12

should be factored into the cost of doing these training facilities. **GE-12 cont'd**

I just think that there's a lot more that needs to be put out to the public about the noise impact, the flight patterns of these aircraft, and that the safety of the community while these young men are training to defend our country is taken into consideration. Not only their safety, but our safety here on the ground as well. **NO-4** **SA-7**

Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Thank you very much, sir.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Monty --

MR. MERICLE: Mericle. **3218 BO**

COLONEL HARNEY: -- Mericle followed by Charles Thomas.

MR. MERICLE: Monty Mericle, M-E-R-I-C-L-E. I'm a spokesperson for Saveourvalleynow.org, and I'm going to read this because I only have three minutes. I have a lot of information to try to get across, so let's start.

The Draft F-35A Environmental Impact Statement for the Boise, Luke, Tucson, Holloman Air Force Base Training sites is seriously flawed with errors and omissions and cannot be used as the basis **NP-13**

for the Final EIS or the NEPA record of decision. There are too many serious deficiencies that must be addressed first as outlined in the list that follows. **NP-13 cont'd**

I'm requesting an indefinite stoppage or postponement of the --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can you slow down?

MR. MERICLE: I've only got three minutes (laughter). I'll submit it in writing, but I want it on the record -- until the deficiency of the Draft EIS are corrected. **NP-13**

Number One. There are no definitive dB loudness boundary maps, studies, or numbers clearly and consistently published for the F-35. The F-35 is eight times as loud as the A-10s, by the way. As the off-site loudness has been shown to cause hearing damage, it's essential that the area maps show dB magnitudes at all sensitive areas. L max, not L average. These measures or estimates already exist since they're required to develop the DNL measures in the EIS which was listed for all sensitive locations. **NO-5**

Item Two. Over 10,000 residents will find their homes as -- reclassified as not suitable for residential use if the F-35s are brought in. This will result in tens of millions of dollars of lost **SO-1**

property value. It's essential that a full house-by-house appraisal and valuation be done. SO-1 cont'd, SO-2

Item Three. Over 1,000 residents will be exposed to very high noise levels due to the unusually close proximity of residential houses to the runway. 1,400 afterburner takeoffs will occur annually. It's in the EIS. It is essential that a full noise study be done of the afterburner noise situations, not full military power. NO-38

Item Four. 4 schools and 13 daycare centers will be in very high DNL and noise magnitude areas. What mitigations will be done to avoid deteriorating learning levels, which is a proven result of high noise levels. This must be studied in depth. EJ-1

The World -- Item Five. The World Health Organization states that a DNA level of 50 and above can cause health and mental problems. It's essential that the EIS include value maps for 50 DNL, 55 DNL, and 60 DNL. Just because they aren't on the map doesn't mean they don't exist. NO-5

Item Six. Several thousand residents will be exposed to DNL and magnitudes above the 65 multi DNL boundary maps --

MS. TURNER: Sir, you have to slow down or she's not going to be able to capture it.

MR. MERICLE: I'll submit this, and she can --

MS. TURNER: But she doesn't see that.

COURT REPORTER: You still have to --

MR. MERICLE: Okay. Are you going to stop me, then, if I slow down?

MS. TURNER: Sir, you need to slow down or it won't be captured.

MR. MERICLE: Okay. Item Six. Several thousand residents will be exposed to DNL at magnitudes above 60 to 65 DNL. Multi DNL boundary maps and studies are needed for 70 DNL, 75 DNL, 80 DNL, 85 DNL, and greater than 85 DNL. And what mitigation will be used to avoid the severe health, mental, and financial impacts in those areas? NO-4, NO-6

Item Seven. In order for individual homeowners to understand their options, a residence-by-residence list of all properties and any and all avigation easements and legal incumbrances imposed by the city, the state, and the county that incumber each property is required. SO-2

Item Eight is present clarification of the "No Action Alternative." This -- we think this means all four locations will continue to be candidates for basing. They'll be pre-scoped, pre-stockpiled, and DO-1, DO-2

activated as they're needed. We'd like clarification on that. **DO-2 cont'd**

Item Nine is the EIS states that the F-35s in Boise will contribute over 250 tons of additional carbon monoxide to the area around Boise. This is 250 percent more than allowed by the EPA rules. The Air Force mitigation is to request an exemption. **AQ-3**

This doesn't mean that the CO -- carbon monoxide isn't going to be there. Analysis of the health impacts on residents, especially children, is required, as are financial impacts of Boise becoming EPA noncompliant on air quality standards.

Item 10. What are the next steps in the bed down process for the Final EIS? Will actions be **NP-1**

taken to reconcile the airspace and land use conflicts that are identified by the EIS due to bringing F-35s in? **LU-1**

Will joint land use studies be authorized? Will zoning ordinances in conflicted areas be enforced? Will rezoning occur? Will a program be **SO-3**

initiated to move residents out of the various zones?

And the last one: Is the Air Force -- will the Air Force bring several F-35s to Boise to conduct a typical training routine of 50 sorties, five **GE-2**

takeoffs under full afterburner, and five takeoffs

and landings at night, measure the loudness and let the residents of Boise valley hear the future for themselves (applause). If the Air Force is unwilling to do this, please list the reasons why. **GE-2 cont'd**

MS. TURNER: What's the last part?

COURT REPORTER: "If the Air Force isn't willing to do this."

MR. MERICLE: Oh, if the Air Force is unwilling to do this, please list the reasons why.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Charles Thomas followed by Greg Gempler. **3219 BO**

MR. CHARLES THOMAS: Which Charles Thomas? We've got two Charles Thomases.

COLONEL HARNEY: Charles E. Charles E.

MR. CHARLES THOMAS: Charles E? Thank you (laughter).

COLONEL HARNEY: What are the odds of that?

MR. CHARLES THOMAS: I would first like to thank the Air Force for everything they do for our country, for their -- first of all, for the country. But I have to question their baseline conditions that were brought forth by this gentleman. And where did they get this information? **DO-55**

I saw the map, and, you know, I disagree

with it. I live on Cloverdale and Franklin, and when an F-15, -14, or -16 takes off, punches in the afterburners, I can't hear my TV, it rattles my windows. And you say the decibels are similar to an A-10. No, sir, they are absolutely not. **DO-55 cont'd**

Thank you for all of this information. It's wonderful information on the F-35. $26 million for the immediate community, that's -- that's wonderful news, but as stated by this individual, it is either an Air Force or National Guard installation that the F-35s are going to come to.

We have -- I'm a pilot. You're seven minutes from Mountain Home Air Force Base. Why do we need the F-35 here in the most populous area in Idaho? We have one of the most premier living conditions, as far as I'm concerned, in the United States. We do not need it impeded with this noise.

Has anyone heard an F-35? They -- ah, right over there. They are so loud that if you think Kuna is going to be not impacted by this, then you're sadly mistaken. And that's why I really have a problem with the studies that have been done on the noise levels and the decibels that this entire community is going to be exposed to. **NO-37**

And, like I say, thank God for the Air

Force. Every time there's a good air strike, I go, yeah, you know. I'm a veteran. I'm a Vietnam veteran, and I appreciate what the Air Force has done, but we do not need it in the middle of this community. **GE-1**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Greg Gempler followed by Bob Gruenhage, G-R-U-E-N-H-A-G-E. **3220 BO**

MR. GEMPLER: Hi. My name is Greg Gempler. The last name is G-E-M-P-L-E-R. And how in the world does she do that?

But, anyway, I'm an Air Force veteran as well. I was born and raised on Air Force bases. I moved here to Boise when my dad retired from the Air Force, and have lived out in southwest Boise here off of Cole -- Cole and Desert.

I've been out here for -- since 1974, and so I've seen all of this growth in the Valley and that kind of thing. And I tell you, I'm excited about the F-35 coming to Boise. If it does, I'll be very excited by it (applause). **GE-3**

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

MR. GEMPLER: I live in the flight pattern, if you will. I live -- we just sold our house out

here. We're waiting to close on another one just off of Cloverdale and Lake Hazel, and so I'm pretty intimate with it.

I've lived on bases that have flown everything from B-52s to F-15s. I've worked on F-15s for years. I worked on F-4s out at the Guard here, and I'm pretty intimate with the living conditions on the base underneath that. And so I've got to thank you guys for living in such substandard conditions. You know, how the -- see, I remind myself that --

COLONEL HARNEY: Just slow down, please.

MR. GEMPLER: Oh, I remind myself that these people that come to work on these aircraft are going to be our neighbors, and they're going to be dialed into their little kids sleeping; and, frankly, I'd change these 72 jets or whatever if they can just keep the dog next door to me shut up.

You know, so I'm not concerned about the noise levels. I understand that they're loud. I've worked around F-15s my -- for a decade or better. And, you know, I understand that they're louder than an F-15.

I also understand that they're not as loud as an F-18 that we have come through here quite frequently. And I will turn -- turn the mirror to

NO-9

the F-18s that come through here all of the time. And so I don't think that it's something that's going to seriously impact us.

NO-9 cont'd

You know, I'm encouraged by the economic impact. I'm encouraged by the -- we've all seen our housing values decrease dramatically, as they have across the nation. Here is an opportunity to have an economic impact on Boise that we can't duplicate.

I'd hate to think about Micron leaving. And we get worried every time they lay somebody off, but here we have an opportunity to add something that's Micron and bigger. And that's just the direct jobs, let alone all of the ancillary jobs that become part of that economic growth when you add 2500 jobs, and all of that support that comes with that, and all of the economy that's -- that's also -- that's also going to become ancillary that supports the base, not alone -- not just the actual jobs that would come onto the base.

And so I'd encourage you to keep an open mind about the F-35 and the installation that could become part of our community, and encourage those people to come. I think it will be a great thing for us.

GE-3

And I honestly -- yeah, they're going to be

loud airplanes. Airplanes are loud. They're part of our lives. I've lived underneath them over here for 30-odd -- 38 years now. And -- I'm starting to get older -- and I think it's a welcome enhancement to our neighborhoods.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Come on up, sir.

Just a couple of things -- and it's kind of flexible as we go along -- what she does is kind of amazing, but for her to get everything down, we need to make sure that you're speaking so that she can do that. So if you'd just slow down just a touch.

And then the other note that was passed to me is: "Can you please have everyone speak closer to the microphone so all can hear?" So please speak closer to the microphone so everybody can hear.

With that, Bob go ahead. And after Bob will be Roy Bade.

MR. GRUENHAGE: I'm Bob Gruenhage. I'm just a resident. This is not the same Boise now as in World War II. The population then was 35,000, and now we're over 200,000, with a metro area of 500,000, and they plan to expand.

3221 BO

DO-19

It's generally not the amount of planes that are here, it's the amount of times they take off and land and are in the air. And there's a big difference between flying once a year and 30 times a day in the noise level that, in fact -- that effects people. And, also, there's not just one plane taking off. Sometimes they go into groups and also fly outside the contours that are shown in the map.

NO-39

NO-69

And, also, there's a safety issue. There's a Marine Corps air station, Miramar, in San Diego, that, in as recently as December 200 -- December 8th, 2008, four people were killed and two homes were destroyed and three homes were damaged with an F/A-18D. That was two miles from the air station.

SA-1

And there on August 12th, 1968, at the same air station, there was another crash that didn't kill anybody, but the population wasn't as high then. But they say if it hit now, it would have been dangerous. And besides those, there were other accidents there that didn't affect people.

The F-35 initiative is a federal program, so the economic benefits should be -- shouldn't have any effect, because it takes the same amount of people to run the facility as anybody, and -- and the -- so the job -- long-term-job creation should be the same, but

SO-13

the locations should make the big difference. **SO-13 cont'd**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: The next speaker would be Roy B-A-D-E --

MR. BADE: Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: -- followed by Renate, R-E-N-A-T-E, Huebner. **3222 BO**

MR. BADE: My name is Roy Bade. I'm also a Vietnam veteran. I want to thank you folks that are still in the armed forces for what you do. I really appreciate it.

As far as the aircraft goes, I don't know that much about the F-35, other than the statistics are pretty impressive. Considering the situation around the world today, I'd like to see that we have the best aircraft and the best trained men possible.

Short and sweet, personally I would welcome F-35s here. I like the idea of compatibility with the Mountain Home Air Force Base. If we have 24 craft here and the balance at Mountain Home, I think that would be just a superb combination. It would keep some of the issues as far as noise down. Instead of having multiple aircraft here you'd be limited to the 24. **GE-3**

And just, plain and simple, the bottomline is I look out for the guys that are flying for us to protect us, and I think it just would be -- enhance us to have a portion here and the balance at Mountain Home Air Force Base. And that's it.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: After our next speaker will be Kevin Cahill.

Come on up, ma'am.

MS. HUEBNER: Hello. My name is Renate Huebner, H-U-E-B-N-E-R. **3223 BO**

I live about two miles from here, and I am impacted by airplane noise. And with all due respect to the military personnel -- I thank you for what you're doing in your mission -- but the F-35 has no place in Boise.

It is too close to the airport, too close to the taking off and landing. And to hear these aircrafts flying over my house, it is unbelievably noisy. And I would hope that the Air Force would please consider a different location for the F-35. **GE-1**

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Thank you for your

comments, ma'am.

Kevin Cahill. And after Mr. Cahill will be Chuck Thomas (laughter).

3224 BO

MR. CAHILL: Hi. My name is Kevin E. Cahill, C-A-H-I-L-L. I have a bachelor's degree in math and economics from Rutgers College, with honors. I have a master's degree in economics from Boston College. And I have a Ph.D. in economics from Boston College.

I live in Boise. I've been here for two years now. And some citizens of Boise asked me if I could review this document as it pertains to socioeconomic impact. And so I did.

Before I make my comments, I just want to say that I have nothing but the most respect for the military and for people who serve in the military. But this report -- if this were my work, and I were to present this at an academic conference, I would be laughed out of the room, and I'd probably lose my job (applause). It's awful.

So what exists in the report is fundamentally flawed. And I'll just give one example. A lot of -- one of the claim s is the number of jobs that will be brought -- be brought to Boise. And that is not an analysis. It's an

SO-13

assumption.

The Air Force assumes that 2,000 people will be hired. They do some silly analysis to do some residual employment, and they say the magic number is 2500. The reason it's fundamentally flawed is there is no analysis of negative impact. It's all just jobs being hired by the Air Force, but, obviously, the economy is going to be impacted negatively in some way.

SO-13 con't

So the -- the Air Force is not providing a net impact number. They're just providing a positive, which is silly. Again, I could never get away with that (laughter).

The other statistic that's being floated is the number of people impacted. And the Air Force claims that there's only going to be 10,000 people impacted, but that assumes that anyone subjected to noise lower than 65 dB DNLs has no impact.

So if someone is subjected to 65 dB DNLs, they're counted in their analysis, but if you've got to be subjected to 64.9, it's 0. So, you know, that's where they get the 10,000 number. That's not the number of people impacted. That's just the number of people subjected to the 65 number that they're using as their cutoff.

NO-2

Any economist would consider a gradual impact of noise, not this zero-one cutoff. And then the biggest flaw -- and I'll try to do this in 30 seconds -- is what's not shown in the report, not what is in the report.

NO-2 cont'd

There's no impact on quality of life, and economists routinely assess quality of life by asking people. You go to places where this noise exists, and you ask people what it's like, and that's how you get assessments of quality of life. And there's nothing like this in this report.

There's also no real-world analysis pre/post using existing data by the Bureau of Labor Statistics or the U.S. Census. There is nothing in this report. And, again, no serious economist could get away with a report that's missing those two things.

SO-23

That's my comment. I would like to say that I wrote an expert report in this matter, and it's available at Saveourvalleynow.org. Anyone can read it. It's posted.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: So Mr. Chuck Thomas --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go Chuck (laughter).

COLONEL HARNEY: -- followed by -- followed by Peter Jenny.

(Everyone talking.)

3225 BO

MR. CHUCK THOMAS: My name is Chuck Thomas. I'm a board member of the (inaudible) --

MS. TURNER: Hang on so she can hear you. Thank you.

MR. CHUCK THOMAS: T-H-O-M-A-S. I'm one of the folks that went through the last hearing process where we completely debunked all of the facts and figures that we were presented with, most of which were -- we were told they had no idea what the noise levels were.

We took a lot of time -- Monty Mericle, myself, and others -- to find out what the levels were. You can go on the internet, you can find them out yourself. Rest assured, the only way we can address -- these figures we're given now are deceptive, deception.

This is a bad deal for this community. I'm a has-been pilot. I love aircraft, airplanes, anything to do with them, but I know where I live, off of Overland and Maple Grove here, my home would be rendered as unlivable. And in past cases, people have gotten as much as $14,000 in compensation for the loss of their home (laughter).

In dealing with the government over the last

30 years, in trying to impose some ethics reform, there's not much room for politicians and ethics in the same room (laughter). It's like -- they're like diapers, you need to change them often.

In regards to this, if this thing is shoved down our throat without any due recourse, like Monty's not allowed to show his noise impact chart, which is legitimate, unlike the ones we've been given -- this is a railroad job, not the kind of thing you should expect in this country -- I can make one sincere promise. If you trash thousands of people's homes in this valley, I can promise you a major class-action lawsuit will go after all of the political cronies and the lobbyists who brought this operation back here to Boise. That's a promise. We will have no other recourse. **GE-14**

I love the military. I love what they're doing. I'm one of the most patriotic people you'll ever meet, but wrong is wrong and right is right, and what's going on here tonight is wrong. I grew up in Holloman Air Force Base -- next to it in Alamogordo.

Now, there is the location. It's 14, 15 miles -- yeah, 30 seconds -- 14, 15 miles from the air base. It's right next to White Sands Missile Range, and just a skip from Fort Bliss and the **GE-1**

missile range out there. There is where it belongs. Those are the people that want this operation. **GE-1 cont'd**

Don't listen to your political cronies around here and the lobbyists with the construction/real estate industry that are sucking them in here. Do what you know is right.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. JENNY: Good evening. My name is Peter Jenny, J-E-N-N-Y. I'm president and CEO of a conservation group called The Peregrine Fund and The World Center for Birds of Prey. We're located 3.6 statute miles directly south of the airport. **3226 BO**

At this facility we raise endangered and threatened birds of prey from around the world. Most notably, we currently maintain one-third of the world's population of California Condors, a critically endangered species. The Condor and other endangered species we're working with are extremely sensitive to noise and visual disturbance, so we are, justifiably, very concerned about this proposed activity. **BI-19**

However, having said that, current civil and military aviation activities have not, to this point, negatively impacted our facility. What we're really

concerned about -- and this is a huge unknown for me -- is how much more impact this will represent. And reading the EIS I was not clear on the differential there. **BI-19 cont'd**

So I just want to go on record as saying that we're certainly concerned, and we would appreciate your sensitivity to this concern that we have.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: So our next speaker will be Stephen Purdy, followed by Diane Roberts. **3227 BO**

MR. PURDY: P-U-R-D-Y.

Steve is my name. I'm a 25-year firefighter who's retired. I spent my last nine years at the airport as a crash fire rescue captain. My hat's off to every active military and all of the past vets that have done this great service.

I think the question here is: Do we want Boise to be an airport town? Do we want to change our name to Mountain Home, say? The quality of life will suffer. The bureaucrats that we're dealing with -- and I was a bureaucrat -- will tend to want to prove their point. Not that they've cheated or skewed the number s, but I think there's some **NO-36**

evidence that I heard tonight that they've done that.

The jobs are estimate only. 2188 to 2635, estimate only it said. 10 million to 26 million increase. But, you know, I think after we've made this an airport town, we have F-35s taking on and off, I don't think we're going to read an article in MONEY Magazine or Businessweek that's increased and gave us a higher rating of a livable city, where we're going to draw in larger businesses over a period of time and establish -- we're already attracting people because we are rated so high for the quality of life. I think you're going to find, when you're having the noise levels that will come with this, guaranteed, that will change. **SO-18**

Where they're doing all of these studies with the dBs -- I measured the dB when we were all talking. It was 20. If you look at the way dBs work, when you get up to around 60, it's thousands -- I don't know the exact numbers, but it's much louder than just what -- when we were trying to talk back and forth.

The F-15s last summer were the example that -- that's all the example we need. They were too loud. Sitting in the house talking on the telephone when they take off, I was torn between **NO-8**

trying to figure my phone -- or finish my phone conversation or run out and look at them, because I love aircraft. But that's not the point. **NO-8 cont'd**

Let's see. Is the location suitable? It's not. I mean, there's no -- you know, you can do all of the studies you want, try to convince us with smoke and mirrors; this is not the place to put this. **GE-4**

Safety and training -- I've got 30 seconds. Training is the most likely for an incident, single engine increases that. I don't know what the glide ratio on a single engine jet is, but it's not very far. And -- huh? **SA-1**

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It will fall like a rock.

MR. PURDY: Yeah, fall like a rock. So the sound of freedom, the sound of safety -- when we build a fire station -- everybody loves us until we build a fire station in your block (laughter); then they don't like us so much. So if you want the sound of freedom and the sound of safety, we'll run our fire truck up and down your street. You'll love it (laughter).

(Applause.)

3228 BO

MS. ROBERTS: My name is Diane Roberts, R-O-B-E-R-T-S. I live in a place where every morning **NO-8 NO-36**

I can tell when the planes start firing up, and the first ones take off, and this is at 7:00 in the morning, and it's not pleasant, but it's an interesting way to wake up. **NO-8 NO-36 cont'd**

But I don't want to wake up to F-35s getting their groove on (laughter), so to speak, every morning, and the jet pilots that are flying them getting their groove on. I don't want to hear that. The quality of life in Boise is why I live here.

I grew up in Idaho. I grew up in Heyburn. I've been lied to before by the government about various things, like Big Mike, nuclear testing, Nevada desert, any of those things, INEL. I've lived here and heard it and been on the deserts and been in the mountains and been camping at night when the stars were up there. I love Idaho. I do not want it.

And this place -- they talk about the jobs that are coming. How many people are going to move away because of the sound? This is a contained valley. The mountains -- it will ring off of the mountains, all of that, so I hear it. And not only that, but the whole valley will be affected by this. **SO-1**

As an Idahoan, born and bred in Burley, Heyburn, farm girl, taking potatoes out, I want a **NO-36**

good quality for us, and it does not include F-35s going off with a bunch of jocks gunning them. I drove a '56 Chevy, and I know the temptation (laughter). NO-36 cont'd

So thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Thank you for your comments, ma'am.

The next speaker is Dan Buerstetta, B-U-E-R-S-T-E-T-T-A, followed by Bernard Schur.

MR. BUERSTETTA: My name is Dan Buerstetta, B-U-E-R-S-T-E-T-T-A. I'm an ex-airborne paratrooper. I've jumped out of more planes than most of you would think would be sane, and flown in almost all of the other kind of aircraft, save for a jet. And, guys, give me the call, and I'll be there in the cockpit with you. 3229 BO

I have hearing loss as a result of being in the military. I don't like loud noises. I think this aircraft will be problematic for even people who don't have hearing issues, to begin with. NO-6

You know there's an issue when the parameters for discussing this are expressed in percentages of people that will be woken up from a dead sleep with their windows closed, numbers like NO-3

16 percent and 33 percent. NO-3 cont'd

I want to just step back and say, isn't that the end of the discussion? Where does common sense prevail? I mean, this is so highly inappropriate for this community it's to the point of absurd. If this were the only place in the world, or in America, that we could accomplish this mission, we could rethink it.

We could all move out of Boise and let them do it here, but I think there are more feasible alternatives that make more sense where we can get the job done and not negatively impact so many people. GE-1

For every three people that get a job, ten people in -- for the gentleman with a Ph.D., perhaps, it's a small multiple -- will be inconvenienced by it. I think it's a false economy to say we're going to make a lot of money on these incoming jobs.

I live in a neighborhood of very expensive homes. Those homes are going to diminish dramatically. Tax revenues will plummet. SO-1

Good companies that have come to cities for quality of life -- and that's a high consideration for good companies. It's got to be a neat place to live, because these are highly educated people, and they're SO-18

not going to move to a place that's super noisy. So that's another negative impact on this formula for valuing the presence of this program in this town. **SO-18 cont'd**

I kind of question whether when wildlife comes to a screaming halt, per the statistics, look up, go into an alarm mode, that ultimately they become habituated to this kind of alarming noise presence, even though that's what this study contends. I don't think anybody can learn to tune out a sonic boom. I wish I could, maybe I wouldn't be up here talking. **BI-5**

The sheer numbers that they're proposing, 24 aircraft minimum F-35s up to 72 with multiple sorties day and night. The impact to businesses, nurseries, elementary schools, high schools. The stress factor involved, I don't think, has been given enough credence here. You do not continue to function as a healthy human being or as a society when you're constantly being intermittently stressed. **NO-6**

I would encourage everyone to tell as many people as they can about this. So many people in my neighborhood are not aware of it. Use whatever means possible to communicate. Write the newspaper. What's the -- I say young people -- but the email, Facebook, get the word out. I think when people know

the facts, they'll all be in line to stand up here and speak against this.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Bernard Schur, S-C-H-U-R.

MR. SCHUR: Schur. **3230 BO**

COLONEL HARNEY: Schur.

MR. SCHUR: Like S-U-R-E.

I'm Bernard Schur, S-C-H-U-R. I'm also a Vietnam vet. It took me two years to get over hearing helicopters land; I don't know how long it's going to take me to get over F-35s.

I'm concerned about one element that was not contained in this report and nobody yet has addressed it, the 10,000 kids between birth and 18 years old going to be subjected to decibels, not at 65, but at 100 and 125, and even more for afterburners. **EJ-10**

I'm concerned about the people who have been left out of this, the people in Kuna, and especially for Meridian. I came here to represent the young children and the people of Meridian. **DO-38**

Meridian will not get any money out of this, Meridian will not get any jobs, but it sure as heck is going to get an awful lot of noise, sonic booms, and a lot of nervous sleeping.

Now, there's not one person in here who hasn't woken up ill and had a bad day at work because they were feeling rotten. How are you going to feel with a 110-decibel night when you get up to go to work and your kids get up to go to school, and they're all sick? **NO-3**

Now, from Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday last week, when they were landing those planes, my little girl, who's five, said, "Daddy, is there a storm coming in? I can hear the thunder." And all of those three nights she did not get a good night's sleep, and she had to go to her preschool, and she was fidgety.

How many of your children and grandchildren are going to be fidgety? And who's going to pay for the hearing aids; not the government. Who's going to pay for the Paxil for the parents to relax; not the government (laughter). That's where the economy is going to boom, at the drugstore (laughter), and that's not what we need.

This is not the climate, this is not the valley, this is not the place for F-35s. God bless the military. Most of us here served in it, and we appreciate it. And this is a fantastic plane. I love this plane. I like the triumph series that it **GE-4**

represents, three different services getting one fantastic plane, but not here. Not here. And that's what we have to tell the military. **GE-4 cont'd**

And I think the fact that we are willing to file a class-action suit against the Air Force, and against Mayor Bieter, and against the city council (applause) is the number one thing we have to tell them. We will be before a federal judge and let him decide whether or not this is a valid impact statement. **GE-14**

And, besides, military people, you don't want to live here, because you can't drive those planes like a '65 Chevy. You're going to have to tone them down, and that's very frustrating to a pilot; I know, I've got some relatives. Hot gunning is in.

And how are you going to stop coming over Meridian? And Meridian has been left out of this. I want Meridian in the impact statement, and I want them to appear at these hearings. **DO-38**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker will be Skip Nakashima, followed by Richard Kaylor.

3231 BO

MR. NAKASHIMA: Thank you.

N-A-K-A-S-H-I-M-A.

Thank you for coming. I want to start out saying that I really support the F-35 program. The only question I have is the C model for the Navy. I don't know why they can't get by with a B model also. And I can understand the need for the difference between the A and the B. **GE-3** **GE-13**

A couple of things to address on this EIS, though. One -- and Lieutenant Governor Little alluded to that -- and they're talking about a southern runway. That southern runway is located -- or will be located south of Gowen Road and run parallel to the existing strip.

The noise impact or footprint that they have discussed and put out in the EIS does not show where that runway is going to be. That puts -- that broadens the footprint for the noise level and the safety level. **DO-35**

We've kind of all heard about the noise level thing tonight, so I don't want to beat on that, except that I agree with it. And I've heard that the noise level is four times that of the F-15, so that will give you an idea there. But I agree they should bring the F-35 in and let us see what it's like. **NO-1** **GE-2**

That idea of running the code around the

people who want the noise of the sound of safety, well, that sounds like a good idea to me. Let a code run go by 50 times a day around these people and see if they like it.

The main concern I have, in addition to the noise, since I live in the noise area, but has not been addressed in the EIS -- I don't think it's been adequately addressed -- is the safety level. I just noticed in the paper today there was a letter to the editor, and it said -- it talked about the schools involved, but it also talks about the daycare facilities involved.

But I wanted to mention and point out one of the things that they don't address, the safety level. And one of the other gentlemen here was talking about we could "what if" the situation to death, and I agree. You can what if it to death.

But we have -- on the departure, the west departure and approach end of the strip of the airport, we have Maple Grove Elementary School, we have West Junior High School, we have Dehryl Dennis educational school, we have Silver Sage School, and all of these people in close proximity. **SA-1**

We've had military aircraft crash already, and all of these things are within there. And I

said, if this goes down, this is a new plane and a new training area training new pilots, if one of those planes goes down and takes out an elementary school like Maple Grove, what's that worth? That's all I have to say. **SA-1 cont'd**

This is the most populated area in the state, and one of the things that they don't discuss as an alternate, that I would have a question to -- number one, Mountain Home would be very good. The other one is Fallon Naval Air Station. They're now having joint military bases, why don't they put it there? The rangers and the MOAs are all within range of it, just as well as Boise. **GE-1**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. KAYLOR: My name is Richard Kaylor, K-A-Y-L-O-R. **3232 BO**

I'm an Army brat. I was born in the Panama Canal. My dad graduated from West Point, and he retired after 30 years. Looking at the Environmental Impact Statement here, it's a little deceptive, because it does not show these 65-decibel-day-night-level ranges. **NO-4**

I've read the 80-page executive summary at home, and it had three basic scenarios, with the **DO-9**

largest up to 72 F-35As. However, looking at the handout today, it says, quote, "basing 24 or 48 training aircraft" -- which were the lower two scenarios -- "would not be cost effective." **DO-9 cont'd**

If this is true, why do you include these lower statements -- basing scenarios, other than to lead people to believe that there's some scenarios that are not as bad.

What is even more scary is you look in the handout, and it says, quote, "deliveries could possibly reach up to a total of 144 aircraft." So that kind of doubles the problem. **NO-11**

It's scary that 9,977 residents would be affected by noise levels greater than 65 decibels day-night average, and that is defined as not suitable for residential use. So even though we're talking about this money coming in; what about all of the property values that are going down? **SO-1**

Also, 313 people risk hearing loss. We need to have a map of the avigation easement. An avigation easement, which now currently is east of Maple Grove Road, says that you have no legal recourse for airplane noise if you live in an avigation easement. **SO-2 SO-10**

It says you can expect particles to come **SA-9**

down over your home, also little droplets of fuel, and that also it allows unlimited access to your property. People can come on who are associated with the aircraft at any time, and you have no right. SA-9 cont'd LU-9

The Environmental Impact Statement says, "If it's too noisy outside because of the aircraft, go inside." It says, "If it's too noisy inside your house, go to the other side of your house." NO-56

Go -- there's a great website, we heard about it earlier. Saveourvalley.org has the map of the noise level and also has a lot of information.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker will be Michael H. DeJulis.

MR. DeJULIS: I don't need to. Everything I was going to say has been said. 3233 BO

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay, sir.

MR. DeJULIS: Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: How about Wendy F-U-R-T-O-D-E [sic], and after Wendy will be Joe and Casey Borman.

MS. FURTADO: It's Wendy F-U-R-T-A-D-O, Furtado. This will impact our owls, who very richly dwell in these areas, keeping rodents, particular ly 3234 BO BI-5

mice, at bay. They help the ranchers and farmers.

Each owl eats approximately two mice per night. They're extremely fragile, requiring quiet. These beautiful birds are so fragile that they will not move, they will literally drop dead. BI-5 cont'd

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Joe and Casey Borman, and following them will be Adam Frickey.

MR. BORMAN: Good evening. I'm Joe Borman. 3235 BO This is my special needs son, Casey Borman. We live about a half mile directly west of here, and, as you can see, Casey is not quite a normal child. He's 26 going on 2, basically.

And as we witnessed --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You have to talk in the mic. NO-58

MR. BORMAN: -- as we witnessed a year and a half ago when the jets were here from Portland, I can only cover one set of ears at a time when we're outside, and Casey is not intelligent enough to cover his own ears, so consequently -- and, you know, we will no longer be able to have our windows open at night or during the day. NO-36

MS. TURNER: Come closer to the mic.

MR. BORMAN: Closer to the mic.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Turn it back down. I think when you did that, it kind of shorted it out. Pull it down towards you. There you go. Maybe not.

MR. BORMAN: It seems like the closer I get the worse it gets.

At any rate, we will, basically, need to sell our house, and I'm anticipating that we will probably get half the value or less for our house. And, you know, I will not stay in a situation where we have, you know, jets potentially, you know -- several times more jets than what we had a year and a half ago flying over our house. SO-1

Now, we're not inside the area that's supposedly affected by this, but we will be affected by it. And it's part of my responsibilities, because I have a certified family home that I will no longer be able to keep my son in such a situation. And so, I mean, it will have a direct economic impact on our family.

And, you know, my hat goes off to the military. You know, you people are the finest people I know, bar none. I mean, the people who sat us back there, you know, realized that we have a unique situation, got chairs for us, and et cetera. My hat goes off to all of you.

But there are certain people -- and the previous gentleman mentioned that the children in this area will not be able to save themselves, so, basically, we're going to be cutting off our own head to save ourselves.

At any rate, thank you very much. And, please, if you have any say over this, you know, help the people that live in this area of town. It will be unsuitable for living. SO-1

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FRICKEY: Hello my name is -- everyone hear me all right? Good. 3236 BO

My name is Adam Frickey, F-R-I-C-K-E-Y. I'm also a vet. I was with the 3rd Battalion, 7th Marines, India Company. I've been to Iraq and Afghanistan. Go -- oh, sorry. Slow down. I'm fast.

I was -- I've been everything from machine gunner to an infantry squad leader. And, you know, I've been exposed to a lot of loud noises, too. I live right off of Vista and Federal Way, so right next to the airport.

And I tell you -- slow down. Sorry -- I've heard a lot of figures tonight. I've heard a lot of things about noise decibel levels. I've heard a lot

of things about how much money this will bring to the Valley. And I don't know, I don't put much stock in either of them.

I think that they're both rather -- I think they both suit the needs of either case. But I tell you what, if we don't have the F-35 here, the Valley's going to be losing money. I think the F-35 is a good program. And these jets aren't flying circles around neighborhoods. They're getting up and out, and they're coming back. I guess that's pretty much all I wanted to say. Yeah, I guess so (laughter). **GE-3**

Thanks.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay. So as I mentioned before, the hearing was scheduled to end at eight o'clock, but we've -- and we've heard from everyone who's signed up to speak, but we still have some time left, about 20, 25 minutes or so.

So is there anyone who's already -- is there anyone who's already spoken that would like another three minutes?

Mr. Mericle, come on up.

And then is there anyone after Mr. Mericle who would like three more minutes?

Mr. Cahill.

3218 BO

MR. MERICLE: I'll try to speak a little bit slower this time. There's been a lot of information and misinformation about noise, about dB level, and it's not rocket science. This is a dB meter. You can order it off of the internet for about $90. It's three-tenths of 1 percent accurate.

You push the button, and it tells you what the dB level is. In this case, it's 47 dB in this room right now. Okay. You can drive a truck outside, I can get you a noise level. You can drive the fire truck, you can drive anything you want. You can fly an airplane, and this will give you the dB level.

And so the fact that we've had three years, and we're trying to get information on what's the loudness of the F-35, and I still, from most of the people at the air base, get the story, well, we just don't know; it's like, let's have somebody at Eglin Air Force Base, where they fly these, go out, go 1,000 feet away from the planes, push the button, and you're able to get the loudness. **NO-42**

And the loudness is probably in the neighborhood of 121 dB. And that's very level -- very high. At 125 is when it causes sound-induced

pain in the ears. This is the -- the problem is this is a battlefield weapon. And when it was specified, there was nothing about loudness, about sound.

And so it's not something you can consider when it's a battlefield weapon. You bring it to an urban environment, and you've got incompatibility. I think that's one of the reasons that we've seen the EIS slanted, so that in the whole EIS there's an extremely small amount of information on the loudness, the L max. It's called the maximum loudness of the F-35s. **NO-37** **NO-13**

You get -- you get DNLs, which is average. It's like having one foot in boiling water, one foot in ice water; on average you should be fine (laughter). Give me the max. And we've asked for that repeatedly. We've asked for some sort of an independent Air Force supported project to do that, and we've seen no response. **NP-3**

We've asked that the F-35s come in so we can hear it, take our measurements. We hear absolutely nothing. We've had a British consultant who's come in, done some measurements, it comes out to about 121 dB at takeoff.

We've had Robert Webb, who was an EIS Air Force audiologist in Florida for his career to take

measurements. It comes in around 121 dB, which is about two to three -- two to four times as loud as the F-15s, which is the loudest things they fly out here, but that doesn't have credibility because it's not Air Force sanctioned.

And so that's what I'm trying to say is that we are able to measure the loudness. I can tell you how thing loud -- how loud things are. And so that's what I wanted to get across.

There was another issue about the F-35s coming in, taking off in the morning, and leaving and then coming back. Now, this is a training facility, and so they may be doing 14,000 takeoffs and landings a year, but that will include 39,000 touch-and-go, low-altitude flybys. It's in the EIS.

It's not us, it's a fellow that works for SIA -- SAIC as a consultant, Bob Van Tassel, was -- helped to put this together. So it's not opponents or proponents making this up. This is what's coming out of the EIS.

So the facts are there, we just need to get them out and get them balanced so that we can get an EIS that truly reflects both the positive and the negative.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Mr. Cahill, why don't you come on up. We'll give you three more minutes. And then we've had four other speakers sign up in the interim, so we'll make sure everybody gets a chance. We'll have enough time.

MR. CAHILL: Thanks a lot. **3224 BO**

You know, there's a phrase in the -- not in economics, but in other professions, which says that the reason people go into economics is because they're not smart enough to go into physics. But even an economist like me, you know, saw this report and noticed some glaring omissions.

And I just want to talk about one of them, just to explain how a certain analysis can be very informative, and it really doesn't take that much work. And it certainly could be included in an EIS.

But the U.S. Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics each produced data on population, employment, and, basically, most characteristics that you would think of that are related to people.

And analyses that economists very commonly do is you look at a city before a certain event took place, and then you look at that same city after the event took place, and you look -- and you look to see **SO-23**

what's different, and that way you can measure, you know, change or impact associated with the given, you know, event.

And loud noise is not something that has never been studied before. It's -- you know, there are places that have -- where loud noise has been introduced. What the Air Force should do is go to those kinds of places and go to the Census Bureau and go to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, download the data, and look at what happened before and after, and then you can assess the impact on population and the impact on employment.

What the Air Force's analysis is is purely hypothetical. It's given input for the number of jobs, and then look at what the outcome is. There's a whole series of analyses called comparables analysis, where you take two different kinds of cities, one city that was introduced to noise, and a whole set of comparable cities along different characteristics which weren't introduced to noise, and you look at what happened between those two sets of cities. **SO-23 cont'd**

And, again, that's all done with Census data and Bureau of Labor Statistics data. And it's all going to be downloaded on any economist's hard drive.

So my point is: There are analyses that are very basic in economics which are completely ignored by the Air Force's report.

And for any analysis to be considered suitable at a Ph.D. level, you'd have to do something like that. You couldn't possibly rely on hypotheticals alone. And that, I think, is one of the crucial flaws in the EIS. **SO-23 cont'd**

I'll say it one more time, I wrote an expert report on this, and it's available at Saveourvalleynow.org.

Thanks.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay. Our next speaker will be Brad Rowen, followed by Jeremiah Massey.

MR. ROWEN: Thank you. My name is Brad Rowen. I just wanted to address another issue. I'm assuming that everybody's here due to the noise ordinance -- or I should say, the noise concerns, in general. **3237 BO**

It's slightly off the tangent, but at the same point, very few people know that there was an ordinance that was passed recently -- in the last administration with Ada County -- that allows unlimited noise.

The ordinance that is in place currently does not have a decibel limit, and I just thought that the people that were here would want to know about something along these lines.

Because we've talked about the levels around the airport and everything else, but in all of Ada County, other than the airport area, there is no actual limit that is stated at this point, and very few people know about that.

So I've gone through, and I've actually established a website. It's not quite as good as his, and it won't be up and running for another day or so, but it's called Noisyinboise.com. I'm also setting up something on Facebook, which will also be Noisy in Boise.

And, basically, the concern is the fact that there is no numerical decibel limits available right now. What happens is if somebody is neighboring to you and runs loud equipment, they can run it anytime they want. And even if they're sited for it, they can fight it in court.

And the problem that they're running into in court -- and this has been issued several times over -- it gets thrown out, because it's too subjective and it is unconstitutionally vague. And I know that

all of you people are here -- are here for noise concerns, and there's an underlying problem, even when this is all said and done, that says unless we make a change on that, then anybody can still make as much noise as possible.

And noise is detrimental to people's health, their wellbeing as well, and it's something that needs to be addressed. It was something that Commissioner Woods and Tilman and Yzaguirre passed about three years ago. And I have more information on it. So if you'd like to get some, I have some packets on the way out. **NO-6**

Thank you so much for your time.

(Applause.)

MR. MASSEY: My name is Jeremiah Massey, and this is my daughter, Elsie. M-A-S-S-E-Y. I live close to the Jackson's at Orchard and the freeway. And right now when we have some of these fighter jets flying, it rattles the house, rattles the windows. **3238 BO** **NO-12**

I have hearing protection for my daughter that when those do take off, she runs screaming, covering her ears, and she grabs those hearing -- that hearing protection, because right now it's bad.

If these come in, she's probably going to end up losing some of her hearing, and it's not **EJ-2**

something that I want for my daughter, it's not something I want for me, and it's not something I want for my wife. **EJ-2 cont'd**

I am a former vet. I was over in Iraq. I was close to some of the paladins over there, and I have some hearing loss myself. It's just not something I want to see. If these do end up coming in, I'm already upside down on my house, I'm going to be more upside down.

I can't move as it is. But I always wanted to look out for my daughter. Probably just end up having to move, cut my losses and run. And I don't want to see that happen to the area of people I live with. **SO-1**

And there's a lot of people that do not know about this. The information has not been passed around. Get the word out. I've been putting stuff on Facebook, I've been putting stuff on Twitter, I've been talking to people I work with.

People don't know. This valley is not aware of what they're trying to shove down our throats and what they're trying to put us through.

Thanks for your time.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Next we have Glen Stephens,

followed by Casey Loft.

MR. LOTT: Lott.

COLONEL HARNEY: Lott.

3239 BO

MR. STEPHENS: Glen Stephens, S-T-E-P-H-E-N-S. I'm a Vietnam veteran. I served 20 years in the Air Force as a civil engineer, and I did a four-year term in the pentagon. And my job was to go to places like this and tell people that you've got to get proper zoning around the airports so that we don't have to close Air Force bases like Lowry Air Force Base in Denver and McClellan in California.

When you get encroachment, airplanes can't fly, too much complaint from the people that live there, and it's just not a healthy thing. So I've been on both sides of this problem.

After I retired from the Air Force, I became the planning and zoning administrator for Ada County, and it was my job, then, to try to protect the development around the airport, and I represented the county commissioners on the airport planning commission for three years.

And when the F-4 was assigned in the '80s, the noise contour at that time was at least a half a mile wider than is shown on the current maps. And the F-4 is far quieter than the F-35, as much as we

NO-1

know about it. We really don't know.

NO-1 cont'd

So one of the things I did while I was at Ada County was I wrote all of the ordinances for the beginning of the air quality program to get all of our vehicles tested. And last year we had several days that we were right at the limit of being declared a nonattainment area.

And the added noise, the emissions that get put into our air could be just enough to push us over, and then we've got a whole new list of things that we have to do. So it was kind of brushed aside in the study, and I think that that's something that needs further study.

AQ-3

And the last thing I'll say is we've spent millions of dollars to build a concrete canyon all of the way along the interstate highway over here back by the airport, and then we want to go right across the road and put in an F-35 that makes far more noise than the road traffic, and, yet, we spent millions of dollars to do that. And it just seems like we're having one government program cancel another. So think about it.

(Applause.)

3240 BO

MR. LOTT: My name is Casey Lott -- can you hear me in back? I have a pretty loud voice --

L-O-T-T. I'm a wildlife biologist. I've published papers in peer-reviewed journals. I evaluate environmental impact statements on a number of issues.

And you can always tell where the biggest lie is by looking at the biggest color map. And the one that you're -- you've seen tonight is the one about decibel levels. All right. I'm going to do something that is kind of unpleasant, so cover your ears.

(Screaming.) Now, that decibel meter running for 24 hours in this room is not going to detect that yell, yet all of you wish it didn't happen. That's the joke here. Average decibel levels over a 24-hour period is not what you want to measure.

What a noise everyone in this room -- what everyone has complained about, you know, the windows rattling in the house, the kids running to grab the ear protection, that's from acute periodic disturbance.

And that is what affects humans. That is what affects wildlife. That is what raises stress levels. That is what decreases fitness. That is what decreases quality of life. That is what causes

NO-24
NO-81

human health problems.

Economic analysis? Where's the economic analysis of human health problems that come with this EIS? Where's the economic analysis of increasing emissions so much in this valley that kids have more asthma in this valley? Where's the economic analysis of losing federal funding for highways here, losing the jobs that come with that federal funding?

It's not -- it's the net. It's the net that we want to look at here. You know, where's the analysis of how this is going to affect antelope herds, elk herds? Quality of life in this valley is hunting. Quality of life around Boise is hunting. Quality of life is being able to drive to many locations within three hours of here and be in the wilderness.

To me, this is not worth it, and it's kind of a joke. And that's all I have to say.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: I have another speaker who wanted an additional three minutes.

MR. PURDY: My wife says I have a lot of words (laughter). Who's the first guy that talked tonight?

COURT REPORTER: Actually, I need you to

NO-24
NO-81 cont'd
SO-40
SO-13
BI-5
NO-36
3227 BO

identify yourself.

MR. PURDY: Huh?

COURT REPORTER: I need you to identify yourself again.

MR. PURDY: Oh, Stephen Purdy.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you use the microphone?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The Little guy. **3227 BO**

MR. PURDY: Is he still here? I didn't think so --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They lie and leave.

MR. PURDY: -- because they don't care about what we're saying.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He had dinner with Otter.

MR. PURDY: Huh?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He had dinner with Otter coming up so he had to leave.

MR. PURDY: Yeah. I just want to know who's going to make the final judgment? Who are we trying to prove this to? Are we just preaching to the choir? And the few that aren't -- you know, that have the freedom to speak that they do want -- who is listening and how will we really, in the end, affect **NP-1** **NP-22**

anything? **NP-22 cont'd**

I think there's a lot of them educated people that put up some really good points that need to be looked at, but I look around, and I see the guys from the Guard and the Air Force, but I don't see anybody that really is going to change anything. It's the politicians.

The F-35s will not bring long-term value. There will be, maybe, some immediate value within the first three to five years of the building program, but in the end, I think, like I was trying to point out before, it's going to downgrade our community. **SO-1**

Quality of life is going to go in the toilet clear into Meridian, like that one gentleman was pointing out. So why not work towards quality industry that is non-noise producing, non -- more of the high-tech stuff that -- we've attracted quite a few people and continue. **NO-36**

But if we bring this in, we become a circus -- as far as noise, not a circus as people. It's only going to downgrade. So it's the politicians -- state, city, and county -- that are pushing this, and somehow we need to get the word out to them that they're kind of a short lifespan, politically speaking, if they do this to us.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: We have about four minutes left. Mr. Nakashima, would you like to finish us out here?

MR. NAKASHIMA: Thank you. I'm Skip Nakashima. I just wanted to point out, there was one of the things in the EIS that said if you lived within the noise print, that you should upgrade the interior of your house to decrease the noise environment, and I was wondering if the Air Force considered coming out and putting or implementing that upgrade into all of the homes who are located within that noise print? **3231 BO** **SO-32**

Also, as -- I was listening to this, and I was thinking about this, that south runway, the 2A departure and approach goes right over Senator Risch's house (laughter). I wonder how that runway will be used when the planes start flying, if they do? So that's all. I was just wondering. **DO-56**

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: All right. It appears that we have no remaining speakers. The Air Force representatives will be available by the display boards to discuss things with you. Thank you for your time and interest in the F-35A Training Basing

EIS proposal.

And tonight is not the end of your opportunity to participate in the review process. Written comment sheets are available at the registration table, and you may turn these sheets in tonight or mail or fax them later. And the mailing address is printed on the comment sheets.

The Air Force welcomes public comments in writing at any time during the EIS process. To receive timely consideration for the Final EIS, all comments must be submitted by March 14th, 2012.

So the hearing is adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 8:01 p.m.)

D.8.12 Transcript from the Boise Air Terminal Airport Air Guard Station Public Hearing Held February 28, 2012, in Boise, Idaho

CERTIFICATE

I, Andrea L. Check , do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 7th day of March , 2012 .

Andrea L. Check

Andrea L. Check — July 20, 2016

Andrea L. Check — Commission Expiration

U.S. AIR FORCE F-35A TRAINING BASING EIS PUBLIC HEARING, BOISE AIR GUARD STATION

PUBLIC HEARING

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2012

Boise Hotel and Conference Center
3300 South Vista Avenue
Boise, Idaho

Taken By: Andrea L. Check

APPEARANCES

AIR FORCE PANEL: Colonel MaryBeth Harney
Colonel Mike Nolan
Lieutenant Colonel Jon Wheeler
Jim Holley

certainly say that, but you don't need to use up your time repeating what they've said because it will already be in the record.

And, finally, this isn't a question-and-answer session. It's an opportunity for you to put your views and comments on the record about the proposal.

And then just one last comment, and I'll probably say this again a couple of times, just speak slowly so that the court reporter can get everything down.

Questions you pose will become part of the record and will be considered. After we're done with the formal part of this hearing tonight, the Air Force representatives will continue to be available to discuss things with you.

So with that, I'll go ahead and call our first speaker followed by the person afterwards.

The first speaker would be Thomas Coops, if you want to come up, and he'd be followed by Lynn Owen.

3241 BO

MR. COOPS: Good evening. Can you hear me?

I didn't prepare a long statement. I have a couple of ideas that I wanted to bring up. I'm happy to have the opportunity to be -- have information

given to me here this even ing about the noise level.

My experience with the Air Guard is that they can fly as low as 500 feet over my home. I'm one of the neighbors of Gowen Field. I live about two miles from the end of the runway. And in the past, the attitude is, we can fly that low if we want to.

Based on that training that they've given me, I just want to say that I don't believe this is going to be a lot of fun for me, and I expect my real estate value to plummet. And that's all I have to say. **SO-1**

(Applause.) **3242 BO**

MR. OWEN: Good evening. My name is Lynn Owen, O-W-E-N. I have a few things I'd like to say. It's kind of long, so I'm going to try to get through it quickly.

I'd like to thank everybody for coming and the presentation and the debate. I feel everyone that resides in the Boise and the surrounding areas will be impacted by the F-35s being flown in our area. **NO-11**

Due to the fact that we have a commercial airport in our sphere with air traffic that fly directly over our area, as I speak, the pilots that **AM-2**

are being trained on the F-35s are now going to be sharing this airspace with commercial and passenger aircraft. That could cause a dangerous situation for the area residents. **AM-2 cont'd**

I believe the people impacted by this F-35 proposal should have been given proper written notice -- I mean by mail, because I believe we live in that area -- of this general plan, and the noise simulation emitted by the F-35s should have been on television or by flyovers in our neighborhoods, so we could actually hear what they sound like -- the A-10s don't bother me. I love them. I wave at them every day when they used to fly over -- so we can actually hear the noise created in our Treasure Valley. **NP-20** **GE-2**

This would -- I believe this will have a tremendous negative impact on our way of life. I have resided here in the Boise area for several years, and my wife and I have enjoyed the peace and quiet here. We decided, after many years of hard work, that the Treasure Valley provided the ideal place for us to live. **NO-16**

First and foremost, we'd like to commend the Armed Forces for their great and difficult task and sacrifice for protecting all of America's freedoms and our way of life. I, myself, served in the U.S.

Air Force in the late '50s and early '60s.

I was stationed in Norton Air Force Base in San Bernardino. It is no longer an Air Force base. In the 1970s I owned a small, five-acre horse ranch in the Nuevo, California area, a small ranching and farming community of about 3500 people, located in Riverside County, just eight miles southwest of March Air Force Base. About the same distance our home is located now from Gowen Field.

As the -- as the housing projects around March Air Force Base expanded, the landing pattern was moved further east, closer to my home, and, boy, could these big B-52s create a lot of racket taking off and landing. They vibrated my home, and the noise destroyed my family's quality of life and greatly diminished the property values in our area.

The short term economic gain for the Treasure Valley will result in little or no value compared to the devastation caused by the homeowners that reside in this general plan area. **SO-1**

Okay. Thank you.

(Applause.) I do have a little bit more. And I'm a real estate broker, and I've got a lot to say.

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay. Thank you for your

comments.

The next speaker will be Barbara Priest, followed by Jeanne Wilson.

3243 BO

MS. PRIEST: Hi. My name is Barbara Priest, P-R-I-E-S-T. And I've lived down the street for approximately 35 years, so I'm a newbie here. Most of my neighbors have lived here 40, sometimes 50 years in this neighborhood. We have loved it. We have grown, we've taken care of our yards, we've done everything, and now noise.

I -- I don't -- I don't know how to explain the noise that we hear on a regular basis. This opportunity to come here and speak has given me -- not only for noise, but safety. No matter how safe they say they are, there's not 100 percent fact that there will never be an accident. Just one accident in this town will devastate us all. **SA-1**

And the air quality. The air quality in the wintertime here is outrageous. We don't have -- need the added air quality -- terrible air quality in this area in the wintertime that we already have. **AQ-1**

Asking questions tonight only -- only made me ask more questions and more questions on noise. I not only live in the 65 decibel, I work in the 65 decibel, so I will have it 24 hours a day. And I'm **NO-44**

wondering where the government stands on the workplace?

Are OSHA standards the same for takeoff and landings in a 65 decibel for a teacher that works at Owyhee School, or a person that works at Norco selling welding supplies? Do they need to wear ear protection during the day while they're working? **NO-44 cont'd**

This is not acceptable in our area. Thank you. **NO-37**

(Applause.)

MS. WILSON: My name is Jeanne Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N. I agree with all of the other speakers. I'll just keep this brief from a handout that my neighbor -- neighbors handed out. **3244 BO**

And what it says is: "Based on the Air Force's Environmental Impact Statement, 72 F-35A aircraft operating out of Boise would expose 6,958 acres of property to so much noise that the area would be designated by FAA regulations 'not suitable for residential use.'" **SO-1**

That just says everything about our property values. We won't be able to give them away.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker is Dean

Olmstead, followed by Kevin Merrell or Merrell. **3245 BO**

MR. OLMSTEAD: My name is Dean Olmstead, O-L-M-S-T-E-A-D. And my main objection to these is the noise level. We live close to the flight path now, and a couple of nights ago we had an A-10 go over, and it was so loud that it drowned out every noise in our kitchen. We couldn't hear anything. **NO-8**

Now, this is an A-10 that we have now. And from what I understand, these A -- these F-35s are going to be eight times as loud as the A-10s. I can't even imagine what it will be like. It's just beyond my imagination. And I think we should be given some information besides numbers as to what this is going to be. **NO-1** **GE-2**

So -- and that's -- that's all I've got to say. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MERRELL: I'm Kevin Merrell, M-E-R-R-E-L-L. **3246 BO**

Good evening. The F-35 Draft Environmental Impact Statement contains disturbing news. Under the 72-jet scenario, the area designated by FAA regulations as not suitable for residential use would impact almost 7,000 acres and over 10,000 citizens. **LU-6** **NO-11**

That doesn't sound like the Boise I grew up

in. It begs the question, why even include Boise in the basing option? A comparison table in the Draft EIS reveals the other three sites experiencing dramatically lower impacts than Boise. **DO-32**

The F-35 coming to Holloman Air Force Base, for instance, would impact all of an additional three people at 65 DNL levels. Speaking of the DNL levels -- the story gets a little murky here -- the noise contour map is based on a sleight of hand called "day-night-level noise averaging," or DNL. **NO-24**

The map describes a 24-hour average of normal sound levels and the 50 daily sorties of the extremely loud F-35. It's kind of like inviting someone who can't swim into a shallow lake with an average depth of only four feet, but not telling him, well, most of the lake is three-feet deep, why, there are a number of places where it is ten-feet deep.

I like economist Kevin Cahill's deceptively simple suggestion to study the experience of other locations that have gone through a similar experience. We'd quickly find ourselves studying the experience of Valparaiso, Florida. **SO-23**

Unlike our elected officials in Boise, or the -- who are quietly supporting the F-35, or the elected officials in Tucson, Arizona, who are loudly

supporting the F-35, the city fathers of Valparaiso took the Air Force to court because the noise from the F-35s from nearby Eglin Air Force Base was so intrusive. While they didn't get the F-35s to stop their overflights, they did win a reduction of the number of jets, from 144 to 59. **GE-7**

Well, I have grown up thinking Boise has a certain progressive attitude about it, marked by a sense of community and a genuine commitment to nurturing its citizens. Our city deserves better than inviting three squadrons of extremely loud F-35s to come here. **GE-4**

I would challenge our civic leaders to learn about the Draft EIS and publicly respond to the impacts that they find.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: I'd like to commend all of you for speaking slowly up until now, so keep it up.

Our next speaker is David Nelson, followed by Monty Mericle.

MR. NELSON: My name is David Nelson, N-E-L-S-O-N. **3247 BO**

So I heard there was a rigorous screening process that found potential sites, and Boise came up **DO-32**

as one of them. And even after that process, I have to ask: Who in their right mind would base these jets here and ruin our community? **DO-32 cont'd**

(Applause.)

The second thing I want to say is, in my line of business, in home construction, you use the right tool for the right job, and Boise is not the right tool for this job. On top of that, we get tax revenue increases due to the economic activity from this base -- or the basing of these planes; however, we do not hear about the economic decrease in our home/land values, and even those numbers you can't put an emotional value on it. **GE-4** **SO-13**

Who in their right mind would put these jets here? **DO-32**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MERICLE: Monty Mericle; M-O-N-T-Y, last name, M-E-R-I-C-L-E. I'm one of the spokespeople for Saveourvalleynow.org. And I've been a licensed electrical engineer in the state of Idaho for 37 years. **3248 BO**

And I'm going to speak louder than I should, because I'm going to address deficiencies in the Environmental Impact Statement. I want to try to get

as much of it as I can on the record, because the record of decision, which is coming up this summer -- if they follow their process -- is going to be based, in large part, on a well balanced environmental impact statement. And what we've got so far is not well balanced. It has many deficiencies.

And here I go. The Draft F-35 Environmental Impact Study for Boise, Luke, Tucson, Holloman Air Force Training sites is seriously flawed with errors, omissions, shoddy work, and cannot be used as a basis for the Final EIS or NEPA record of decision. **NP-13**

There are too many serious deficiencies that must be addressed first, as outlined in the list below of 11 items. I'm re -- I'm requesting an indefinite stoppage or postponement of the NEPA process until the deficiencies in the Draft EIS are corrected.

Item One -- and this is probably one of the two worst -- is there are no definitive dB loudness boundary maps, studies, or numbers published in the F-35 study. Perform them if you've not done them, or publish them if you have. **NO-4**

At the -- as the off-site loudness has been shown to cause hearing damage, it's essential that the area maps show dB magnitude at all sensitive **NO-5**

locations. These measures or estimates already exist, as they were required to develop the DNL measures, which are listed for all sensitive locations. **NO-5 cont'd**

What's missing? We've got averages. If you put one foot in ice and one foot in boiling water, on average, you should be okay. We've got averages. What we need are magnitudes.

This is a dB meter. You can buy this off of the internet for about 90 bucks. It has three-tenths of a percent of accuracy. If I walk outside, I can measure the loudness of a car, of a fire engine, of an F-35A, of a B-1, of an A-10.

That's what we need, is we need to have maps that show the magnitude. That's what we're all concerned about. DNL is something that we will find out about if they come here. **NO-4** But everybody is aware of the loudness. An A-10 is one-eighth as loud as an F-35. The F-35 is twice as loud as the F-18s -- or F-16s and the F-15s. **NO-1**

The next item, Item Two. Over 10,000 residents will find their homes reclassified as "not suitable for residential use" if the F-35s are brought in. This will represent in millions of dollars of lost property value. **SO-1** It's essential that **SO-2**

a full house by house appraisal and valuation be done. **SO-2 cont'd**

The next item. Over 1,000 residents will be exposed to very high noise levels due to the unusually close proximity of residence -- residential houses to the runway. **NO-11** 1,400 afterburner takeoffs and landings will be required annually, according to the EIS.

It's essential that a full noise study be done of the afterburner noise situation. **NO-38** We talked to the EIS project manager. He's not aware of anything about afterburners.

The next item. 4 schools and 13 daycare centers will be in very high DNL and noise magnitude areas. What mitigations will be done to avoid deteriorating learning levels? This must be studied in depth. **EJ-1** I've got to four. I've got five more that address --

(Applause.) This will be on our website.

COLONEL HARNEY: Next would be Richard Rogers, followed by Chuck Thomas.

MR. ROGERS: My name is Richard Rogers, R-O-G-E-R-S. **3249 BO**

And I'm here to say that I'm in favor of this project for the Luke Air Force Base in Arizona. **GE-4**

(Applause.)

I have spent about four or five hours already viewing this impact statement, and I consider it to be -- as usual, with most federal documents, the information is there, but it's a son of a gun to find.

Initially in the planning scoping meetings, the city officials and concerned citizens brought up 19 issues. And I'll just pull out a page in here. It doesn't matter what page number it is. But the least -- documents that cost millions of dollars could have at least referenced where the answers to those points are in this document instead of having to look around for it.

NP-3

As somebody said, well, we just do the minimum required under the NEPA process. Well, the citizens of Boise deserve more than the minimum.

(Applause.)

The max in this document -- well, they're maps. I'd expect to find something like that in 1921. People in this area that are going to be impacted need to know specifically where the boundaries are on the 65 decibel, or whatever number you want to put out there.

NO-4

It appears to me, after looking on the

computer at this, I might not be in this, but after coming here tonight -- I live in southeast Boise, and it looks like most of Lakewood and maybe right on the verge, Timberline High School. That should have been a study point. Timberline houses thousand of kids. Why wasn't that in there?

NO-5

The other thing is I believe this project requires a conditional use permit from the county. And under the county permitting process, anybody that's directly impacted in their land values are to be notified directly, not just in a public meeting like this.

LU-15

There's several hundred people out there -- thousands of people who probably don't even realize, because they don't get involved, that their property's going to get impacted on this.

The -- there's a value -- there's one point in here there's -- there's a formula for calculating lost property values. The least this report could have done is come up with a rough estimate on lost value per $100,000 property assessed value.

SO-13

Thank you for your time.

(Applause.)

MR. THOMAS: My name is Chuck Thomas, T-H-O-M-A-S.

3250 BO

Before I forget, I wanted to bring up something I think a lot of folks have maybe forgotten about is I've got a couple of sons that are engineers out at Micron. They brought up something to me today that I hadn't thought about, is the manufacturing process out there at Micron is very, very sensitive. The vibrations from these aircraft are going to severely impact the manufacture of these wafers out there. So this is something -- another thing to throw into the mix. **NO-61**

First, I want to make it clear, too, that over the last few hearings in 2010, and these here, there's been some question about the patriotism of those of us who oppose this move of F-35s here. That is not the case. We are very patriotic folks, and we'd like to really thank God for our troops who honor their oath of office, unlike so many of our officials --

(Applause.)

During the previous -- 2010 and these hearings, we've provided, through our research, significant noise studies on these F-35s that are in major conflict with the folk s that were paid by the government to make them sound acceptable. **NP-32**

This is pretty typical with government these

days. You know, if our public servants did the same, you know, in honoring their oath of office, we wouldn't be here tonight, and our nation wouldn't be facing economic collapse. It's just the way it is. We need to take care of our business with our officials and do our enforcement job.

Basically, here, you know, Monty Mericle has furnished a lot of information on this through the Save Our Valley Now website. I would encourage you folks to go there and get your information.

Why the feds, you know, restrict our actions and our public lands and our economy by not allowing us to access our minerals, and then they're allowed to bring in the F-35s.

And we're on the verge of pollution a lot here, of having our -- of -- you know, exceeding air standards. Why they could bring the F-35s into our city and poop in our air standards (laughter), it's another confusing issue. **AQ-3**

And I'd encourage you folks to follow up on this. And one thing is for certain, I can promise you all: If they are foolish enough -- if our officials are foolish enough, and the contractors and developers that wag their tails in this state, if they bring this in here, we will file a major **GE-14**

class-action lawsuit (applause) against all concerned. This will be financially unprofitable. GE-14 cont'd

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker is Ray Dupree, followed by Pritchard White. 3251 BO

MR. DUPREE: Thank you. My name is Ray Dupree, D-U-P-R-E-E. And, folks, I'm a former Marine Corps pilot and a retired airline pilot.

The Air Force has always been very good friends with the City of Boise, and I expect them to continue to be very good friends of the City of Boise. I'm one of the few here tonight that strongly do support the fact that the F-35 may come into the Boise area. GE-3

I'd like to mention that there are dozens of dual-core -- dual-use airports throughout the United States -- Chicago, New Orleans, Houston -- where they have military operating alongside major commercial airline -- airlines with absolutely no problem whatsoever.

Folks, the F-35 is fairly noisy. When I was a young pilot for American Airlines, I flew the first MDA into Orange County Airport. Orange County is probably much more sensitive to noise than this area,

surrounded by beautiful and expensive homes. And the airlines developed a noise abatement program, where we worked with the city over monitors -- sound monitors making the people actually quite happy with the operation.

The F-35 is still being developed. There are a lot of noise abatement programs that are going to come to surface which are going to make the area shrink down. It's not going to be nearly as noisy, once it gets into operation, as they -- as they say it's going to be (laughter).

Folks, let me point out something to you. You know, when we go to sleep at night, we're very fortunate. Nobody's kicking in our doors, nobody's bombing, nobody's strafing. Those things don't come about by accident.

And I know you're all very patriotic here. I know you all have reasons to have your own opinions on this, but, folks, the military has an operation in force. They do a great job for us. And, folks, it just can't always be somebody else's son, it can't always be somebody's else daughter, and it can't always be somebody else's city.

So I know it's going to be hard if this comes in. Some of us are going to have to sacrifice

more than others, but I think the area needs the F-35 in this area. **GE-3**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

3252 BO

MR. WHITE: My name is Pritchard White, W-H-I-T-E. And I'm an acoustical engineer who's spent about the last -- more than 40 years dealing with aircraft noise. I understand all of the terms and words and models that have gone into this EIS, and I find it's significantly lacking in several areas related to the noise. **NO-4**

Those of you who have lived around here for 15 or more years can remember in the olden days when the F-4s were here in town. And they were not near as noisy as the F-35. The F-35 is, you know, two to four times as noisy. And there's going to be, maybe, about ten times as many as there were F-4s.

Most recently you've been hearing the noise of F-15s and -16s as they play in the sky around here. Well, that F-35 is a lot noisier than that, and there's going to be a lot more of them. So that just puts you in perspective of what you might be hearing. So if you've heard the F-4s, and you hear the F-15s and -16s, you know what you've got coming at you. **NO-1**

Now, finally, the -- the impact analysis, as far as I've been able to read it, had very little to do with the wildlife that live around here. Out there in the areas at the end of the airport, there's deer, there's antelope, there's elk, all of that. And we know for sure those animals do get spooked when loud noises come.

And it interferes with their breeding patterns, it interferes with their life cycle during the winter, in particular, when they're down low, they're over near the Boise River. And on the east side, that's right -- right there where they take off.

And on the Boise River, it's right where they come in when they're coming from the east. So those will be making a lot of noise. It will be bothering the wildlife there so that we may not have as much of the deer and elk that we're used to and that we'd like to have. **BI-5**

Finally, I did not find any decent economic analysis of what it might cost to fix up the houses, the schools, the businesses, to the standards that -- to get the 65 DBA and the interior levels brought down to reasonable. **SO-13**

Now, at LAX -- they did this many years

ago -- either they demolished the houses or they had to spend millions and millions of dollars to pay the houseowners and the businessowners to fix their places so that they would be acoustically acceptable on the inside. **SO-13 cont'd**

And I don't find that number factored in. It certainly is a big thing. If they don't do it, the property values will go down. And if they do do it, we, as the taxpayers, are probably going to have to pay for it.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker is Dan Buerstetta, and after Dan will be Janet Ward. Either Ward or Wand -- Ward.

MR. BUERSTETTA: Dan Buerstetta, B-U-E-R-S-T-E-T-T-A. **3253 BO**

Sound is the one annoyance you can't hide from. You can't pull down your shades. It follows you everywhere. It ruins your enjoyment of the outdoors and the indoors. **NO-16**

This is a flawed, misleading document full of omissions. I'm an airborne paratrooper. I've jumped out of helicopters, prop planes, and even a jet. I love aircraft. But even with wearing ear protection, I've lost some of my hearing. None of the planes I've been around my entire life are even remotely as loud as the F-35. **NP-13**

NO-1 NO-5

NO-1 NO-5 cont'd

This is the most expensive -- $35 billion and counting -- behind schedule, and over budget aircraft possibly in the world. It's certainly possibly the world's loudest aircraft. And I say "possibly," because the military won't divulge meaningful, straightforward decibel data, if they even have it. **DO-5**

The planes are in somewhat of a prototype phase, so all of the data is rendered somewhat inaccurate. Perhaps it will be accurate relative to the finished product, but we don't know this at this point in time. **NP-13**

All of the locations have requested flyovers. I think we ought to have a week-long flyover demonstration, so that we, the citizens, can judge with our own built-in decibel meters what the experience will be like. **GF-2**

This is a hyper-loud war bird that doesn't belong in a densely populated urban metroplex. **NO-37**

Imagine you had an unobnoxious -- had an obnoxiously noisy car, which also happened to pollute a lot, you desperately wanted to sell; it would

behoove you to find a buyer who's gullible enough to buy it without driving it, believe everything in the misleading, full-of-omissions brochure, agree to a nonrefundable, nonreturn, no-agree-of-future performance sale, and even accept the caveat that they must live with this car until 2050. And the car is a lot like Steven King's Christine. It starts up in the middle of the night and makes you miserable. But don't worry, 38 years of misery averaged over 500 years is nothing (laughter and applause).

The DNL noise levels averaging sound out over 24 hours is a common means of measuring sound, but it's impractical for this. If I put a cherry bomb next to your head and blow it up, but average it out over five -- or, rather, 24 hours, I could say to you: What are you complaining about? It meets the 24-hour standard, and it didn't exceed 65 decibels. You have nothing to complain about. That's akin to what we're being asked to do here. **NO-24**

The environmental impact of the F-35 will be negative, not positive. It will create fewer long-term jobs than insinuated. It will destroy Boise's quality of life. It will pollute. It will ruin our ace in the hole for attracting clean, high-paying jobs. It will destroy our enjoyment of **NO-36** **AQ-1** **SO-18** **NO-18**

river floats, hikes in the hills. **NO-18 cont'd**

The F-35 noise, per this study, will increase the carbon dioxide, monoxide, nitrous oxide, and contribute to our burgeoning inversion. Home values will yield diminished revenues to the tax -- to the city and county. When we use more -- thank you. **AQ-1** **AQ-11** **SO-1**

(Applause.)

MS. WARD: I am -- I am Janet Ward, W-A-R-D. **3254 BO**

It makes no sense at all to locate the F-35s here. And I am appalled that Owyhee School, Hillcrest, and West Junior High would be subject to noise levels which cause hearing loss. On page 20 on the Boise section, they said that West Junior High would be subject to 98 decibels. **GE-4**

Now, I have taught at Mountain Home Air Force Base. During the 1980s I taught a course out there for Boise State. When airplanes took off off the runway, our building shook. I'd have to stop lecturing for several minutes. We'd start up again, another plane would take off, I'd have to stop lecturing. It is not a good teaching environment. I am appalled that we would do this to our children. **EJ-2**

One of the other concerns is our air quality. In Boise and the valley we already are **AQ-3**

borderline noncompliant for carbon monoxide, ozone, particulates, and nitrous oxide.

If the F-35s are located here, we would exceed nitrous oxide, we would exceed carbon monoxide. And the price of noncompliance is expensive. Boise City would end up paying a lot of penalties, which brings up the city council position. **AQ-3 cont'd**

Last summer they endorsed this but said they wanted to preserve neighborhoods. All right. You can't have it both ways, city council. And I would urge the city council to revise its position and not support this ill-conceived basing of the F-35s. **GE-4**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: The next speaker is Gary Crowell, and he will be followed by Thomas Berry. **3255 BO**

MR. CROWELL: My name is Gary Crowell, C-R-O-W-E-L-L.

Lots of the points that I had to make have been very well covered tonight. I'm a residential realtor. I want to reaffirm those points and talk about quality of life in Boise.

I'm a 58-year native. I've been around the old planes, the new planes, and I live very close, at

Cole and Victory, to the impact of what we have right now. And it's bearable. And I bought the home knowing what I was buying.

This is really trading it out to a much bigger noise level than I bargained for, and it will be a further reduction in my property values. And everybody that's impacted, and the builder who wants to build more homes in Boise -- it's going to impact a lot more of Boise. **SO-1**

Boise's usually finishing up in the top 10, 20 cities for places to live in the United States. I don't see this helping us. The whole city can be impacted by it, not just the people that are in the blue zone or on the edge of the blue zone or in the pink zone.

I think it's really a short-sided economic gain, the number of jobs and the money that come to us. I think long-term can be offset much worse with property values and other corporations that choose to not come to Boise and/or leave Boise because of it. And the Micron issue is very, very realistic to take a look at. **SO-13 SO-18**

The other thing is to ask us to be -- remain vigilant about this. Because I can see so many planes going into Luke Air Force Base, and a second

or third wave coming into Boise. I don't know how that plan works, but I don't think we get to let our guard down. Right now it's being proposed and presented that they're probably heading to Luke, but I think we get to stay vigilant.

Thank you for all of your contributions.

(Applause.)

3256 BO

MR. BERRY: Thomas Berry, B-E-R-R-Y.

There's been a half dozen or so good speakers ahead of me, so I -- so to speak, some of my thunder may have been stolen like a loud air fighter, but here I go.

For the record, I am opposed to the basing of the F-35 of any configuration and any mission at Boise Air Terminal Airport/Air Guard Station Gowen Field. GE-4

It is my opinion the F-35 is incompatible with the facility and is incompatible and unsuitable for the surrounding residential, as well as, commercial establishments. NO-37

I find the draft impact statement lacking and negligent. NP-13 For example, the impact statement shows the contour largely in line with the airstrips. This is an incomplete disclosure, as it does not show the noise impact zone for the military landing NO-53

pattern for an eastward approach, which is far south over the subdivisions which include the intersections of Lake Hazel and Maple Grove. NO-53 cont'd

The noise contour purposely stops short at the computer-modeled 65 decibel zone. There also needs to be contours for every three decibels within that zone, as sound increases, as well as contours for every three decibels outside that zone, as sound diminishes. NO-4

Why three decibels? Because every three decibels equals a double in actual volume. Noise is measurable and can be specifically targeted, scaled, and quantified.

Real-time decibels need to be measured -- excuse me -- real-time decibels need measured in all takeoff and landing patterns for existing and proposed runways and measured by a neutral contractor agreed upon by the Air Force and the affected residents and businesses. NO-54

The results need combined with a door-to-door census and survey of affected residents and businesses. Proponents say Gowen has had a military history since World War II. Proponents say we used to have the F-4s as recently as '96. This is true.

However, what wasn't here are the thousands of houses, as well as schools, churches, and businesses that are here now. If planning and zoning had plans for future fighters to be bedded at Gowen Field, they never should have zoned the areas for residential development. **GE-13**

(Applause.)

Proponents abdicate the sound of freedom. Well, the sound of freedom is citizens gathered to voice whether an aircraft is suited to their environment.

(Applause.)

The sound of freedom is what we enjoy when we come to our neighbors -- come home to our neighbors and watch children play while we burn backyard burgers or hang seasonal decorations. The roar of the F-35 flying over our homes, businesses, and city is not the sound of freedom.

It may be a reminder of the price of freedom, and a significant population of the Treasure Valley would be forced to pay a large burden of that tax in their quality of life, property values, and health. **NO-36 SO-1 NO-6**

Lastly, it's popular to announce whether you are a veteran or not. It appears to add some

credibility. I come from a family of military service. I'm a veteran of just short of ten years. I am a veteran of Desert Storm and have shoveled us out of the sand.

I know the real meaning of rockets red glare. I know what it is like to be woken up at night. I've lived on and near naval air stations. I enjoy wearing my patriotism on my motorcycles, skiing helmets, and shirts.

I hope that establishes my credibility. However, you don't need to be a vet to be a patriot, nor is it -- is this an issue of your patriotism. And don't let others paint you into that corner. This is an issue of quality of life, practicality, and suitability. Boise does not fit the model for the F-35. **GE-4**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker is Susan Olson, and she will be followed by Kevin Cahill. **3257 BO**

MS. OLSON: My name is Susan Olson, O-L-S-O-N.

A lot of what I -- my thoughts have been communicated this evening. One thing that hasn't been mentioned is, as I understand it, with 72 -- if

72 planes are at Gowen, that would be 14 -- 14,000 sorties per year. That comes up to -- based on -- say, they fly 300 days, that's 46 flights a day. And 1400 of those 14,000 are at night, with the afterburners, et cetera.

We ought -- I feel myself to be as patriotic as anybody, but the sound of freedom has many rings. And one of the things is -- is our quality of life. And we all contribute in different ways to our community and to our country, but our quality of life, our health, our wellbeing, and our peace of mind are one of the things that each of us should feel comfortable with. **NO-36**

And if our house values plummet putting some people underwater -- and just the peace of mind and the unsettling doesn't seem right. And our legislature seems to be, and our local government seems to be very excited about future jobs, but I don't think they have put into the equation what we have -- will lose: The companies that will not come here, people that will leave. **SO-1**

SO-18
SO-1

And so there -- we may be a high-desert town, but we are a city. We are not Holloman. We are not in -- out in the middle of nowhere. We have 80,000 people in the city of Boise, and over 250,000 **NO-37**

in the valley, and each of those should be valued. **NO-37 cont'd**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

3258 BO

MR. CAHILL: Hi. I'm Kevin Cahill, C-A-H-I-L-L.

I'm an economist. I have a bachelor's degree in math and in economics with honors from Rutgers College. I have a master's degree in economics from Boston College. And I have a Ph.D. in economics from Boston College. I live here in Boise, and some citizens came up and asked if I would write an expert report about the EIS on a pro bono basis, and I did.

I've spent quite a lot of time with this document, and my conclusion is that it is fundamentally flawed, and it is grossly insufficient. **NP-13**

And I just want to -- I'll point out a few reasons why.

One reason why it is flawed is because -- well, the speaker before me said she doesn't think that the negative impacts were included in the equation. And that's because they weren't. There is an equation, it's called an IMPLAN model. And that's the model that the Air Force used to calculate jobs. **SO-22**

The IMPLAN model assumes a positive impact.

It, therefore, does not take into account any negative impact. It is a math model. It's geared for certain uses, but it is not applicable in this situation.

So when you see estimates of jobs of 2,000 or more jobs, that's an assumption that there's no negative impact, which I consider a fundamental flaw. Lots of folks have talked about impact on property values. It's reasonable to assume that there would be a negative impact to population, jobs, and other aspects of the Boise economy. **SO-22 cont'd**

Another thing I'd like to point out is the Air Force -- even though they assume that there's no negative impact, they highlight two studies in their literature review which typically consider -- consist of hundreds of studies. Well, they highlight two.

And in their two studies they find out that there just may be a negative impact on property values. But that is inconsistent with their assumption that there's no negative impact. So you can't have it both ways. You can't have a math model that doesn't assume negative impacts, and then say, oh, well, by the way, there's this academic literature that shows there might be one. **SO-33**

Now, those two things are incompatible. And

that's why this report, among other reasons, is fundamentally flawed. **SO-33 cont'd**

It's grossly insufficient because the entire socioeconomic analysis is hypothetical. It ignores real-life data. There's nothing that does a pre/post analysis of places where noise already exists. And these data are readily available by the U.S. Census and by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is completely ignored in this report. **SO-23**

So I've come to the conclusion that the report is fundamentally flawed, it's grossly insufficient. And my expert report is available online. I am not affiliated with Savethevalleynow.org [sic], but they have published my expert report if anyone would like to read it. **NP-13**

Thanks.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker is Janet Karknua [sic]. I believe it's K-A-R-K-N-U-A [sic]. I apologize if I mispronounced that. Followed by Brad Rowen. **3259 BO**

MS. KIRKHART: Hello. My name is Janet Kirkhart -- I apologize for my bad penmanship -- K-I-R-K-H-A-R-T.

I have been a resident of Columbia Village

for 20 years. I'm very concerned that my home is specifically in the area that would be designated as "not suitable for residential use." My home and my neighbor's homes will be directly affected by the impact of this -- bringing the F-35s to Boise. **LU-6**

To those who say that if -- I should not have bought in that area knowing I was in the vicinity of air traffic, we spent time, several hours, 21 years ago before we purchased our first house --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. You have to slow down.

MS. KIRKHART: Thank you.

-- listening outside on the M hill to the air traffic activity. We were fully aware that we were purchasing near both Gowen Field, and not far from the airport.

To those that claim that the air noise is not going to be much of a problem, that they're in favor of it, I respect their opinions; however, I don't believe any of us really fully understand the impact and the effect of this noise that the F-35s would have on our community.

I know I don't, and I would be in favor of inviting flyovers so we can fully evaluate the impact **GE-2**

of the noise activity. With respect to the quality -- or the air quality issues, one thing that has not yet been mentioned is with the inversions we frequently have low levels -- **GE-2 cont'd**

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. You have to slow down. **AQ-11**

MS. KIRKHART: -- low levels of air clouds that will hold in the sound. I have a friend who lives off -- a new subdivision off of Highway 55 who has heard aircraft activity in the last couple of weeks as a result of the low cloud levels.

I just want to make sure of your consideration of the quality of life issues, the impact to our air quality, our home values, and our quality of life, specifically, the possibility or probability of this having a negative blight on our quality of life with respect to bringing new business to Boise. **NO-36 AQ-1 SO-18**

Over the last 20 years there has always been one person in my household working the nightshift in manufacturing. This was not just limited to Micron Technology. I am concerned that it would alter -- or hinder the expansion and relocation of new business to our area, specifically in the areas that we want more further job growth. **SO-18**

And so I just have a very great concern about the impact this would have to our area. And with respect to Columbia Village, I seriously doubt this is the vision that J.R. Simplot had for this project in Columbia Village.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

3260 BO

MR. ROWEN: Hi there. My name is Brad Rowen. First of all, I commend all of you for coming out here tonight. It is not only admirable, but it is a great job that you do by coming out here, because we represent the silent majority.

The problem we run into is the handful of people that know how to work the system -- whether it's media or elected officials, they're also known as lobbyists -- they have the money; we don't. We have the homes, we have the families, we don't have the big bucks that they do. They're a collective effort.

The fact that you're all out here tonight, we form a collective effort. What we have to do tonight is to actually contact those that are making the points. For me, the whole noise ordinance and the whole noise issue hits home.

Over the last four years, my four-year old

and five-year old daughter and myself have been, basically, driven out of our home by noise issues. The problem that we ran into is that we complained about it, the complaints went to the police, and after that they ended up going to court. The court threw them out.

The current noise ordinance, as it states, offers no decibel limits whatsoever. Okay? We are currently being exposed to 75 to 85 decibels on a daily basis. Okay? I can't get anything done.

I can hire an attorney, but the problem is I'm going against a private country club full of attorneys. Okay? So for them, it's a bottomless pit. They've basically broken the whole thing down, saying that, A -- the ordinance, the way it's stated right now, actually breaks it down and says that it is subjective and is not holding up in court.

And if they decided to push against the prosecutor, they said they will take it to the federal and Supreme Court here saying that it is unconstitutionally vague. So currently it has absolutely no value to it whatsoever.

As individuals, we have to fight for our rights for peace and quiet. And where it comes in, as far as the punch line goes right now, is for us to

maintain a collective effort. We can't beat the corporations. We can't.

Does anybody out here have a million dollars in the bank right now? Anybody? Anybody? Okay. Do we all own homes that we know are going to drop down dramatically where we're going to be driven out?

You have no idea -- well, actually, some of you do -- what it's like to have somebody running four weed whackers outside your window, 50 feet away, every single day beginning at 6:00 a.m. And then to complain to the prosecutor and have him say something along the lines of, if I were you, I'd take their deal, and I'd just move. Great. This is what we're looking at.

The way we can do things here are two things. A, I've set up a website called Noisyinboise.com. I've linked it to Saveourvalley.org -- Saveourvalleynow.org. I'm also putting up things for Facebook. Facebook is a much easier way to post things. It can post comments and we can run a blog as well.

If you go to Noisyinboise.com, there's a direct link there. If you like the page, it will pass it on to other people. I also pulled a packet together, which a gentleman over there -- he's from

Channel 2 News.

There's four TV stations in this town, there's a boatload of radio stations, and nobody's here covering it, except for Channel 2 right now.

(Applause.)

What we have to do is contact the media and contact our elected officials. I put a packet together, at my own money, and put them over there right by the camera over there. It has all of the elected officials' names, contact information, as well as TV stations, radio stations, and newspapers.

You need to do one thing tonight, and that is contact these people, and they will get you taken care of. But if they don't hear you, then you don't exist.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: All right. Next up is Dallas Baird, followed by Maxine Prosser.

3261 BO

MS. BAIRD: Well, once again, almost everything I had to say has been said, but I'm speaking for four different households in this impact area, so I feel that I have to at least say something.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear.

MS. BAIRD: My husband --
MS. TURNER: Microphone. Microphone.
COLONEL HARNEY: You have to speak --
MS. TURNER: You have to speak into the microphone.
MS. BAIRD: My husband was a volunteer during the Vietnam era, and my heart goes out to everybody who volunteers. Thank you so much.
My husband now works for a company who reads environmental impact statements and has to write reports for people like NOAA and Army Corps of Engineers.
And when he looked at the Environmental Impact Study, his first question was: Where's the environmental impact study (laughter)? So far we don't have an answer.
I'd like to vote for bringing some practice rounds here. And let's make sure the city council is in session, the statehouse is in session, the governor is here, and let's hold some meetings right here in this building. And I don't think they'd get much work done. **GE-2**
The other thing is I own three homes in this impact area. If it's as bad as it looks like it could be -- if -- who's going to make me whole? We **SO-11**

came here and brought our savings, invested in this beautiful, beautiful city. Who's going to make us whole? Where's it going to leave us? **SO-11 cont'd**
Thank you.
(Applause.)
MS. PROSSER: My name is Maxine Prosser, P-R-O-S-S-E-R. I live right off of Cole and Victory. **3262 BO**
Now, I love to garden, but there were times in the past, just recently, that when those jets fly over, I have to put my hands over my ears. **NO-8**
Now, I'm concerned, not only with my own health and hearing, but I am concerned about the children and the schools that are just a few blocks away from my house. They are on the football fields, the baseball fields, they are outside at different times, and you never -- what are they going to do when these F-35s fly over? **NO-6** **EJ-2** **EJ-6**
I am also concerned about the effect on animals. And I am just concerned in general of why are these necessary in our town? And I say, do not bring these to Boise. **BI-5** **NO-37** **GE-4**
Thank you.
(Applause.)
COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker is Brett Danielson [sic]. I'm not sure what the first name

is, but the last name is definitely Danielson. And following that will be Brian Allen.

3263 BO

MR. DANIELSON: My name is Brent Danielson, D-A-N-I-E-L-S-O-N. I want to express my concern and opposition to locating the F-35 training base at Gowen Field. Locating the training base at Gowen Field is not in the best interest of those surrounding neighborhoods or to the City of Boise or the Treasure Valley as a whole.

GE-4

The training base will have a significant adverse effect, as approximately 10,000 people and well-established and vibrant neighborhoods in the central bench, southeast, and southwest Boise will be within the 65 DNL threshold, above which certain land uses, such as residential, are not considered compatible by the FFA [sic].

NO-11

LU-6

The quality of life for residents in these neighborhoods will be greatly diminished with the addition of the F-35s. The quality of life is diminished by the excessive noise. There is no way to mitigate the noise. The noise is there by the simple fact that jet engines of the aircraft make loud noise.

NO-36

In addition, these residents' greatest investment is at stake with the reduction of property values, or even being able to sell their homes to escape the noise. Is the Air Force willing to buy out the homes of the 10,000 affected residents?

SO-1

SO-1 cont'd

SO-11

I believe that there's even more people beyond the 65 DNL line that will be effected, as there would be some residual noise that would be heard outside that line. There's a good possibility that 20,000 to 30,000 more residents would be affected. This equates to about a quarter of the City of Boise's population.

NO-11

The current airport influence areas that have been adopted by the city go far beyond the 65 DBA line that's currently at the airport. The effect of the F-35s could be a good half mile to one mile from that dB N -- DNL line.

NO-69

Have these homes and businesses that are currently not in the airport influence area been built to the standards that are required for homes and businesses currently in the airport influence area? What about the parks, schools, and recreational areas near the 65 dB DNL line?

LU-37

EJ-1
NO-18

For example, almost all of Simplot Sports Complex is within that line. Where will our youth play soccer and baseball? As far as I know, there seems to be a shortage of places for our youth to

EJ-6

engage in these activities currently.

EJ-6 cont'd

The majority of the industrial businesses are in land -- industrial land zones in Boise and Ada County are located near the airport and Gowen Field. I wonder what effect this will have on those businesses and their employees? Obviously, the noise levels next to the airport will be excessive.

NO-44

How will the operation of those businesses effect the health of those business's employees? Will this drive out existing businesses that currently employ people here in the Treasure Valley?

The long-term economic future of Boise and the Treasure Valley, essentially, rests on knowledge-based economy. Those involved in knowledge-based occupations come here for the quality of life that we have here currently in Boise. These businesses will not grow or expand without being able to attract the same type of worker that we've done so with HP and Micron over the last 30 years.

SO-18

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. ALLEN: I'm Brian Allen, A-L-L-E-N. And as a sportsman, I'd like to start out with comments dealing with big game.

3264 BO

I hunt deer and elk all of the way from, you

know, Bear Valley, Benchmark, Stanley area, down to Juniper Mountain, and I've had B-2 bombers -- or, actually, B-1 bombers fly underneath me. I've had F-15s, last October, 200 feet over my head setting up elk camp.

I personally don't believe that big game is going to be impacted by the planes that they're talking about bringing in. We've already had a couple of decades of low-flying, high-speed aircraft all over the place, and I think the wolves are probably the bigger issue when it comes to big game.

BI-4

BI-5

I hope that the Air Force and the area it's evaluating is, actually, the greater Boise metropolitan area, which is about, essentially, a 60-mile radius of Boise. And so that's only 800,000 people.

I'm actually for the F-35s. Being a 30-year financial planner, I look more at the economics long term of job creation. Where our kids, junior high kids, high school kids -- you know, we've seen Albertson's leave, we've seen, you know, everything abandon, you know, the Valley because of the always great reception.

GE-3

And I think we have to be really honest to ourselves on where are our kids going to have future

jobs? And this is a major economic -- probably the single biggest economic federal program that could ever come to Boise. **GE-3**

Talking with the airport management, you know, there's a third runway, possibly even a fourth runway planned. That's a little farther out down the road. But I think with some capitol expenditures, that the Air Force has to put into Gowen to be able to support the current projected planes, and then the infrastructure development of more runways, if they're positioned properly, I think we can help deal with some of the noise. **DO-35**

But when you look at the 800,000 population of Treasure Valley, greater metropolitan area, yeah, 10,000 people are going to be affected. And we have to kind of figure out how to balance that out. **NO-11**

We have a data point with the F-4s for over a decade when they were out there. So hopefully we can strive and strike a balance to something that will work for all parties involved.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay. I'd like to invite up David L. Smith, followed by Steve Tornga.

3265 BO

MR. SMITH: My name is David Smith. And if

you need to spell the last name, you've graduated recently from modern education (laughter).

First of all, the F-35 is a great airplane for a rural, isolated Air Force base, such as Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho; not being based on the edge of Idaho's capital city. The quality of life in Boise will not be enhanced by the noise or the pollution from the F-35. **GE-1** **NO-36** **AQ-1**

As a single airman in the 1960s, I lived on and worked on the F-104Cs, -Ds, and -G, Lockheed Starfighter at George Air Force Base, California, which is in the Mojave Desert, not Boise, Idaho.

The howling and screaming from its J79 engine and air-bypass flaps was very mild compared to the decibels of noise from the F-35. We Boise residents put up with Klamath Falls' F-15s two summers ago, but we knew it was for a short, defined period of time of six months, not decades. By the time that plane leaves here, I'll be 108 years old (laughter). **NO-1**

Another thing, in some of the literature I was looking over was that they concentrate on how it might affect schools. Well, how about homes? I live right behind this building in a house that was built in 1950. It's not insulated like the California **SO-1**

subdivisions west of here, so that's a problem for me, personally.

The decibel area on the computer was one thing that they talked about, and I'm really going to get the noise. Another thing they talked about was the types of planes. This plane is a one-engine plane. If you look at what we've had here with the Phantoms, the A-10, the F-6 -- F-15s, excuse me, those are all two-engine planes. If those things conk out, there's a chance that there's still one engine to go. They can still do a go-around and not crash into something.

Another thing they talked about was training of foreign pilots here, eventually. They experienced that at Luke Air Force Base in 1964 for 18 years after. Those pilots that are foreign pilots, they don't have the same gutsy, stick-to-itiveness as American pilots in the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marines.

When those things -- the flame goes out in those single-engine planes, they automatically ejected and could care less where those planes landed. And I followed up with that by living in Germany for 14 years and hearing about the pilots that we trained in the German Air Force, and how they

SO-1 cont'd

SA-16

PN-4

just jumped at the first little wrong thing. They didn't stay with the plane like the American pilots did.

There's a difference between noise levels of civilian planes. We live here because it's, basically, a civilian airport. It has the National Guard component. But civilian planes they're always trying to engineer the noise down. The military planes they never do that, and so that's something to think about.

But there's a lot of safety in there besides the noise. We've talked mainly about noise here, but that's where it's been. And I think that you want to talk about economic impact, how it's going to affect Boise. No, it's not.

Those people are going to live somewhere between the triangle between Kuna, Caldwell, and Eagle. Meanwhile the Boise people who live right under this noise is going to get stuck with the bill.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. TORNGA: My name is Steve Tornga. It's T-O-R-N-G-A. And thank you for the opportunity. And I would also like to say, I sure appreciate the -- the people who are in the Air Force and the Guard

SO-1

3266 BO

that are here, and other people who served in the military.

(Applause.)

I really wanted to find some positive things at this meeting, and I did find a few. Very few.

I'm happy to see that there are two Air Force bases that are being considered, because it certainly would seem like an Air Force base would have a mission that's compatible with this deployment and this training facility. NO-37

I don't see a municipal airport that has a dual role serving this mission. I just think it's a terrible idea for a metro area, and I certainly hope common sense and logic prevail.

A different point of view that I have is, basically, moving here in '82, finding a home on Sunrise Rim, right down the street here as well, just up -- down from David. And we are right in the middle of the impact area.

We spent a lot of time putting together a neighborhood plan. That plan included safety and noise abatement. We have sidewalks now most of the way. We're still working on that. We now have children, and families moving into the neighborhood with children, which is just real exciting.

We also have a sound wall, which has made a tremendous difference, and the new road surface on the highway here. We were able, with that improvement, to get our decibel rating down -- and this is a whole different way of tracking decibels -- but down 16 decibel points, which got us into a normal neighborhood. We can actually talk in our backyards without raising our voices.

(Applause.)

And now I can go back -- I'm the neighborhood association president right now -- and I can go back and tell our people that if this happens, we may be living in a place that's not suitable for residential use. LU-6

That's going to be a very painful thing to try to explain. People have really put a lot of sweat equity in their homes. And I think we're proud of Boise, and it just makes no sense whatsoever. SO-1

Looking at all of the data, it just looks like it's skewed terribly off base. I wish -- well, people have spoke about it that are much more knowledgeable than I will be and so I appreciate their comments. But this is not the right place for this base. GE-4

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: The next speaker is Steve Raeder, followed by Greg Long. **3267 BO**

MR. RAEDER: Hi. My name is Steve Raeder, R-A-E-D-E-R.

Every -- excuse me -- everyone's done such a great job so far tonight presenting a lot of facts and details. And I don't have facts and details. I'm an accountant. But I can present emotional (laughter) -- emotional aspects of what's happening here. Okay?

My family is about as American as apple pie. We were here before there was a country. I had family members that fought with George Washington. I had family members that fought in the Battle of the Bulge. I have family members that went in on Utah Beach. My family has put a lot of equity and blood into this country.

I -- it disgusts me when people say they question my patriotism for being against something like this. I'm not against the F-35s. The F-35, if the military seems -- sees that it's a necessary aircraft, that's great. I support that. I don't support it in Boise. It's not an appropriate location for it. There are plenty of other **GE-4**

facilities where this would be better suited. **GE-4 cont'd**

One thing I can talk about from an accounting perspective is that we see these numbers batted around; billions of dollars for Boise. One, no one has shown any detail on where this billions of dollars is coming from. It's very easy to make up money. Look at what Enron did (laughter).

It's very, very easy to say there's going to be billions of dollars. No one has shown exactly how billions of dollars is going to come in here. Plus, if you're familiar with accounting, there's two sides. **SO-13**

It's an accounting equation. Assets equals liability plus equity. We're seeing one side of the column here. We're seeing billions of dollars in Boise. We're not seeing the cost to Boise.

What's going to happen with 10,000 blighted homes in our city? I'm sure if there were members of the police force here today, they could speak about some of the neighborhoods that are around this area that are impoverished, low income, that they deal with drug-related problems, things like that, because people are not vested in their property, they're not homeowners that are there to make a positive impact on our community. They're making a negative impact **SO-1**

on our community.

That is going to expand exponentially with the footprint that these F-35s are going to create in our Valley. And with that, I just would like to say thank you for giving me your time, and I hope that we stay together as an organization and can work together to continue to keep these out of our city. **SO-1 cont'd**

(Applause.)

MR. LONG: Greg Long, L-O-N-G. **3268 BO**

I was watching the TV yesterday, and part of this was on the TV, and my thoughts -- I had some thoughts about it. And it went back to when I was in the military. And I thought about that I was really appreciative of the places where I trained before I went to Vietnam. And I got back here with my skin on, and a lot of it was due to my training.

And I -- I -- I was in four different states before I went over there. And I was -- I was thinking during this, I was stationed in Da Nang, Vietnam air -- out at the air base there.

And those F-4 Phantoms, they would take off, and they would put those afterburners on and go straight up so they wouldn't get shot down. And I'm glad they had a place to train, huh, so they could get out of harm's way when they shot straight up.

I'm a bit nervous. I haven't done this before. I -- I live on Airport Way. I've lived in Boise here for 13 years now. I'm in my 60s now. I love my peace and quiet. I live by the freeway. Man, it's noisy. It's so noisy.

I don't like all of the noise, but that's where I live because it's convenient for me. And I live a quarter mile from the airport, so I know all of the planes that take off. And sometimes it's a bit loud, and I don't like it when it's really loud. **NO-8**

But, you know, my thought -- and I can understand people with property, and I appreciate that -- but my thought is, is that we -- we have to -- we have to have places to train for the future that we don't know what's going to come sometimes.

And my question would be: Is it 72 planes or nothing? Okay. One minute. I could see 24 planes because of the location of the airport. You know, I don't know if it's about supporting or not supporting for me, it's that -- that I appreciate the fact that I had places to train when I -- when I was in the military. **DO-73**

And I've lived in Tucson. That's a million people down there. Maybe it would inconvenience those people down there that have a million people,

or Luke -- I've been by Luke Air Force Base. There's a lot of people that live there, you know.

I think -- I get inconvenienced in my life at times, but this country has given me so much and continues to give me a lot.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: We have about six speakers left, so we're going to go through everyone who's signed up, so we're going to go a little bit past eight o'clock.

So our next speaker is Robert Johnson, and he will be followed by Kenneth Andresen.

3269 BO

MR. JOHNSON: I'm Robert Johnson, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. The people that have preceded me have pretty well said everything of great importance that needed to be said and that I wanted to be said. I do have a couple of points that I would like to make.

First of all, just from the facts that I've heard here, raised a couple of questions. One, is it going to be they're going to put planes in Boise but not Mountain Home Air Force Base? If so, that would pretty well irritate me.

DO-41

And the second point is if they put planes in Boise and Air Force -- excuse me -- Mountain Home

Air Force Base then is the alternate runway, that, again, would really irritate me.

DO-41 cont'd

The second question that comes up is when they bring in more than 24 planes, then they're going to ship the A-10s somewhere else. Where? And what is it the Idaho Air Guard is going to fly?

DO-73

As far as the Environmental Impact Statement goes, the colonel here is a judge, and I know she's not here to give her fellows advice, but she might just as well explain to them what happens when you put a really crappy piece of paper in front of a federal judge.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

3270 BO

MR. ANDRESEN: I'm Kenneth Andresen, A-N-D-R-E-S-E-N. Looking at the map in the EIS, the impact seems to be pretty symmetrical around the runways and Gowen Field. I live on -- my house is on Canal Street. I can look out my backyard and see the planes landing and taking off at the field.

I noticed when the fighters are here training, it's like two planes at a time. And when they come in to land, they just don't line up in the center of the runway and come in, they come in north of the field -- north of the runways from the east,

NO-40

and then they make a 180-degree turn and come down and land. One plane peels off, and then the second plane goes a little further, and then it peels around and comes and lands.

So I think the map is not correct in the EIS. It seems about the same distance of noise north and south of the runways. I think the noise is going to be further to the north of the runways to allow the planes to do this 180-degree turn -- the fighter jets.

Maybe the F-35s are going to have a different protocol for landing. But in the past the fighter jets have always made this -- frequently, at least, from my observation, have made this 180-degree turn to land.

NO-40 cont'd

And to the comment of, well, just move, I'm -- my house is in the impact area. So, yeah, I could just move, and I could sell my house for what? Who would buy a house in the impact area? My house used to be on agricultural land. The only thing I could foresee is that the houses would need to just be razed and reverted back to agricultural land.

SO-1

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speaker will be David Christiansen followed by James Hunt.

3271 BO

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: My name is David Christiansen, C-H-R-I-S-T-I-A-N-S-E-N. Before returning to my native Idaho, I was a biostatistician. Now, you've heard from an accountant and an economist. Now this is the other very boring profession (laughter).

What I did, though, is excited -- exciting. I actually presented data to the FDA to get two new drugs approved. In order to get a drug approved by the FDA, you must do an unbiased risk-benefit analysis. All three of those words are important, unbiased, risk, and benefit.

This Environmental Impact Statement only talks about benefit. It doesn't talk about risk. It doesn't talk about cost. And risk must also include -- any drug that's approved by the FDA -- quality of life, the impact on quality of life. This environmental statement does not do any of these things.

NP-13
SO-23

The first example I'll give is, I walked in, and I looked at the map -- and I looked at the first map, and I said, oh, there aren't any homes in this area. And I said, oh, that's Mountain Home.

NO-4
SO-23

Then I looked at the Boise map. There are no pictures of how many houses there are in there.

It's just lines. That's biased. That doesn't give you the true impact of what will happen to the quality of life of the people in that area. **NO-4 SO-23 cont'd**

The second one -- and in order to be unbiased -- I'll say I have not verified this -- but I looked on Save Our Valley Now, and there was a reference to an article that our U.S. representative sent out a postcard saying, send this in if you agree with the F-35. There was no opportunity to say I don't agree with it, which will, then, allow you to sa, every response we got was positive. That's very biased. **GE-13**

(Applause.)

If I had -- if I had submitted something like that to the FDA, it -- not only would it not have resulted in the drug being approved, I'd have been fired.

I have a couple of specific questions. One is: Why wasn't Mountain Home included in this? Why was Boise? Was this just a strong man to put up there to knock down, or was there, some people have said, lobbyists involved? I don't know what the answer to that question is. **DO-32**

I also would like to know, in other cases, what other home -- what homeowners have been **SO-11**

compensated when they are actually put into an area where you can't live in that residential area anymore? **SO-11 cont'd**

What this reminds me of, for those of you that are old enough to remember, is what we are going to have here if that happens is a sonic love canal, where houses are not going to be worth anything. **SO-1**

Thank you.

(Applause.)

3272 BO

MR. HUNT: Hi. My name is Jim Hunt, H-U-N-T.

I live in Boise, just west of the airport, exactly under the flight path inside the outer marker, so I know what the noise is. A little bit about myself. I'm retired military. I served 25 years in the Air Force and the Idaho Air National Guard.

I know what the -- what -- how important training is. Training, for a pilot, is extremely important, especially when you get into combat. You have to know exactly what you're going to do ahead of time. You can't think about it. It's got to be instinctive or you're going to lose your life.

A little background on training. There are several times in the history of the United States Air

Force when we've been very lacking in training for the pilots. In Korea our pilots were doing very poorly, for two reasons. One was training, and one was aircraft.

When they got the F-86 and they started training the pilots in air -- air combat training, they went from about a 2.4-to-1 ratio up to a 12-to-1 ratio. And in Vietnam we went through the same exercise.

The Air Force says, we kind of forgot about training from 1950 until Vietnam, as far as air combat training went. It was interesting that the Navy had F-4s over there, and they had about a 12-to-1 kill ratio.

We were shooting down 12 enemy airplanes to losing one F-4 -- Navy F-4. The Air Force was over there doing about a 1.24-to-1. And they thought, what's the matter? Why is the Navy doing so well and the Air Force doing so poorly?

Well, they figured out that the Navy pilots had about 200 sorties of air combat training. The Air Force people were getting over there with 12 sorties of training -- air combat training.

The Air Force started red flag down at Nellis. They started training their pilots. The

kill ratio went from 1.24 up to 12-to-1. That's the importance of training.

Now, I am very thankful for the young men who are serving our country, those pilots. We're making it very tough for them. We're giving -- we're building fewer airplanes, we're training fewer pilots. Most pilots that we have are deploying more and more often. It's not a great life. They have no family life to speak of. They're gone constantly.

I, for one, am willing to suffer a little bit of inconvenience. Temporary transitory noise is all it costs me to see that these guys get training. And I, for one, will do my part to help them get their training. I encourage you all to support the F-35 in Boise. GE-3

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: All right. Our final two speakers this evening will be Tom Munds, followed by David Dean.

MR. MUNDS: Thank you. That's Tom Munds, M-U-N-D-S. 3273 BO

I'll bet the decision has already been made already, like some of the other things that happen with the state -- or the city with the mayor lately. It's been kind of crazy. I've been watching it from NP-1

afar.

The one thing I wanted to be able to mention -- there was a couple of people that mentioned an interesting word that most people have forgotten about, and it's called the constitution. And one of the things I try to do whenever I get a chance to speak is to be able to remind people where the power is actually inherent.

Is it in the people or is it in the government? I mean, we sit here at legislative hearings throughout -- throughout the land, and we sit here and pander and beg to our government. The government should be begging to us.

We are the ones that are -- that have the power to be able to determine what happens and what doesn't happen, as long as people know it. If you guys don't know, are not familiar with the document -- the only document that has secured our freedom for 235 years, I suggest you start to read it. That's why I'm running for senate.

But my question was: Do we have a constitution, I mean, where the government is limited to the few and specific powers, where the power is inherent in the people? **GE-13**

As government continues its relentless

pursuit of control of private property -- and of private property, I need to ask the constitutional provision that allows the program -- that allows for a program that people so adamantly oppose. **GE-13 cont'd**

Will people be subject to imminent domain? **SO-3**

If their property values decrease and they're unhappy, will they be compensated? Probably not. **SO-11**

What this project really needs to do to pass this thing is to do what it's always learned to do here in the last few years is to be able to use fear tactics and force against its own people and to spend our money doing it, and taking from our own retirements and hard-earned dollars to be able to get what they want to be able to use it as a control measure against its people.

This is not about the preservation of freedom, folks. This is about control, and it's about the restriction of your freedom that happens every legislative session.

This is why I'm running for the state senate, to put the power back in the hands of the people. And this video will also be available in its entirety on my website at Tommunds.com.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

3274 BO

MR. DEAN: Hi. My name is David Dean, D-E-A-N.

One of the earlier speakers tonight, Chuck Thomas, and I are neighbors. He actually lives across the street from me. And I believe his house is actually in the impact zone. My house is not (laughter). So that's where these remain.

So the Air Force -- someone asked earlier what the Air Force -- who's going to buy their property once this goes into effect once their land is condemned. Fortunately, the Air Force actually has done that. So for Chuck and the other 10,000 residents in Boise, they can look to -- look forward to their $14,000 payday. And so they have that going for them.

SO-11

Fortunately, like I said, for me and my family, the Air Force is telling me that I'm not impacted by that. I live in the magical zone between 65 and 0. So -- but in all seriousness, I bought my home in 2007, and the City of Boise is actually still issuing building permits for that area, just because, you know, the housing bubble, people are -- the lots never sold, so they're still building house s there. Apparently someone at the permit office never got the memo about the F-35s.

So I guess the last thing I'll say is I was actually at last night's meeting as well. And with respect to our public officials, Brad Little, our Lieutenant Governor actually spoke first thing at the meeting and then promptly left. So I guess that pretty much sums up what our public officials think about us.

Thanks.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: All right. So we have gone through all of the speakers. I want to thank you very much for your time and interest tonight in the F-35A Training Basing EIS proposal.

Tonight is not the end of your opportunity to participate in the environmental review process. Written comment sheets are available at the registration table, and you can turn those in tonight or mail or fax them later. The mailing address is printed on the comment sheets.

And as mentioned previously, the Air Force welcomes public comments in writing at any time during the EIS process. To receive timely consideration for the Final EIS, all comments must be submitted by March 14th, 2012.

Again, thank you very much, and the meeting

for this evening is adjourned.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 8:13 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Andrea L. Check , do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 7th day of March , 2012 .

Andrea L. Check

Andrea L. Check — July 20, 2016

Andrea L. Check — Commission Expiration

D.8.13 Transcript from the Boise Air Terminal Airport Air Guard Station Public Hearing Held February 29, 2012, in Marsing, Idaho

U.S. AIR FORCE F-35A TRAINING BASING EIS PUBLIC HEARING, BOISE AIR GUARD STATION

PUBLIC HEARING

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 2012

Marsing American Legion Hall
126 North Bruneau Highway
Marsing, Idaho

Taken By: Andrea L. Check

APPEARANCES

AIR FORCE PANEL: Colonel MaryBeth Harney
Colonel Mike Nolan
Lieutenant Colonel Jon Wheeler
Jim Holley

time repeating what someone else has already said since it's already on the record.

Also, this isn't a question-and-answer session. It's your opportunity to put on the record your views and concerns about the proposal that you want the decision-makers to consider.

Questions that you posed during your comments will become part of the record and will be considered. And after we're done with the formal part of this, the Air Force representatives will continue to be available to discuss things with you. So if you have specific questions, then you can ask them at that time.

So with that said, I'll call up our first speaker. Darryl Ford, followed by Eugene Smith.

So, Mr. Ford, if you want to come on up.

3275 BO

MR. FORD: My name is Darryl Ford. The last name is spelled F-O-R-D. And I live in Caldwell.

I'm for having the air -- the aircraft based in Boise. I -- I'm a retired quality assurance specialist in defense -- for defense contractors, and I worked on shuttle orbiter check out in Palmdale, California.

GE-3

And my father learned to fly in Tuskegee, Alabama during World War II. That's when it was the

Army Air Corps. And that is -- he worked on SR-71s, U-2s. F-117s are what he retired on at the Skunk Works in Palm Dale.

And at his funeral in 1999, the Tuskegee airmen were there to recite High Flight at his funeral, and they also did a flyover afterwards with the airplanes in Missing Man Formation. It was quite a touching thing.

To me, many of my friends -- me and my friends, when we hear a high-performance propulsion aircraft go overhead, we all usually make the same expression, that that's the sound of freedom, so let freedom ring. And I can think of no better way to -- when I hear the sound of freedom, to -- no better way to be reminded of how my tax dollars are spent.

I remember when the military effort after World War II was supported without any resistance, and everyone was eager to jump in and support our troops. That included what it took to make it safer for these brave Americans, our heroes.

They're here to protect the USA, and part of some of the progressive agendas disrupt normal morals of people and conquer from the then. Does this look familiar to anyone?

There are some people that move near

airports and then complain about the noise. They must be stupid, or they must have some other agenda in mind. Why would anyone want to support their children and grandchildren in the service by denying them the best place in the world to practice their -- and to perfect their abilities to protect us? They must be stupid or have some other agenda in mind.

The next time you hear a high-performance aircraft -- propulsion aircraft go overhead you can repeat after me, let freedom ring.

Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Mr. Eugene Smith.

MR. SMITH: Eugene Smith, S-M-I-T-H. **3276 BO**

Thank you, Colonel.

I would like to first start off with a little trip down memory lane. Back in the '50s, three miles due north of where we currently sit, I was growing up a young little boy on a fruit ranch. At that time there were no laws against high-performance aircraft breaking the sound barriers over built up areas, and it happened all of the time.

My 80-year-old grandmother, Mrs. Morgan Smith, used to comment at the time that it is just the sound of freedom. That's the first place I heard that phrase, and we heard it earlier again tonight.

Frankly, there is no truer statement on the face of the earth.

Next, let's jump ahead a few years to December -- to January of 1991. I got called up out of the Individual Ready Reserve as a scout to go over to Operation Desert Storm. For the first two or three weeks I hung out around a place called central command in a little town called Dhahran in Saudi Arabia.

I watched these gun camera movies as they came in for showing. We would then leave CENTCOM headquarters and go over to the end of the runway there at Dhahran Prince Aziz Airport, then we'd watch as the wild camels would come in right after sundown and come -- and start cavorting at the end of the runways.

The Air Force APs were out there with their machine guns, jeeps, and everything else they could get to try to chase these camels off those runways, but they wouldn't move, despite the fact that Tornados and Jaguars, combat loaded at full afterburner, were taking off and landing within feet over their heads.

The wildlife are not as environmentally impacted as a lot of people would have us think. And **NO-9**

those who are afraid of 80-decibel sound levels have never been around Caldwell High School when classes quit for the day and heard the boombox cars go by. Good heavens, that's worse than any A-10 could ever do, and I have a feeling, much worse than an F-35. NO-9 cont'd

Folks, I referred to these gun camera movies earlier. I'm going to add that into the briefing material. The fact is you don't get that kind of professionalism, that kind of accuracy, for free. You can't get it in a simulator.

You have to go out, you have to press that envelope, you have to train those troops, you have to get guys down on the ground who can call in those aircraft, and pinpoint strike those targets.

Without it, folks, we're sitting here in a pretty lame pool of nothing. And as we watch the news every day, it gets just a little bit closer and a little bit closer to when we're going to need those guys again.

Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Next I would like to invite up Juan Almanza, and Diane Roberts afterwards.

MR. ALMANZA: My name is Juan Almanza, A-L-M-A-N-Z-A. 3277 BO

To me, I'm -- I came here based on these

hearings, which I'm just finding out are only for the environmental purposes is what it's sounding like to me. And I have two kind of comments on this.

Just two days ago on Commondreams.org they had a big article about F-35s. And I would assume that anyone working in the field would be -- would try to be as acquainted as they could with all of that information coming out, as much as possible.

And I wasn't really expecting to speak here tonight, and I'm not speaking for any group. I'm speaking as a taxpayer, I'm speaking as an American -- indigenous American, and I'm also speaking as a veteran of the United States Army. My father served in the Air Force, and my brother in the Marines. We are from a military culture.

I'm grateful for the military and the troops and everything that they do, but I'm not really happy with our government, because if they did a good job watching our bankbook -- all of our bankbook, we wouldn't even be here in this room.

If you read that article on Common Dreams that came out two days ago, you would see what a fiasco and boondoggle the F-35s are, and what a drastic hole in our pockets it's creating -- even here in Boise -- socially and economically.

It's very unfortunate, here we've come this far, and we're now over $1 trillion spent on this one project alone, and this nation's $14 trillion in debt. 1 trillion of that is on this project alone. And from those nine countries that have been working with this -- as that gentleman said there -- in trying to do this, several of those countries have come out saying that they're not going to order this, and they don't trust these jets, and they're not working with them, and yet here we are thinking about bringing them to Boise, wasting the money, and messing our environment up more than it already is. DO-5

You know, people might think that loud jets are the sound of freedom. To me, that's the sound of a depression coming if we don't start paying attention to how much money we're spending on defense.

3278 BO

MS. ROBERTS: I'm Diane Roberts, R-O-B-E-R-T-S. And I'm one of the people that live in -- the stupid ones, because I live where the noise from the airport wakes me up every morning. I live in Boise.

All of Boise, it will be affected by the sound, which is eight times more than the F-35s -- or the -- whatever it is that they've got going now. I NO-1

don't know.

But I know that I want to challenge the Air Force. If they want to bring these things to the valley, bring them to the valley, let us listen to them, let us see what kind of wool is being pulled over our eyes. GE-2

Because not only are these military planes not well designed and a boondoggle, as Ben mentioned, but they're not good for our economy. We need to get something that will work. We do have people that can do things that will work.

And the sound of freedom, to me -- I grew up in Burley. I've fished with my father at Sublett, Minidoka Dam, all along the Snake River. The sound of freedom, to me, is not a sonic boom interrupting my day, it's not jets flying over; it's peace, it's quiet.

It's not -- they mentioned they're going to have nighttime things that they have to do, so we have to hear these big booming planes at night. This is no place for the -- this is nothing that we need in the valley, because we have the -- they've not mentioned the bird s of prey center in this whole study. This was taken from stuff that was ten years old that the birds of prey wasn't even there yet. NO-16 BI-9 BI-19

So who are we to know how -- I am an animal. I am affected by sound. I am grouchy if I don't get sleep at night because the planes are booming and going. The sound of freedom, to me, is not the United States trying to shove something that is unworkable down our throats just because we live in Idaho and we're the last outpost of civilization -- they can do anything they want to us, and the gov and all of those guys making money off of this -- have we followed the money trail for this one? SO-3

Who's making money off of this? It's not us. We're getting our ears hurt and our environment ruined because we have to consider having this in our place. We considered INEL, let's see, we considered the test down in Nevada, Big Mike, I think. We're all being affected by that still today.

So what does this mean about years of noise? We'll all be blooming idiots, and they think that we're already that; that's why they're putting it here.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Our next speak er is Jim Brown, and then after that I'd like to invite up Wendy --

MS. FURTADO: Furtado.

COLONEL HARNEY: -- Furtado. I should remember you from the other night.

So, Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Folks, I'm torn on whether to support this F-35 program or not. I get to thinking, on the one hand, we already lost our C-130s over in Gowen Field, so there went our tax base right out the window. If we bring the F-35 back in here we'll have a whole bunch more construction, which I've been in construction most all of my life, and that will help out the economy in this area. 3279 BO

As far as people worrying about the noise, ma'am, if you lived in Sublett, I don't know how you'd hear anything other than the wind blowing. Now, why you moved to Boise and built near an airport -- the airport was there before you got there.

And, sir, every dime spent on defense --

MS. ROBERTS: I think we're being attacked.

MR. BROWN: -- is a dime well spent.

MS. ROBERTS: I don't think that's fair to yell at us from the pulpit. That's not fair, and I don't take that -- I will not take that.

MR. BROWN: I don't really care what you think, ma'am.

MS. ROBERTS: I know that --
MR. BROWN: This is my comment, ma'am.
MS. ROBERTS: -- but you will not yell at me from your pulpit.
COURT REPORTER: Okay. Actually, you guys have got to stop. You can't --
MR. BROWN: Ma'am, this is my comment. It's my three minutes.
COURT REPORTER: -- talk at the same time. It's only one person --
MR. BROWN: And it's my turn, three minutes. I've made that point. That's as far as I'm going to take that.
MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.
MR. BROWN: But on the other hand, then I see -- when this whole construction comes in, then I see -- I get to thinking, you know, we've got a lot of people in Boise anymore that we didn't have 20, 30 years ago, what are we going to do, get a whole bunch more Californians in here with this construction going on?
Thank you.
MS. FURTADO: Hi. Wendy Furtado, F-U-R-T-A-D-O. I spoke the other day and did a terrible job, but wrote it down, as I did tonight. I

3280 BO

didn't come two nights ago intending to talk, but I felt I had to.
What's going on here, for the few of us that are not from this area -- and I think there's only about three of us -- we've heard a little more about the real facts, and so for those of you that weren't at those meetings, you might not realize how loud these things are.
I just scratched this out tonight. I wish to goodness I had had a couple of days to refer to Saveourvalley.org [sic]. Oh, please, all of you. Thank you.
And my original idea in coming here tonight was actually to finish what Monty Mericle had started but could not get out in three minutes. Again, please refer to Saveourvalley.org [sic]. I'd really appreciate that.
So just -- you know, again, these things are louder than you think, even for those of you that are familiar with the loudest of loud planes that we've ever had available before. I'm just not an educated person, so I wish you would all go to that website.
But I do know a few things. The number is more like 10,000 homes will be uninhabitable for residential use, or incompatible. I do know that I

NO-1

LU-6

called all of the news organizations in my phonebook, including all of the newspapers that would pick up. One organization, one news -- Channel 2 News -- no. Sorry. It was Channel 7 News was aware, and I didn't think they did a very good job of reporting what they partially heard.

No other agency was aware, which kind of lets you know how many people in Idaho are aware of this mess. I personally would encourage a flyover for a week before this decision is made using the 72 planes --

MR. FORD: Let freedom ring.

MS. FURTADO: -- up and down overhead. We want to hear if we can hear them when they're up high when we are out at the Snake River, when we are in Boise, with them echoing off of the mountains.

GE-2

I also have -- I'm going to tell you this because I thought of it just now. I do have concerns about the carbon monoxide levels and my child and the rest of our children. With our inversions, we don't need any more carbon monoxide. This is going to be bad stuff. It causes brain damage, actually.

AQ-11

MR. BROWN: (Inaudible.)

MS. FURTADO: You're a sweetheart --

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MS. FURTADO: -- and even more uneducated than I (laughter).

MR. BROWN: Anytime I want to --

COURT REPORTER: Hey, you guys, I can't take comments from the audience as well. Only from the speaker, please.

MS. FURTADO: It is distracting.

MR. BROWN: You didn't tell them that, though.

MS. FURTADO: And I already had scratch here, because I haven't had the time in life. Since I got on board with this two days ago, I simply haven't. I was locked out of my car most of today, and I really wanted to come here with some good information. It's all scratched out. I really am thrown off now because of your comment.

Thank you.

MR. FORD: Can you stick around? We need to talk to Jim over here on your noise level.

MS. FURTADO: I didn't know I'd be beat up or anything else tonight.

MR. FORD: I don't beat on women (inaudible).

MS. FURTADO: Yeah.

COLONEL HARNEY: I'm going to invite up our

last speaker, but I would just -- I appreciate the dialogue that's going on here, but I would ask everybody to respect the speakers who are coming up, let them speak for their three minutes. I think we'll have opportunities for some of you to come back and speak for another three minutes, but she can't take down the dialogue.

So our last speaker who's signed up is Andrea Blades, if you want to come on up. **3281 BO**

MS. BLADES: Can everybody hear me okay?

My name is Andrea Blades, B-L-A-D-E-S. I live in Boise, and out of interest in this process, I have attended all three of the U.S. Air Force hearings -- public hearings.

I have listened to comments, both in support and opposition to these ideas of locating the F-35 here in Boise. The vast majority has been deep concern and passionate opposition to this idea.

A particular comment about the importance of training our servicemen really stood out to me and got me thinking from a different angle. Why would anyone think it's a good idea to mix inexperienced pilots in training, unproven, expensive, high-performance jets and a large civilian population? **SA-7**

One of the few articles that were published in the Idaho Statesmen on February 2nd, 2012, titled, "F-35: a lesson why it's hard to kill a federal program," had some very concerning comments. And for the sake of time I'm going to clip these quotes very much -- very considerably.

The futurist fifth-generation jet fighter was built in a rush. The jet fighter is the most costly weapon system ever at 385 billion and rising.

"Despite criticism from defense secretaries, government investigators and powerful senators, the Pentagon still wants the Joint Strike Fighter.

"Thomas Donnelly, a defense analyst at the American Enterprise Institute...said the F-35 was being built on the fly. We've had to invent it and build it at the same time." And so we're going to take some technological risks, and we're going to keep building and fixing.

If I were a pilot in training, the risk of losing my own life and destroying a very expensive piece of equipment would be stressful enough, without adding the pressure of taking off and landing over schools full of innocent children and large quantities of civilian homes. **SA-1**

I would want -- if -- why would we want to

put our pilots, our young men and women, in a position of barely surviving a screw up or a mechanical malfunction and then also being personally responsible for the lives of hundreds of kids in schools or the lives of several homeowners asleep in their beds. Isn't that why we go to war in the first place, to protect our way of life, to keep our homeland safe, to protect our loved ones and our children from threats of evil? **SA-1 cont'd**

To me, this proposal seems more like politicians trying to influence something they know nothing about then any good sense. And I say, let's support the recommendations of our knowledgeable servicemen who have recommended locating this base where they say it belongs, in Luke Air Force Base in Arizona. **GE-4**

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay. So as I mentioned before, the hearing is scheduled to end at 8:00 p.m., and we've heard from everyone who's signed up, so is there anyone who's already spoken or someone else who hasn't spoken that would like to come up and speak for three minutes?

And just let me know.

MR. BROWN: Could I bring this gentleman up

here and explain some of that sound quality that we were seeing on the screen there, ask him a question about it so everybody up here --

COLONEL HARNEY: What I -- what I would ask if -- this is the comment period.

MR. BROWN: That's what I'm doing is commenting on that.

COLONEL HARNEY: Well, it's not a question-answer session, and so I'm going to say that if you want to speak with him, you can do that when we're done. They'll be available to talk to you.

So is there anyone else who would like to come up and make a public comment for the three minutes period?

Come on up, sir.

MS. TURNER: What's your name, sir? **3282 BO**

MR. BIRCH: My name is Kenneth Birch. It's B-I-R-C-H.

MS. TURNER: Just one moment, please, sir.

MR. BIRCH: I've stood here and listened to the comments of most of you people. A little background is I spent 40 years in the Air Force as a ground pounder in the Air Force keeping these aircraft flying. I've also directed the maintenance on them. I've listened to these aircraft --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

MR. BIRCH: Pardon?

COURT REPORTER: Could you repeat that last part?

MR. BIRCH: I have listened to these aircraft. I've listened to worse than what this 130 -- this A-35 [sic] is ever going to put out. But my comment is -- it's to the people that have been up here that have talked about Boise. This area was -- this meeting was for the people that lived in this area. NO-9

If you've got a problem with it, then do it in your part of the country, which you did in the last two meetings. Let us do our comments down here about what it will impact us.

These aircraft and these people that fly them -- you say inexperienced pilots. There is no inexperienced pilot that gets in one of these aircraft. Not a one, believe me. I do the maintenance on them, I've seen them, I've talked to them, I've talked to the ones here tonight.

I've been around experimental aircraft. This is not a time to be talking about it, not with the world situation we have today. You say, okay,

this electronics is out of place. Wrong. They've got people out there everyday that are destroying our military electronic systems, because our guys have to reestablish new systems every single day. Not weeks, not months, not years. It's everyday. It's money well spent.

Do you think they don't plan this? I've been in on the planning of some of this stuff at times. Very small part. Put my input in and went on my way. These guys take their lives every time they climb into an aircraft.

And it doesn't have to be a new experimental aircraft. It can be today with a very old aircraft. Something can happen to one of these aircraft at any moment. So can your car -- can happen every moment.

You're out there saying, well, they're spending all of this money on the new one. Take a look at your car and what it costs now. That's a comparison. Your car has as much electronics in it as is in that aircraft, and if it wasn't for that aircraft, you wouldn't have that car, because that's where that technology came from.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Lin Paporello.

3283 BO

MS. PAPORELLO: Paporello.

COLONEL HARNEY: Paporello. Sorry.

MS. PAPORELLO: P-A-P-O-R-E-L-L-O. And it's L-I-N, Lin.

Hi. I know this is to be spoken from the EIS Draft, and so I'm trying to stay right with the draft. I have some questions that I would like to have clarified on the draft.

One of them is that I happened to read -- I did read all 160 pages of this, and I'm telling you it is gruesome. I've never read anything so hard in my whole life. So I may not understand it, because it's very difficult.

But what I'd like to question about is on page, I think it was, 150. It also talks about the proposed bed down of the Royal Saudi Air Force units to be either at Mountain Home or at Gowen Air Force Base.

And it states that this would also add additional, to the three -- we would now have four squadrons flying out in -- a lot of it out in this area, because you're underneath the saddle and several other places.

But the takeoff would be -- a lot more takeoffs going on out of Gowen Air Force Base with

touchdowns out at Mountain Home and out here. And it's a great -- it's great. The guys get to practice. I'm not for them not practicing.

My question is: How many other royal Air Force bases from other countries are we planning on allowing to come in and we're going to also train them over our populous? So that would be one question I would like to have explained to me.

DO-61

And the other one would be the -- and they do say that, oh, there will be some -- there will be perceptible change in noise level. Not -- and it would not tend to reduce noise to quiet levels. I love how they word some of this stuff so it makes it very difficult.

Now they talk about the negligible parts of the air quality. Everybody has spoken so far at 100 tons per year that they said would be -- that's our standard. Well, somewhere around there there's been a new major -- for new major thresholds that they raised it to 250 tons of pollution in the atmosphere. And the F-35's emissions are at 335 tons a year, which would increase annually.

AQ-3

So that would be my other question is how -- how we can have this elevating -- you know, you can't breathe, but now you can breathe. You can breathe

here. Oh, you can't breathe. Oh, you can breathe here. And this elevation of stuff. AQ-3 cont'd

So that would be my questions that I would like to have corrected from the ESI Draft [sic].

Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Would anybody else like to come up?

3279 BO

MR. BROWN: Yeah, can I?

COLONEL HARNEY: Mr. Brown; right?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)

MR. BROWN: Somewhere it said that if we had 24 aircraft in here, or whatever -- the case scenario B --

MS. TURNER: Can you hear him okay?

Can you use the microphone, sir?

MR. BROWN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. TURNER: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: I was trying to get there to Jim, too. I question the noise level change between the first aircraft that takes off and the 10,000th aircraft that takes off. NO-89

You're saying that the noise level changes quite a bit, but the problem is, when you get off

that runway, you've got -- you've got an air traffic spot you've got to fly, correct, gentlemen?

In other words, the first aircraft can't take off and go up to 30,000 feet within a mile, the next aircraft he can't hang down low and out a mile, he can't be 200 feet above the ground; right?

Help me out here. So --

COLONEL NOLAN: We can talk more afterwards. We can't answer questions right now. As soon as the comment period is over with we can.

MR. BROWN: Well, okay. I question that, then, because they've got to fly the same corridor. The first pilot that takes off, and the 100th pilot that takes off have got to be in that same corridor, so that noise level cannot change for length. NO-89 cont'd

So how does it -- how does it impact 9,000, almost 10,000 families, as opposed to the Case Scenario B1, which is 20 aircraft -- 24 aircraft. Whatever. It's got to be the same. It can't change. There's no way it can change, because one pilot can't fly 200 feet off the ground after he's out there two miles. They shut him down. They shut the base down.

So what I'm saying is every aircraft that takes off from there at the same noise level has got to go up to the same place in that air -- the

airspace out there. You can't just fly anywhere you want taking off and landing from that air base. That's my question. I disagree with the noise level. NO-89 cont'd

Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay. Anybody else that wanted to come up and speak?

Okay. Ms. Wendy -- say your name again.

MS. FURTADO: Furtado. 3280 BO

COLONEL HARNEY: Wendy Furtado.

MS. FURTADO: Sorry. Again, just scratch here.

And I don't have to spell my name; right?

Okay. I would have appreciated -- and I would still appreciate -- if those homes we're referring to, the 10,000 homes that will be uninhabitable for residential use, or incompatible, would be notified in mail before they could possibly be allowed to make the final decision, and have plenty of time -- more than 30 days, because people work and get very busy, as I've found in this last couple of days, that they can't get to things like this or write. So that was one point. NP-20

Another point would be, again, I'd like to see more study on the impacts of our wildlife. I really do like to get out there. And I see wildlife BI-9

of all kinds that I can think of that I've enjoyed for many years, and I really do believe they'll be impacted greatly. These planes are louder than you think. You need to go home to the website and look it up. It will help. Yeah. BI-9 cont'd

Have you heard an F-35?

MR. BROWN: (Shakes head.)

MS. FURTADO: Okay. That's right. I won't talk to you, sir, because that's not what I'm supposed to be doing here. I forgot.

I just wish I had been more organized, to say the least, because there were so many more things that could have been said. And I just wish all the people of Idaho had been truly notified to be at -- here at this last hearing. I mean, really, I've talked to a few people in these last three days since I got on board, no one knows. No one knows. NP-14

Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Sir, would you like to come up and speak?

MR. HOADLEY: Yes. 3284 BO

COLONEL HARNEY: I've seen some people who've come in. Did anyone of the new folks want to provide a public comment?

MR. HOADLEY: I really --

COLONEL HARNEY: Please state your name.

MR. HOADLEY: Okay. I'm David Hoadley. I live right on the river. You're talking about the -- the noise to the wildlife. I am neither pro or con on this, but do you want to take the boats off the river?

I -- I live on the river. When the boats go up the river, the ducks all take off. So when it comes to disturbing the wildlife, there's a lot of things that disturb the wildlife, but they come back. But those boats that take off -- the jet boats that go off the river -- I say I live right on the river. I know what kind of reaction takes place when there is any noise. **BI-4**

COLONEL HARNEY: Thank you for your comments.

Sean Short.

MR. SHORT: I -- I live out here in Marsing, and so I guarantee you when I see the F-35s flying overhead and hear them flying over my head, there's going to be a big sense of pride in my heart. And -- and knowing the price of freedom. **3285 BO**

And I've been a big supporter of the F-35 coming to Boise. I think it's a great thing for our economy -- or at least I did. But I do have some

friends in the particular impact zone here around the airport that have a little different perspective, but it's -- and that opened my eyes a little bit to the impact on them and their housing prices and their way of life there in their homes. And there's a statement here that I'd like to read from him.

It says, for the record, I am opposed to the basing of the F-35A of any configuration and any mission at Boise Air Terminal/Air Guard Station Gowen Field -- **GE-4**

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can you slow down a little bit?

MR. SHORT: Yeah. It is my opinion the F-35 is a poor match with the facility and is incompatible and unsuitable for the surrounding residential, as well as, commercial establishments. **NO-37**

I find the draft impact statement lacking, embarrassing, and negligent. The more I study it, I find it infuriating as well. I have a bachelor's of science. Had I submitted any paper resembling this impact statement to one of my research and method professors, I would have received a D, at best, and would likely have been counseled to consult with my advisor as to whether I'd selected the right major. God help me if I'd used it in my senior paper. **NP-13**

The impact statement shows the contour largely in line with the airstrips. The impact statement is incomplete in its disclosure, as it does not show the noise impact zone for the military landing patterns for an eastward approach -- **NO-53**

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can you slow down?

MR. SHORT: Yeah -- which is far south over the subdivisions which include the intersections of Lake Hazel and Maple Grove. It lacks any impact of a proposed alternate airstrip south of Gowen Road. **DO-35**

The noise contour purposely stops short at the computer-modeled 65 decibel zone that we see here. There also needs to be contours for every three decibels within that zone, as sound increases, as well as contours for every three decibels outside that zone, as sound diminishes. **NO-4**

Why three decibels? Because every three decibels equals a double in actual volume. Just because you don't live in that computer-modeled 65 decibel zone doesn't mean you have no argument or right for concerns. 63 decibels will adversely affect your health and quality of life. **NO-6**

And private readings of the F-35 has -- has shown 95 to 106 decibels. Noise is measurable and **NO-54**

can be specifically targeted, scaled, and quantified. Real-life decibels need measured in all takeoff and landing patterns for existing and proposed runways and measured by a -- and measured by a neutral contractor agreed upon by the Air Force and the affected residents and businesses. **NO-54 cont'd**

The results need combined with a door-to-door census and survey of affected residents and businesses. Proponents say Gowen has had a military history since World War II. Proponents would say we need to use the F-4s as recently as 1996. This is true. **NO-37**

However, what wasn't here are the thousands of houses, schools, churches, and businesses that are now here. The F-4 was not a loud -- not as loud as the F-35. If planning and zoning had plans for future fighters to be added to Gowen Field, they never should have zoned the areas for residential development. **GE-13**

Proponents will comment that what you're hearing is the sound of freedom. The sound of freedom is the listening to peoples' comments as they voice their opinions and concerns as to whether an aircraft is suited to their environment.

The sound of freedom is what we look for --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.

MR. SHORT: Oh, thank you. He is a veteran of ten years and has lived on air -- on the airfield bases and has -- and is a very proud veteran, but he is impacted by the levels of this F-35.

So thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Thank you, sir.

Any further comments? Lin -- or Andrea. I'm sorry.

3281 BO

MS. BLADES: Andrea Blades, B-L-A-D-E-S.

I would just like to take a minute to expand on Wendy Olson's [sic] comments about coverage for The Statesmen and people not knowing about this.

I did a little research on that. Researching Idaho Statesmen -- I just focused on that -- and there's actually only been four articles that have been printed in the Idaho Statesmen since April 2011 about this particular topic. And considering this impacts the entire valley, that sure isn't a lot said over almost a year.

GE-13

The articles that were in there -- the four articles and four comments to the editor -- as a matter of fact, two articles didn't even mention the fact that the F-35s were being put in Boise or there was a plan proposed to put them here.

Two articles said that Idaho had been passed over for a potential location. And then the other four letters to the editor were very strong opposition to placing it here.

We have had two meetings before this one. And the first one, Monday night, had almost 100 people at it, I would say. The second one had probably almost 400. The majority of the comments were very passionately against the placement of these planes.

And, interestingly, there has not been a word in the Idaho Statesmen about that. The only public posting that there was about these meetings was actually on February 14th. And it was a very short statement that basically just said that the U.S. Air Force is asking the public to weigh in on potential future training at Gowen Field and Mountain Home. It would be the base for the next-generation F-35 jet fighter. And then it said, find information and Draft Environmental Impact Statement at, and it listed the website, and then it listed the sessions.

GE-13 cont'd

There was absolutely nothing said about the negative impact that was identified in that Environmental Impact Statement. Not a word.

That's all.

MS. FURTADO: Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Anyone else want to come up?

Sir?

MR. BROWN: Me. Sorry for taking up all of the time here.

COLONEL HARNEY: If you could state your name again.

3279 BO

MR. BROWN: Jim Brown, B-R-O-W-N.

Talking about wildlife impact, me and my three sons and one grandson, three, four years ago, I don't know which, we were out hunting, and guess where we were? Bruneau Canyon. We were probably a mile and a half from the training range at -- out of Mountain Home there.

That night they were flying night ops. Those A-10s kept us up half the night. We all just felt so much pride in it. But guess what? The next morning after all of the noise and all of the aircraft flew over, we limited out -- we limited out on our four deer. We limited out on four deer that after -- after the night ops flying that night.

So as far as the wildlife impact, that's a bunch of crock. BI-9

Thank you.

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay. Anyone else want to come up? If not, what we'll do is we'll recess the hearing, and the court reporter and I will remain here until eight o'clock. And if before that time anybody wants to make a public oral comment, just let us know, and we will reopen the hearing and allow you the opportunity to do that. So currently, then, we're in recess.

And during that time if you have questions for the representatives, this might be a good opportunity to do that.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, a break was taken from 7:24 p.m. to 7:52 p.m.)

COLONEL HARNEY: Okay. Why don't you go ahead and state your name and then spell your last name.

3286 BO

MR. MORTON: I'm Mark Morton, M-O-R-T-O-N. I'm from Nyssa, Oregon. And in 1966 I joined the Air National Guard, the 124th Fighter Squadron. I got out in 1973.

The people that were there at that time were number one in the nation as a fighter squadron and --

COURT REPORTER: You know what, can we wait for one second?

(Whereupon, there was a brief pause in the proceedings.)

COLONEL HARNEY: I think they're trying to be quieter now, so go ahead.

MR. MORTON: At that time there was no housing behind the airbase, and the people that have purchased houses and have built around the airbase knew the airbase was there, and they knew the -- the sound of the airbase and what the jets would make.

I see no problem with them, as they knew what they bought when they purchased the properties. I feel that those people are in the wrong place. If they didn't like what they bought, they shouldn't have bought it.

World War II happened because of a problem. That problem can come back to haunt us now. I think the people had better respect the planes and the Air Force where it's at, because those planes can deter a world war again from where they're at on the coast.

COURT REPORTER: "From where they're at on the coast"?

COLONEL HARNEY: Uh-huh.

MR. MORTON: To the coast. I feel that we have to keep our Air Force in updated planes, and those functions that need to be updated at all times

GE-3

for a deterrent.

GE-3 cont'd

I think that's all I need to say. Thank you for coming here.

COLONEL HARNEY: You're very welcome.

Sir, could I ask you to fill out that card with your name, and then we'll give that to them to put in the record.

Thank you for your comment.

COURT REPORTER: Would the Air Force like to order the original transcripts for February 27th, February 28th, and February 29th, 2012?

MS. TURNER: Yes.

COLONEL HARNEY: The hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 7:58 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Andrea L. Check , do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 7th day of March , 2012 .

Andrea L. Check

July 20, 2016

Andrea L. Check — Commission Expiration

This page intentionally left blank.

D.9 Sample of the F-35A Luke Forward Campaign E-Postcard

Series 4000 through 12311

From:
Sent: Date
To: AETC/A7P Workflow
Subject: Support for Luke AFB from Name

HQ AETC/A7CPP,
Attn: David Martin, Air Force Contractor and Kim Fornof
266 F Street West, Bldg. 901
Randolph AFB, TX 78150-4319

Dear Mr. Martin and Ms Fornof:

Luke Air Force Base has served a vital role for the U.S. Air Force for seventy years. As the world's largest fighter wing and the finest training base in the world, Luke is the logical location as a training site for the F-35 mission. Arizona has the ideal climate, land, airspace, training ranges and facilities needed to fly the F-35.

Luke Air Force Base enjoys unconditional community support from Arizonans like me. In fact, Arizona is viewed as a model for proactively and successfully securing statewide legislation that ensures responsible land-use planning around the state's military institutions to ensure that development is compatible with the installation's mission. Luke also possesses the ability to house up to six squadrons of F-35's along with a network of auxiliary fields which are of critical importance to pilot training. Finally, its management and operation of Barry M. Goldwater Range, provides pilots with year round, state-of-the-art training capabilities and a realistic training environment. **GE-3**

These are just a few of the many reasons why I encourage the Record of Decision to support the Air Force recommendation of Luke Air Force Base as the future home to the F-35 training mission.

Sincerely,
Name
City, State, Zip
e-mail address

This page intentionally left blank.

D.10 Response to Comments

The following comment codes are used in the preparation of the Comment Response Matrix provided in Table D.10–1.

AM = Airspace Management	GE = General	PN = Purpose and Need
AQ = Air Quality	IN = Infrastructure	SA = Safety
BI = Biological Resources	LU = Land Use and Recreation	SO = Socioeconomics
CM = Cumulative	NA = Native American	SW = Soils and Water Resources
CU = Cultural Resources	NO = Noise	TN = Transportation
DO = Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives	NP = National Environmental Policy Act	
EJ = Environmental Justice		

This page intentionally left blank.

Table D.10–1.Comment and Response Matrix

AM=Airspace Management			
Code	***Letter Number***	***Description***	***Response***
AM-1	1403	The EIS needs to give the reader a better description of how often aircraft are approaching and departing Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 during the periods when the airfield is actually used.	Table LU 2.2–4 in Section LU 2.2.1 Airspace and Auxiliary Airfield Use in the EIS provides the total number of annual airfield operations at Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1. As noted in LU 3.1.2.1 Airspace Affected Environment, Auxiliary Airfields, Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 is only used for instrument training. Therefore, each sortie flown at Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 would have an arrival and a departure. The timing and frequency of this Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 training would vary with scheduling of other daily mission activities.
AM-2	1442, 1540, 1689, 1737, 1758, 1760, 1790, 1795, 1801, 1915, 1938, 1947, 1971, 1994, A1146, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1211, 2121, 2128, 2189, 2190, 3242	Concern about potential airspace conflict or collision with commercial air traffic	The Federal Aviation Administration monitors flight activity in the immediate vicinity of Military Operations Areas, and low altitude Restricted Areas and all flight traffic, both military and civilian, above FL 180 (18,000 feet mean sea level) is required to be under positive radar control. The F-35A would use the same basic patterns while operating in the local base area and the same routings to and from the various military training areas that previous generations of fighters have used. Those routing and altitudes have proven effective in reducing exposure to possible conflict scenarios. Additionally, standard Air Force policy is for all of their aircraft to use Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and air traffic control facilities to the maximum extent practical to further enhance safety.
AM-3	1440, 1885, 1886, 2184, 3016, 3056	What assurances do we have that the F-35A pilots will adhere to flight regulations (designated flight paths, buffers, elevation, speed, power settings, etc.), especially since current uses do not appear to be adhering to these regulations.	The United States Air Force requires all aircrew members to comply with flight regulations. If a complaint is received by a base alleging that an aircraft was being operated in apparent violation of regulations, that base will investigate the allegation and take appropriate disciplinary action should the allegation prove to be true.
AM-4	1759, 1900, 1985, A1062, A1146, 3145	Tucson International Airport and Davis-Monthan AFB are less than the required 5-mile distance from each other. This is not addressed in the EIS.	Refer to the second paragraph of Section TU 3.1.1.1 of the EIS for an explanation of the combined Class C airspace associated with both Tucson International Airport and Davis-Monthan AFB. No minimum distance requirement for separation of airports is specified within CFR §14, Part 77, “Safe, Efficient, Use, and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace” or Part 139, “Certification of Airports”.
AM-5	1793, 2199	If we own the land, why don't we own the air space above the land and what right does the Air Force have to fly over private property? What makes the Air Force think it can control (or make uninhabitable by virtue of noise) land it does not own?	Section 3.1.1 (Regulatory Setting) of the EIS cites the U.S. Code and Congressional direction that charges the Federal Aviation Administration with responsibility for managing all navigable airspace. While this does not provide for ownership of the airspace overlying public or private lands, management of this airspace does consider, as appropriate, those conditions where flight restrictions or other measures may be needed for avoidance of obstacles and other sensitive land use areas. This clarification has been added to Section 3.1.1 of the Final EIS.

AM=Airspace Management			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
AM-6	2105	Is local airspace appropriate for F-35 training?	Chapter TU 2.2 of the EIS states the results of an analysis of the local and regional airspace currently used by the Tucson ANG, and its suitability for use to fulfill the requirements of the F-35A training mission is demonstrated by the conclusion that no additional airspace would be required meet those training needs.
AM-7	2092	The Federal Aviation Administration does not anticipate any requests for new or modifications of airspace as a part of the Proposed Action.	Thank you for the Federal Aviation Administration's review. As noted in Sections TU 2.2, BO 2.2, HO 2.2, and LU 2.2 of the EIS no additional airspace would be required to meet training needs.
AM-8	2092	The Federal Aviation Administration encourages collaboration with local air traffic control facilities to determine the feasibility of conducting airspace operations in any of the proposed areas. If any additional airspace is required, supplemental environmental analysis will be required in order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.	The Federal Aviation Administration is a cooperating agency on this EIS and contact with local and regional air traffic control facilities has been ongoing. As stated in Sections TU 2.2, BO 2.2, HO 2.2, and LU 2.2 of the EIS, no additional airspace would be needed to meet training needs.
AM-9	2136	Overflights of Saguaro National Park and particularly overflights of Designated Wilderness within the park are a concern for the National Park Service. Will there be methods to ensure overflights do not occur? Would the F-35s fly in areas and use the same flight tracks (which are not identified in the section) that are currently used by F-16s and A-10s? Aircraft currently often fly in proximity to the park, causing impact to the natural quiet.	Any restrictions that are currently in place or procedures regarding avoidance areas would not change. F-35As would use basically the same flight tracks that are currently in use, and would adhere to those currently established flight restrictions. The proposed action does not include any changes to airspace or avoidance areas. The Air Force would continue to follow existing agreements with the National Park Service.
AM-10	1913, 2151	By the Air Force's own admission, "Under Scenario T3, the projected annual military airfield operations would exceed the maximum number allowed as per agreement with the Tucson Airport Authority" (Executive Summary, p. 71). What is the nature of this agreement and what factors go into determining the maximum number of military airfield operations at a civilian airport? What concerns are represented by the restrictions?	As mentioned in Section TU 3.1.1.1 of the EIS, the current agreement, was executed in 1994. The maximum number of operations was mutually arrived at during negotiations for the agreement to address concerns regarding airfield noise. The agreement would have to be renegotiated to accommodate Scenario T3.

AM=Airspace Management			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
AM-11	3007	Don't understand the need to transit from Military Operations Area to Military Operations Area supersonically.	The contiguous boundaries of the Holloman Military Operations Areas and their overlying Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspaces and the altitudes at which supersonic flight is authorized within this airspace complex allows the simultaneous scheduling and use of multiple areas to more effectively conduct flight training activities. This includes those maneuvers where supersonic flights may also be conducted within multiple areas during the same mission profile. There is no transit time from one to the other.
AM-12	2136	What existing restrictions are there on supersonic and subsonic flight? Are there existing flight restrictions over National Park Service units? If so, can agreements be amended to more adequately reflect current conditions? If not, can agreements be put into place for flight restrictions over National Park Service units?	Overflight restrictions over some National Park Service units do exist. The Air Force would continue to follow existing agreements with the National Park Service. Authorization for supersonic operations is obtained through a waiver to the applicable Air Force Instruction. Each waiver is specific to an area and specifies such things as the horizontal and vertical boundaries of the area, allowable times of day (if restricted), number of operations, and may include other operational restrictions.
AM-13	2136	Since the National Park Service does not have access to the current version of the AP/1B, it would be appreciated if the Air Force could provide the Natural Sounds and Night Skies Division of National Park Service a copy of avoidance measures (where they exist) for all National Park Service units listed in the Draft EIS (including Military Operations Areas and Military Training Routes). Please also confirm if these operating restrictions are still in effect and would continue for F-35 training.	The proposed action does not include any changes to airspace or avoidance areas. The Air Force would continue to follow existing agreements with the National Park Service.
AM-14	2136	On Page 3-2 (Airspace Management), should Class B Airspace be mentioned? It is not addressed in this section/list.	As noted in Section 3.1.1, only those airspace units that related to the EIS alternatives were defined in this section to help minimize the length of the EIS.
AM-15	2200, 3017	Is there a letter of agreement between Holloman AFB, White Sands Missile Range, and the Federal Aviation Administration? It doesn't appear to be referenced in the Draft EIS.	No. The Letter of Agreement in question formally defines the Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace (ATCAAs) and outlines Federal Aviation Administration and agency roles/responsibilities for coordinating the daily activation of all airspaces in this military training complex. The proposed F-35A basing does not involve any changes to the existing airspace structure nor would it likely affect the coordination procedures defined in this Letter. As needed, such procedural changes would be as mutually agreed upon by the involved agencies. Therefore, there was no specific need to cite this Letter in the EIS.

AM=Airspace Management			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
AM-16	2200	An Environmental Assessment for the F-22 indicated that the majority of training operations and supersonic flights would occur in Restricted airspace (R-5107 and R-5103), but in reality, for the past four years, the majority of F-22 operations have been over populated areas, not in Restricted airspace. Numerous telephone conversations with the Federal Aviation Administration, Holloman AFB Base Operations, and White Sands Missile Range have consistently resulted in the same answer: range missions have priority over Holloman Training operations. With an increase in the overall number of aircraft assigned to Holloman AFB, this will only increase the problem of the scheduling range time conflicts.	As noted in Section HO 3.1.2.2 of the EIS, while internal DoD scheduling challenges would be expected to increase as a result of the proposed F-35A training operations, scheduling processes are currently being implemented to improve coordination of airspace scheduling and ATC systems would continue to provide a safe training environment and to maintain separation from civil air traffic operations.
AM-17	2200	Part of the Federal Aviation Administration's responsibility as the controlling agency is to review proposed actions, Auxiliary Airfields, and its impact on the safety of the aviation community as well as the public. I find no documentation that suggests that any Federal Aviation Administration review has taken place.	As stated in the Preface to this document "The Federal Aviation Administration and the U.S. Marine Corps (USMC) are cooperating agencies, as defined in Title 40 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 1508.5". The Federal Aviation Administration has reviewed the proposed alternatives and provided inputs in the early stages of the EIS, as well as during the public comment period. The interests and concerns have been incorporated, as appropriate, into the EIS and are part of the administrative record for this EIS.
AM-18	2200	The EIS doesn't include Federal Aviation Administration documents regarding waivers, or letters of agreement for the F-35. Since the EIS states that the waivers are aircraft specific, it should document the F-35 waiver as well as waivers and letters of agreement for other aircraft that are currently operating out of Holloman AFB, including those for the F-22, F-16, Predator and Reaper, FQ-4, F-4C, QF-16 Drone, F-15E, F-4, OH-58D, and any other aircraft that is training, testing, and or using military weapons, including sonic booms, as part of its training.	Any internal or interagency waivers/agreements that may be required for the F-35A or other aircraft types were not addressed or referenced in the EIS if they had no specific bearing or impact on the assessed resource areas. A waiver is required for those aircraft types conducting supersonic operations and those aircraft were included in the Chapter 4 Noise analyses for each basing location along with the projected F-35A operations, which would also require such waiver coverage.

AM=Airspace Management			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
AM-19	2200	The Draft EIS states that data is not always maintained for Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspaces (ATCAAs). Why is data not maintained for these areas since its airspace over private and public lands?	Federal Aviation Administration Order JO7400.2J, Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters, requires the military to submit annual utilization reports for Restricted Area and Military Operations Areas to assist in managing its Special Use Airspace program. While this report includes the name and altitudes of any associated Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace (ATCAA) that may extend above the Special Use Airspace (SUA) (18,000 feet MSL and above), their utilization is not tracked/reported in most cases due to their purpose and the fact that ATCAA operations do not normally exceed the underlying SUA operations.
AM-20	A1093	Is a Military Training Route the same as a flight path? Are the neighbors to the northwest of Davis-Monthan AFB on a Military Training Route?	As defined in Section 2.4.4 of the EIS, Military Training Routes are approved training corridors where military aircraft can operate at low altitudes and high airspeeds while conducting training operations along these routes whereas a flight path is a course flown by any aircraft while navigating to/from/between airports at various altitudes/airspeeds. As shown in Figure TU 2.2–1 of the EIS, no Military Training Routes are located within the general vicinity of the city of Tucson or Davis-Monthan Air Force Base; therefore, any aircraft observed operating at lower altitudes within this region are likely operating along flights paths to/from Davis-Monthan AFB or the Tucson International Airport.

AQ=Air Quality			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
AQ-1	1004, 1278, 1300, 1303, 1469, 1484, 1485, 1486, 1557, 1560, 1568, 1639, 1640, 1643, 1656, 1660, 1685, 1689, 1698, 1758, 1760, 1774, 1776, 1790, 1795, 1799, 1801, 1809, 1814, 1822, 1853, 1865, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1893, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1942, 1972, 1984, 1986, A1005, A1014, A1022, A1026, A1042, A1048, A1054, A1064, A1067, A1069, A1076,	F-35A would increase pollution and affect quality of life.	**Boise AGS Project Region:** The EIS discloses that the Boise AGS project region in the past experienced air quality levels that exceeded the carbon monoxide (CO) and respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}) national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and that current maximum summertime ozone (O3) concentrations approach the level of its NAAQS. Under the maximum F-35A basing scenario for Boise (72 F-35As), this action would increase emissions that would not exceed one percent of the total emissions generated by Ada County in 2008 for any air pollutant. Most of the proposed emissions would occur from F-35A aircraft that land and take-off within the Boise AGS airspace and therefore across a wide area and depth of atmosphere. As a result, these emissions would not produce substantial impacts in a localized area nor contribute to an exceedance of a NAAQS. In addition, emissions generated from F-35A aircraft along flight paths would result in lower ground-level impacts compared to those that would occur near the Boise AGS. The NAAQS define maximum acceptable pollutant concentrations that are based upon health effects to all member of the public, including the more sensitive members, such as children. As a result, the maximum F-35A basing scenario at Boise would produce less than significant health impacts to the public. Section BO 3.3.2.2 of the EIS presents an analysis

AQ=Air Quality			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1077, A1095, A1120, A1121, A1128, A1137, A1162, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1193, A1198, A1206, A1211, A1217, A1234, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, 2028, 2066, 2107, 2163, 2164, 2188, 2199, 2200, 2207, 3016, 3243, 3253, 3259, 3265		which demonstrates that proposed F-35A training flights within the Boise AGS project region would produce less than significant air quality impacts to pristine Federal Class I Areas (such as the Jarbidge Wilderness Area). The EIS presents estimates of carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions generated by the proposed F-35A activities. However, as stated on Page 3–13 of the EIS, the potential effects of GHG emissions from the Proposed Action are by nature global. Given the global nature of climate change and the current state of the science, it is not useful at this time to attempt to link the emissions quantified for local actions to any specific climatological change or resulting environmental impact. **Holloman AFB Project Region:** Section HO 3.3 of the EIS demonstrates that none of the F-35A basing scenarios at Holloman AFB would produce emissions that would contribute to an exceedance of a NAAQS. As a result, the F-35A basing scenarios at Holloman AFB would produce less than significant air quality impacts. **Luke AFB Project Region:** Section LU 3.3 of the EIS demonstrates that replacement of the F-16 aircraft currently based at Luke AFB with the proposed F-35A aircraft would result in a net reduction in emissions for all F-35A basing scenarios. As a result, the F-35A basing scenarios at Luke AFB would produce less than significant air quality impacts. It is expected that none of the F-35A basing scenarios at Luke AFB would substantially increase the incidence of contrails within the project region. **Tucson Project Region:** The EIS discloses that the Tucson AGS project region in the past experienced air quality levels that exceeded the CO NAAQS. Section TU 3.3 of the EIS demonstrates that all of the F-35A basing scenarios at the Tucson AGS would produce emissions that would not contribute to an exceedance of a NAAQS. As a result, the F-35A basing scenarios at Tucson AGS would produce less than significant air quality and health impacts. Since none of the F-35A basing scenarios would produce emissions that would contribute to an exceedance of a NAAQS, these actions also would produce less than significant cumulative air quality impacts. Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) include air pollutants that can produce serious illnesses or increased mortality, even in low concentrations. HAPs are compounds that have no established federal ambient standards, but they may have significance thresholds established by some states and are typically evaluated for potential chronic inhalation and cancer risks. The effect of HAPs on sensitive members of the population is a special concern. Sensitive receptor groups include children, the elderly, and the acutely and chronically ill. The locations of these groups include residences, schools, playgrounds, and hospitals. Emissions of HAPs occur from fossil-fuel combustion, chemical and industrial processes and sources such as dry cleaners, printing

AQ=Air Quality			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			plants, gasoline fumes, and motor vehicles. HAPs are subsets of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and PM_{10} emissions. The data in Table TU 3.3–6 show that due to the replacement of the F-16 aircraft currently based at Tucson AGS with the proposed F-35A aircraft, the maximum F-35A basing scenario for Tucson AGS (72 F-35As) would result in substantial reductions of VOC and PM_{10} emissions. As a result, the proposed F-35A basing actions at Tucson AGS would produce less than significant impacts to public health.
AQ-2	1300	What kind of anti-pollution devices do these jets have?	F-35A aircraft do not have anti-pollution devices. The F-35A aircraft engines are designed for maximum power performance. Therefore, they would not allow for the inclusion of emission controls, as these design changes could compromise their mission.
AQ-3	1551, 1552, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1699, 1785, 1795, 1972, A1026, A1046, A1190, A1223, A1234, 2066, 2070, 2071, 2072, 3218, 3239, 3250, 3254, 3283	F-35A would cause area to be in violation of federal EPA air quality standards (nonattainment). It would potentially place limitations on new businesses and enterprises. Resulting impacts, including financial impacts and health impacts on residents, children, are not addressed.	The EIS air quality analysis used the threshold that triggers the requirement to perform a conformity determination in the Ada County project region (100 tons per year of CO) as an initial indicator that proposed emissions could produce a significant air quality impact. This is an applicable threshold, as the EPA classifies Northern Ada County as not attaining the NAAQS for CO. Exceedance of this threshold does not necessarily imply that the action would produce a significant air quality impact. Rather, it triggers the need to perform further analyses to definitively determine the significance of the impact. The results of the EIS analysis determined that Scenario B3 would produce CO emissions that would exceed 100 tons per year. The EIS acknowledges that if the Air Force chooses the B3 scenario for Boise, they first would have to complete a positive conformity finding and demonstrate that the proposed CO emissions would not contribute to an exceedance of the NAAQS for CO. This position is neither a mitigation nor a request to exempt this action from any rule or regulation. The NAAQS defines maximum acceptable pollutant concentrations that take into consideration all member of the public, including the more sensitive members, such as children. Since the conformity thresholds are indicators of relative impacts to the NAAQS, the air quality analysis in the EIS adequately evaluates the impact of proposed emissions to public health.
AQ-4	A1014, A1204, A1261, 2028	It doesn't appear that the report has the necessary monitoring, tests, and measurements. Air Quality data is only based on estimates of F-35 emissions; actual emissions (when the F-35s are flying) will likely be different.	The air quality analysis in the EIS relies on the best available emissions and flight data for the F-35A aircraft. The Air Force developed data for F-35A flight profile proposed for each project region by a process of detailed monitoring of aircraft (1) engine power settings and (2) horizontal and vertical locations. Air emissions data were developed by the Air Force and F-35A engine manufacturer, Pratt and Whitney. These data are deemed adequate for purposes of estimating actual emissions and air quality impacts for this EIS.
AQ-5	2028	What compensation and/or remediation will be offered to people who are affected by increased emissions?	Please see the response to comment AQ-1. Replacement of the F-16 aircraft currently based at Luke AFB with the proposed F-35A aircraft would result in a net reduction and not increase in emissions for all F-35A basing scenarios within the

AQ=Air Quality			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			Luke AFB project region.
AQ-6	2052	If basing occurs at Luke AFB, the project will be located in a maintenance area for carbon monoxide, a probable marginal nonattainment area for 2008 8-hour ozone standard, and the nonattainment area for 10-micron particulate matter (PM_{10}).	Thank you for the information on the current and projected criteria pollutant nonattainment and maintenance area designations for the area surrounding Luke AFB.
AQ-7	2052	If basing occurs at the International Airport Guard Station in Tucson, the project will be located in a maintenance area for carbon monoxide.	Thank you for the information on the current criteria pollutant maintenance area designation for the area surrounding Tucson International Airport Guard Station.
AQ-8	2052	Specific measures should be employed during any construction activities to prevent the release of regulated asbestos fibers as per 40 CFR 61.145 and any other relevant state/local standards.	All proposed demolition activities at Luke AFB would prevent the release of asbestos materials and would comply with 40 CFR 61.145 and Maricopa County Air Quality Division (AQD) Rule 370.
AQ-9	2052	Since the proposed action may temporarily increase ambient particulate matter (dust) level, specific mitigation measures involving site preparation and/or construction and site restoration are recommended to reduce the disturbance of particulate matter. The following rules are applicable to actions occurring in Arizona: Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) R18-2-604, R18-2-605, and R18-2-804 and Maricopa County Rules 310 and 310.01.	All proposed demolition and construction activities at Luke AFB would comply with Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) R18-2-604, R18-2-605, and R18-2-804 and Rules 310 and 310.1 of the Maricopa County Air Pollution Control Regulations. In addition, we will adopt the dust control measures recommended in your comment letter.
AQ-10	1795, 1972	F-35A emissions would occur within airspace units with pristine Class 1 areas and would impair visibility in these areas.	F-35A training flights proposed within the Boise AGS project region would occur in proximity to, and in the case of a portion of the Jarbidge South MOA, directly over pristine Federal Class I Areas such as the Jarbidge Wilderness Area. It is inevitable that on occasion, these flights would nominally impact visibility within these areas. However, Section BO 3.3.2.2 of the EIS presents an analysis, which demonstrates that proposed F-35A training flights would produce less than significant impacts to visibility within adjacent Federal Class I areas.
AQ-11	1865, 1909, 2164, 2207, 3253, 3259, 3280	F-35A emissions would add to air quality alerts and inversions. Unacceptable that the Air Force would only apply one or more of the criteria under Title 40 of the CFR Section 93.158(a) to address increased emissions.	Please see the response to comment AQ-3. Scenario B3 would produce emissions that would exceed the CO only (and not nitrogen oxide [NO_x]) threshold that the EIS uses to determine the significance of proposed air quality impacts in the EIS. The EIS acknowledges that if the Air Force chooses the B3 scenario for Boise, they first would have to complete a positive conformity finding and demonstrate that proposed CO emissions would not contribute to an exceedance

AQ=Air Quality			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			of the NAAQS for CO. This demonstration would take into consideration the current CO air quality constraint within the Boise AGS project region.
AQ-12	2127	The Maricopa Association of Governments concurs with the Draft EIS conclusion that the deployment of the PTC with 24 to 144 F-35A aircraft will reduce emissions for all pollutants, relative to the 1999 base case emission at Luke AFB. The proposed action does not exceed the general conformity de minimis emissions thresholds for any pollutant or scenario and therefore, the air quality impacts of all scenarios at Luke AFB are deemed to be insignificant.	Thank you for your comment.
AQ-13	2127	Arizona withdrew the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 on 1/25/2011, before EPA took final action. On 3/12/2012, the Draft MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM_{10} in the Maricopa Co. Nonattainment Area was released for a 30-day public comment period. MAG expects to submit the replacement plan to EPA in May 2012. If EPA takes action to find the 2012 plan to be complete by 8/14/2012, the 18-month and 24-month sanctions clocks triggered by the withdrawal of the 2007 plan will be terminated.	Thank you for this updated information on the Maricopa County PM_{10} attainment planning process.
AQ-14	1942, 2164, 2187, 2200, 2207	The EIS fails to adequately study levels of pollution from flight fumes and fuels when considered in a cumulative context.	Please see the response to comment AQ-1 that pertains to the Tucson AGS location. Proposed emissions from any F-35A basing scenario at the Tucson AGS, in combination with future background levels of pollutants, would not contribute to an exceedance of a NAAQS. In other words, all of the F-35A basing scenarios would produce less than significant cumulative air quality impacts.
AQ-15	2150	There are specific operational procedures stated in Maricopa County Air Quality Rule 310 that must be in place during normal, ground disturbing construction activities (additional requirements exist for high pollution advisory days). In addition to measures mentioned in the EIS, practices such as sequencing construction to limit soil exposure and re-routing traffic away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas	Please see the response to comment AQ-9. All proposed demolition and construction activities at Luke AFB would comply with Rules 310 and 310.1 of the Maricopa County Air Pollution Control Regulations. In addition, we will adopt the dust control measures recommended in your comment letter.

AQ=Air Quality			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		have proven effective for dust mitigation.	
AQ-16	2150	Clarification to text on pg. LU-207: 40 CFR 61, Subpart M and the Maricopa County AQ Department Rule 370 require and inspection performed by an AHERA certified building inspector within 12 months of start of demolition activities and notification for any demolition whether regulated asbestos-containing material (RACM) is present or not. A separate notification for any renovation activities to remove RACM prior to demolition is also required and may be submitted separately or combined with the demolition notification. MCAQR 370, Section 301.8 identifies specific requirements for demolition and renovation activity.	Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to comment AQ-8. All proposed demolition activities at Luke AFB would prevent the release of asbestos materials and would comply with 40 CFR 61, Subpart M, and Rule 370 of the Maricopa County Air Pollution Control Regulations..
AQ-17	2150	Based upon analysis and details presented in the EIS, Maricopa County Air Quality Department believes the proposed transition from F-16 operations to F-35 operations will benefit air Quality in Maricopa County.	Thank you for your comment.
AQ-18	1972, 2166, 2167	Draft EIS states that the main effect of climate change to consider is increased temperatures and will increase droughts, wildfires, and reduce snow packs and water supplies. This is not what Idaho needs. Draft EIS needs to discuss how climate change will affect installations and flying conditions.	Boise AGS Project Region and Tucson Project Region: EIS Sections BO 3.3.1.2 and TU 3.3.1.2 discuss how climate change could impact the F-35A beddown scenarios at Boise AGS or Tucson AGS and what adaptation strategies, if any, would be required to respond to these future conditions.
AQ-19	1972, A1048, A1049, 2199	There is not adequate information in the EIS as to how the Air Force would mitigate air quality impacts.	The comment pertains to how operations at the Boise AGS would be affected by predicted climate change, in particular, conditions of extreme drought and scarce water supplies, and how the Air Force would mitigate these effects. As stated in Section BO 3.3.1.2 of the EIS, operations at Boise AGS have adapted to droughts and scarce water supplies and they would continue to do so in the future. However, given the uncertainty of the extent of future droughts and constraints to water supplies, it is beyond the scope of this EIS to develop mitigation measures for these effects.
AQ-20	A1037	Any lingering atmospheric contaminants will affect the quality of observations and potentially preclude the ability to use certain	The comment pertains to the potential for emissions from the proposed F-35A basing scenarios at Holloman AFB to adversely affect the operation of observatory instruments in the vicinity of Weed, NM. Visibility impairment could occur from (1)

AQ=Air Quality			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		equipment for scientific data collection.	projected primary emissions of nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and PM_{10} or (2) secondary formation of visibility-reducing particulate matter in the region due to precursor emissions of VOCs, NO_2, or SO_2. Visibility impairment from primary NO_2 emissions could occur as a brown-colored haze in the lower layer of the atmosphere. This situation usually would occur during the colder months of the year, when a lack of sunlight prevents the conversion of this pollutant to NO_x and oxygen. Visibility impairment due to primary PM_{10} emissions would occur in the form of plume blight or atmospheric discoloration from contrails. Visibility impairment due to the secondary formation of nitrate or sulfate particulates in the atmosphere from emissions of NO_x or SO_2 would usually occur in the warmer months of the year. This effect would take the form of regional haze, which would reduce regional visual range. Holloman AFB is approximately 30 miles west of Weed. The transport of proposed emissions from this basing location over such an extensive distance would result in substantially diluted air pollutant concentrations in Weed. The presence of the Sacramento Mountains between Holloman AFB and Weed would further disperse proposed emissions along this transport route. Weed also resides under military training routes IR 134/195 and IR 192/194. The maximum F-35A basing scenario at Holloman AFB would increase F-35A flights in these routes by slightly more than one per day on average. These nominal amounts of F-35A flights and the intermittent nature of their emissions would produce very low ambient pollutant concentrations in the vicinity of Weed. Consequently, the proposed F-35A basing scenarios at Holloman AFB would produce nominal increases in visibility impairment in the region of Weed and therefore they would not adversely affect the operation of observatory instruments in this location.
AQ-21	2200	Some air quality tables (e.g., HO 3.3-1 and HO 3.3-2) reference data that are over five years old and would not include emissions from fifth generation, F-22 aircraft, unmanned aerial platforms, and T-38 aircraft, all which are currently conducting operations at Holloman AFB. This document should be using current, relevant data for the purpose of this study. Residents can see the decline in air quality since the arrival of F-22 aircraft, Reapers, and Predators. Current conditions need to be identified.	Table HO 3.3–1 summarizes the annual emissions generated by stationary and mobile sources within Otero County, New Mexico for calendar year 2008, as compiled by the USEPA. These are the most current data available for this region. The USEPA periodically updates these data every 3 years for the entire US and it is expected that 2011 data for Otero County will be available sometime in 2013. Table HO 3.3–2 has been revised to include annual emissions due to all operations at Holloman AFB for the baseline year of 2010. These data include (1) airfield operations for all aircraft, such as the F-22, MQ-1 Predator, MQ-9 Reaper, QF-4, and T-38; and (2) on-base vehicle, commuter vehicle, and stationary source activities that reflect base population and vehicle fleets for year 2010 conditions. Lastly, Table HO 3.3–3 summarizes the annual emissions at Holloman AFB that only would occur from operations of the F-16 basing in year 2013. The EIS provides these data, as they represent emissions that the proposed F-35A operations would replace under the Holloman AFB Scenarios H1 through H5. The USEPA and the New Mexico Air Quality Bureau currently find that Otero County

AQ=Air Quality			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			attains the NAAQS for all pollutants. Regarding the impact of existing air emissions, in combination with emissions from the proposed F-35A scenarios at Holloman AFB and their contributions to NAAQS and visibility levels, please see the Responses AQ-1 and AQ-20.

BI=Biological			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
BI-1	1063, 1071, 1074, 1091, 1589, 1793, A1163, 2073, 2074, 2149, 2174, 3000, 3007	Concern for startle effect to horses causing injury to horse and rider. Who would pay for damages or vet bills?	Section BO 3.2.1.2; Section HO 3.2.1.2; Section LU 3.2.1.2; and SectionTU 3.2.1.2 of the EIS state how individuals may begin the claims process for any Air Force-related damage by first contacting the Public Affairs Office of the base in question. Section HO 3.6.2.2 of the EIS discusses that sonic booms from the F-35A are expected to be less intense than sonic booms from the F-22. The same section also acknowledges that low-level overflight and sonic booms have the potential to startle wildlife and domestic animals such as horses.
BI-2	1016, 1485, 1486, 1689, 1758, 1760, 1790, 1885, 1886, 1938, A1067, A1069, A1162, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, 2168, 2174, 2200	Change in noise levels under airspace would compromise the integrity of natural ecosystems.	Environmental consequences with regard to natural ecosystems are addressed for each basing alternative in Sections 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 for soils and water, vegetation and wildlife, wetlands, and endangered and threatened species, respectively. The degree of anticipated changes with the ddition of F-35A training would not be expected to change the integrity of the natural ecosystems underlying the airspace. Please also refer to Appendix B, which contains a review of known studies on noise effects to wildlife and domestic animals.
BI-3	1809, A1087, 2004, 2164, 2200, 2207, 2014, 3016	Concern for disturbance of raptors and other wildlife in training areas and observations of wildlife during overflights would be enlightening.	Please refer Appendix B, which contains a review of known studies on noise effects to wildlife and domestic animals. Many of these studies report observations of wildlife during overflights.
BI-4	3264, 3284	Does not expect significant impacts to wildlife or sensitive habitats.	Thank you for your review of the Draft EIS.

BI=Biological			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
BI-5	1091, 1251, 1303, 1305, 1407, 1412, 1414, 1467, 1485, 1486, 1493, 1515, 1518, 1539, 1560, 1566, 1582, 1640, 1758, 1778, 1790, 1793, 1903, 1914, 1915, 1919, 1945, 1971, 1980, 1985, 1987, A1031, A1034, A1053, A1055, A1064, A1067, A1069, A1093, A1122, A1160, A1162, A1163, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1202, A1203, A1207, A1223, A1237, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1249, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, A1255, 2073, 2164, 2166, 2167, 2174, 2179, 2200, 2207, 3004, 3013, 3016, 3055, 3159, 3229, 3234, 3240, 3252, 3262, 3264	Concern for domestic and wild animals and visual resources from overflight noise and sonic booms, including startle effects.	Sections 3.6 and 3.8 of the EIS under each base discuss the potential for aircraft overflight and sonic boom to affect wildlife and threatened and endangered species, respectively. Please refer to Appendix B, which contains a review of known studies on noise effects to wildlife and domestic animals.
BI-6	1469, 1621, 1987, 2164, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2175, 2207	EIS does not contain adequate analysis of impacts on human beings or biological assessments on sensitive species.	Please see Socioeconomics section for human effects analyses. Impacts of potential impacts to sensitive species are located in base Section 3.8 of the EIS. The Air Force completed consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on effects to sensitive species with a Biological Evaluation. Information on this consultation is provided in Appendix C of the EIS.
BI-7	2053	Requests to be informed on decisions regarding the proposed lowering of the floor of R-2301E over the Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge. The proposed lowering could result in increases in noise that are not compatible with wildlife.	This EIS does not propose lowering the floors or other airspace changes over BMGR. Section LU 4.2 discusses the proposed lowering of R-2301E as a cumulative action. Contact 56th Fighter Wing Range Management Office for additional information on the proposal for R-2301E.
BI-8	2110, 2164, 2207	Analysis for sage grouse is inadequate (including Appendix B) and the potential effects of overflights are not explored. Given the fact that the sage grouse is an Endangered Species Act-listed species, a more robust analysis is needed.	The greater sage grouse is currently a candidate for listing under the ESA. The EIS, including Appendix B, addresses overflight effects, including noise, on wildlife. Appendix B has been supplemented with known studies on noise effects to sage grouse, of which there are few.
BI-9	2137, 2166, 2167, 3001, 3278, 3279, 3280	Noise analysis for impacts to wildlife is inadequate. Literature cited does not include the last 10 years of peer-reviewed science.	The analysis of impacts to wildlife in the EIS is adequate. Appendix B has been supplemented with more recent studies and additional species found in the different alternative project areas. The literature reviewed does not change the conclusions with regard to impacts of

BI=Biological			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			overflight, including noise, on wildlife.
BI-10	2136	Increases in personnel associated with the proposed action at Holloman AFB could increase water demand throughout the Tularosa Basin. If water demand were to increase by 6 to 10 percent, there is the potential that wetland and aquatic communities can be affected. A decrease in the availability of water could also affect the White Sands pupfish and associated habitat.	Water sources and use are discussed under Infrastructure (Section HO 3.13.1.2) and Water (Section HO 3.5.1) of the EIS. No known connection between the Base's (same as City of Alamogordo) water sources (Bonito Lake and springs in Fresnal and La Luz canyons and wells) and the water bodies where pupfish occur (Lost River, west slope of Sacramento Mountains) are known. Nor are effects anticipated from changes to Base personnel. Wetlands/aquatic communities occurring widely scattered under airspace would also not be expected to be affected.
BI-11	A1037, 2126	The Draft EIS does not take into account cumulative effects for noise. F-35s will increase the overall disturbance wildlife is already experiencing in terms of frequency and duration of noise.	The analysis in Section BO 3.6 and HO 3.6 takes into account the reductions in noise associated with transfer or retirement of aircraft being replaced by F-35As as well as the additions of noise associated with F-35A training.
BI-12	2126	The Draft EIS does not include maps showing boundaries of the Birds of Prey National Conservation Area or any other protected areas, such as the recent Owyhee Wilderness Area	Please refer to Figure BO 3.10–4 for identified special use land management areas in the Boise region. Table BO 3.10–5 further clarifies.
BI-13	2126, 2164, 2207	Numerous peer-reviewed studies in recent years have shown significant impacts of low-frequency anthropogenic noise (including jet noise) on songbird breeding success, as well as Greater sage-grouse lekking. Did the Draft EIS consider these?	Please see Appendix B Bird sections of the Final EIS for a review of literature that relates to effects of aircraft overflights. All studies we found on low frequency anthropogenic noise were based on urban/industrial sources including traffic noise which tend to be continuous sources (Wood and Yezerinac 2006; Brumm 2004; Patricelli and Blickley 2006; Katti and Warren 2004). No references to jet noise were located, and all these studies showed species making corresponding adaptations to songs and calls in response to possible noise masking effects. These continuous source noise studies are not applicable to airspace including MOAs and MTRs where low-level overflights tend to be discrete instantaneous exposures against a background similar in character to existing (baseline) conditions. Barber et al. 2009 and Lynch et al. 2011 showed the presence of various aircraft low frequency noise in natural areas, but its effects on songbirds do not seem to be known.
BI-14	2126, 2164, 2207	Impacts of noise should be considered for Important Bird Areas and in breeding areas of bird Species of Greatest Conservation Need breed (e.g., in southwestern Idaho).	Please see response to BI-13. No special use land areas are expected to experience noticeable noise increases from F-35A training.
BI-15	2136	Activities within the airspace-affected area have the potential to affect birds and other wildlife,	The proposed action does not include any changes to airspace or avoidance areas. The Air Force would continue to follow existing

BI=Biological			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		primarily through disturbance from aircraft overflights and visual perception of the aircraft and noise. Though studies have shown minimal acute effects to wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommends minimizing the flight frequency (chronic effects) over areas where wildlife may be abundant such as National Wildlife Refuges and forested areas	agreements. .The noise studies cited in Appendix B do not suggest that chronic effects would be expected. Like people, wildlife appear to become acclimated to noise in the environment. The abundance and distribution of wildlife under designated airspace used by the military including on military installations, and bombing and gunnery ranges that have been in continuous operation since WWII, suggest that chronic noise effects are negligible. Introduction of the F-35A aircraft would represent a minimal departure from existing conditions.
BI-16	2136	There are four designated critical habitat areas for the Mexican spotted owl within the airspace used by Holloman AFB. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommends using the available studies (e.g., Air Combat Command 2007) to propose minimizing flight frequency (chronic effect) over Mexican spotted owl designated critical habitat	The ACC study referenced in the comment as well as the more detailed cumulative analysis (ACC 2008) is considered in the EIS. As reflected in the EIS, the ACC study, does not show significant acute or chronic effects of low-level overflight by military jet aircraft on Mexican spotted owl (MSO) nor do the findings support reducing frequency of overflights as low as 500 ft AGL. Revisions were made in Section HO 3.8 and Appendix B to reflect this study and other studies on MSO.
BI-17	2136	The lesser prairie-chicken occurs under Holloman airspace/proposed training area. The species forms leks for reproductive purposes in the spring at dawn and dusk (Crawford and Bolen 1976), and as a result may be more sensitive to disturbance at these times. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommends the Air Force consider minimizing flight frequency over known lek areas	As indicated in Section HO 3.8, introduction of the F-35A aircraft would represent a minimal departure from existing conditions, and slight changes in the noise environment would not be expected to adversely affect the lesser prairie chicken or its habitat under the airspace. This bird is a low-flying species and the potential for a bird-aircraft strike is so low as to be discountable. A lesser prairie-chicken section has been added to Appendix B of the EIS to review literature on noise effects to the species.
BI-18	2136	Please review and reference the Annotated Bibliography by the National Park Service "Impacts of Noise on Wildlife" available at http://www.nature.nps.gov/naturalsounds/pdf_docs/wildlifebiblio_Aug2011.pdf	This document was reviewed and applicable citations from it added to the updated Appendix B in the Final EIS.
BI-19	3226, 3278	Concerned for increased impact to threatened and endangered birds of prey being raised at The Peregrine Fund and The World Center for Birds of Prey; am not clear based on the EIS what the increased impact will be.	Section BO 3.10.2 of the EIS locates the Peregrine Fund and the World Center for Birds of Prey. Detailed information on raptors is included in Appendix B, Section B.2.6.5. Introduction of the F-35A aircraft would represent a minimal departure from existing conditions, and slight changes in the noise environment would not be expected to affect raptors. In addition, the potential for bird-aircraft strikes would also not be expected to change or affect raptor populations.
BI-20	2173	Research by Delaney (July 1997) studied how helicopter and chainsaw use might affect	The EIS references the results of an Air Combat Command (2008) study that summarizes the results of a 5-year field study of the

BI=Biological			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		reproducing Mexican spotted owl on the Sacramento Ranger District (New Mexico) and indicated that overflight could be reasonably predicted to disturb the Mexican spotted owl during breeding season. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has previously concurred that high decibel sounds are responsible for flushing during breeding season and constitutes harassment of the Mexican spotted owl (which constitutes Endangered Species Act Take). Based on this information, the U.S. Forest Service feels that a "No Effect" determination for the Mexican spotted owl, regarding potential noise disturbance during breeding season (3/1 - 8/31) is not in line with previous U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurrence of events. A "May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect" determination is a more reasonable effect determination; however, if no overflights are to occur between 3/1 and 8/31, then a "No Effect" determination is appropriate.	potential effect of military jet overflight of MSO in New Mexico. This study did not find either acute or chronic adverse effects from overflights by military jets as low as 500 ft AGL (the lowest level proposed for F-35A). The EIS concludes with a "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" determination. See Appendix B for a review of recent literature on MSO.
BI-21	2181	Concerns about how low-level flight will affect populations of desert bighorn sheep, especially rearing behavior during lambing season (Feb 1-May 15). Arizona Game and Fish Department recommends that low-level flights be avoided over designated habitat during this season, in accordance with the Resource Management Plan for the Bureau of Land Management Kingman Field Office (Page 84).	None of the proposed airspace units would pass over the desert bighorn sheep lambing areas in the Black Mountains. The expected slight changes in the noise environment of airspace used by F-35A would not be expected to affect desert bighorns anywhere on their range.
BI-22	A1037, A1162, 2174, 2175	What impacts will the proposed expansion have on the aesthetic and visual resources within the view shed of Weed on either a temporary or a permanent basis?	The Air Force anticipates more overflights, which would be within the viewshed of Weed.
BI-23	2164, 2168, 2207	Baseline data/analysis on locations of special status species, wildlife, and, migratory bird paths as well as the current exposure of animal populations and human communities to F-35 overflights (including sudden heightened noise levels) is needed in order to properly analyze the impacts.	Baseline data on occurrence of special status species are included in the Table 3.8–1 under each base and species specific accounts are provided under Airspace Affected Environment (in B0 3.8.2.1, HO 3.8.2.1, LU 3.8.2.1, and TU 3.8.2.1) for all species that could be affected by training activities in the airspace. Special status species occurring in the base environs (e.g., slickspot peppergrass at Boise) are discussed under Base Affected Environment (e.g., BO 3.8.1.1) for each base, as appropriate. The impact analysis takes into

BI=Biological			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			account the current levels of exposure to overflight activity and the project levels with F-35A under Airspace environmental consequences for special status species. Similarly, the Noise analysis sections address potential exposure of human communities to F-35A overflights and compare it to the existing (baseline) exposure.
BI-24	2164, 2207	Ground-based training support activities will degrade, alter, and adversely impact slickspot peppergrass habitats. More use on roads in remote ranges will promote more weeds. These concerns are amplified by the significant public lands livestock grazing degradation that occurs across lands surrounding remote range sites.	No increase in ground-based training support activities would be required in the target areas and under the airspace that would be used by F-35A compared to the existing range support activities. No effects on slickspot peppergrass would be expected under the airspace used for F-35A training or at the Boise Airport, where facilities for F-35A training would be constructed should Boise be selected for F-35A training basing.
BI-25	2200	In the Airspace Environmental Consequences sections (e.g., HO 3.6.2.2), for low-level overflight and noise, indicating that "No new types of impact would be introduced into these areas" in respect to wildlife is not an acceptable approach.	We have rewritten the referenced sentence, which read: "All airspace units that would be used for F-35A training are currently used as active military airspace by military jet aircraft, including F-16s, A-10s, and, until recently, F-22s; therefore, no new types of impact would be introduced into these areas as a result of introducing the F-35A aircraft". This sentence has been revised in the Final EIS to read : "All airspace units that would be used for F-35A training are currently used as active military airspace by military jet aircraft, including F-16s, A-10s, and, until recently, F-22s; <u>therefore wildlife in these areas have previous exposure to military jet overflight, including low-level overflight and noise, sonic booms, and use of munitions and defensive countermeasures that would be associated with introducing the F-35A aircraft and will be analyzed in this section</u>. The revised wording is underlined.

CM=Cumulative			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
CM-1	1210, 1629	Won't Holloman soon be joining Cannon AFB in claiming it needs the 94,000 sq mi of southern New Mexico airspace connected to the southern Colorado airspace ("Pentagon's 51st state")?	As identified in Section HO 3.1.2.2 of the EIS, basing the F-35A at Holloman would take place without modifying existing airspace or proposing the use of new airspace.
CM-2	1807, 1814, 1900, 1912, 1915, 1931, 1941, 1942, 1985, A1180, 2166, 2167, 3159, 3187	No attempt has been made to ID and analyze the impact of basing when added to already existing military and commercial activity.	In the EIS, the cumulative analysis presents the potential known environmental consequences of the beddown of the F-35A training mission with the current and known future projects where specific data is available.
CM-3	1900, 1985, 1987,	Will the F-35A be included under Operation Snowbird training (or	This EIS addresses the beddown of the F-35A training aircraft and

CM=Cumulative			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	2124, 2128, 2166, 2167, 2189, 2190	other activities such as Operation Noble Eagle), regardless of where the F-35 is based?	all related F-35A activities. Any future participation by F-35A aircraft in Operation Snowbird or other activities would be subject to separate NEPA documentation.
CM-4	2111	Consider placing the last sentence of Page BO-122, paragraph 2, ("There are no public or commercial recreational sites outside the base within the noise-impacted area [defined by noise levels of 65 dB DNL and above] under any scenario") in the Executive Summary (Page 65 Boise AGS Cumulative Effects) to replace current paragraph 3, line 5 "Outside the base, noise levels above 65 dB DNL...."	This change has been made to the Final version of the Executive Summary.
CM-5	2166, 2167, 3173	Recent events that have occurred in Pima County since the Draft EIS should be included (see Tucson 2/23 transcript pg 24-26).	Pima County Board of Supervisors has recommended and approved the acquisition of 382 acres land south of Tucson International Airport as a buffer to the airport. This action will reduce encroachment along that boundary with the airport. Text has been added to Section TU 4.0.
CM-6	A1062, A1235, A1236, 2164, 2168, 2189, 2190, 2195, 2207, 3167	The Draft EIS fails to adequately analyze cumulative impacts and specifically how civilian and military actions will affect the same resources as those related to basing the F-35A. It also improperly seeks to limit future actions to those of a military nature but even in those instances provides none of the requisite analysis. For example, the reasonably foreseeable future expansion of operations at Davis-Monthan AFB and Operation Snowbird are not adequately considered and analyzed. In addition, the reasonably foreseeable expansion of civilian and commercial air operations at Tucson International Airport, Homeland Security Border Patrol, and drones are not adequately addressed.	Tha EIS in Section TU 4.0 identifies the known actions that have been publically identified such as the Tucson International Airport Part 150 Study and the other actions in the airspace to be used by the F-35A aircraft. Available information and qualitative analysis on Operation Snowbird is also included in Section TU 4.0.
CM-7	2166, 2167, 2187, 2200	Cumulative effects section is generally devoid of any actual analysis. The Air Force must finish the work by actually analyzing how the various military and civilian activities will affect the same resources as those related to the F-35A basing.	In the EIS, the cumulative analysis presents the potential known environmental consequences of the beddown of the F-35A training mission with the current and known future projects where specific data is available.
CM-8	2200	Since numerous other aircraft (including the F-16, MQ-1, MQ-9, Tornado, T-38, QF-4, and QF-6) will be jointly utilizing Holloman AFB and designated airspace, references to links for the EAs and EISs should be included in this EIS. Also, a list of where hard copies of the documents can be found should be included. The baseline environmental consequences of the beddown of F-35A aircraft would not be a starting point, but would be an addition to the impact being caused by the above identified aircraft already in place.	Baseline for NEPA purposes includes all of the aircraft, which are programmed to be located at Holloman AFB when the F-35A is expected to beddown. The EIS has references to the EAs and EISs in Pages REF HO1-10. The aircraft that are already flying or will be flying by the time the potential beddown of the F-35A occurs at Holloman AFB are all included in the baseline analysis. The addition of the F-35A aircraft to the baseline analysis is a standard method of identifying environmental consequences.

CU=Cultural Resources			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
CU-1	2000, 2011	Concur with finding of no effect on historic properties or cultural resources	The Air Force thanks the Idaho State Historical Society State Historic Preservation Office and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department State Historic Preservation Office for their review of the Draft EIS and their comment of concurrence.
CU-2	1104, 1412, A1093, 2151	Noise would damage historic resource such as Colonia Solana in Tucson.	The potential effects to cultural resources, including historic structures, from subsonic noise and sonic booms is included in the EIS Environmental Consequences sections, and is more fully discussed in EIS Appendix B, Sections B.2.8, B.2.10, and B.3.2, incorporating the results of (and citing) the studies by Sutherland (1989), Hershey and Higgins (1976); Hershey, Kevala, and Burns (1975); Battis (1983; 1988); Sutherland, Brown, and Goerner (1990); and the 1995 Air Force published study *Environmental Assessment for Continued Supersonic Operations in the Black Mountain Supersonic Corridor and the Alpha/Precision Impact Range Area*. The analysis in the EIS Environmental Consequences sections and as discussed in Section 3.7.2, which is based on the above studies, concludes that noise from F-35A overflights will not adversely affect (damage) cultural resources, such as Colonia Solana.
CU-3	2011	Recommends continued consultation with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and tribes to resolve any adverse impacts.	As stated in EIS Sections BO 3.9.1.2, BO 3.9.2.2, the Air Force has completed consultation with the tribes and SHPOs for this proposed action. If any TCPs are discovered, the Air Force will follow the applicable laws and regulations.
CU-4	2011	If any cultural material is inadvertently found during development, activities must cease and be evaluated.	As stated in EIS Section BO 3.9, in the event of encountering previously unrecorded or unevaluated cultural resources, the base would manage these resources in accordance with the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.
CU-5	1412, 1882, 1886, A1162, 2136	The Draft EIS does not accurately evaluate impacts from low frequency noise on historic structures, particularly structures under the Military Training Routes.	The potential effects to cultural resources, including historic structures, from subsonic noise and sonic booms is included in the EIS Environmental Consequences sections, and is more fully discussed in EIS Appendix B, Sections B.2.8, B.2.10, and B.3.2. The analysis in the EIS in Section 3.7.2, concludes that noise from F-35A overflights will not adversely affect (damage) cultural resources, such as historic or prehistoric structures. In addition, Appendix B includes discussion of CHABA (1977), which deals specifically with low-frequency noise.
CU-6	1795	Draft EIS Page C-2 says the Boise Air Terminal was 9 miles south of the city in 1939. The Federal Aviation Administration National Flight Data Center lists Boise Air Terminal/Gowen Field as 3 miles from downtown Boise. Why the discrepancy and did this have any effect on the evaluation of cultural resources?	The Draft EIS text was in error, as the actual driving distance between the present terminal and the Boise Capital building is just under 4 miles. The error in reporting the historical development of the Boise Airport did not have any effect on the establishment of the Area of Potential Effects for analyzing impacts to cultural resources in the EIS. The Section C.1.1 of the EIS text has been corrected to read "….the new Boise Air Terminal opened at its current location in 1939 on what was then undeveloped benchland about four miles south of the city".
CU-7	2136	The cited King et al. 1988 USGS study, and by extension the Draft EIS, does not take sonic booms into account, which can cause historic structures to shake and potentially result in damage. The Draft EIS also does not adequately account for	The potential effects to cultural resources, including historic structures, from sonic booms is included in EIS Section 3.9 for each base, and is more fully discussed in EIS Appendix B, Sections B.2.8, B.2.10, and B.3.2. The analysis in the EIS Section 3.9.2 concludes that noise from F-35A overflights will not adversely affect (damage) cultural resources, such as historic or prehistoric structures. However, the text of Section 3.7.2 has been enhanced to make more explicit that there is very low potential for impacts to historic or prehistoric structures

CU=Cultural Resources			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		potential impacts to cultural resources from low altitude flights.	from F-35A training overflights.
CU-8	2136	The list of consulted tribes is incomplete, as it does not include entities that are consulted by or affiliated with National Park Service units (such as the Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument in New Mexico). These tribes would include the Caddo Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, Pueblo of Acoma, Pueblo of Jemez, Pueblo of Santo Domingo, Wichita & Affiliated Tribes, Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, and Pueblo of Taos.	Holloman AFB works with tribes in New Mexico whose pueblo, land grant, reservation or traditional use areas are affected by base activities. In preparing the tribal consultation list for each of the installations, the Air Force consulted the Native American Consultation Database for federally recognized tribes for each of the counties under the airspace, as well as the airfield. Maps showing the location of Indian reservations and Judicially established Indian land claims were also consulted to see if other tribes could be identified, each state's State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) web site was also searched for available tribal consultation lists, and New Mexico has a thorough list organized by county. Holloman AFB works with tribes in New Mexico whose pueblo, land grant, reservation or traditional use areas are affected by base activities. At the recommendation of Holloman AFB, Native American governments consulted were selected from New Mexico Indian Affairs Department listing (accessed September 28, 2011) based on knowledge and personal contacts of the Base Cultural Resources Manager and the Base Community Planner, and telephone calls to the Pueblos and Tribes.
CU-9	2136	Please verify all locations, names, and other details of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) locations, especially those associated with Salinas Missions National Monument. For example, please confirm that Abo Mission is outside the IR 133/142 flight area.	A thorough search of the National Register of Historic Places on-line database was performed, and there is no record of the Abo Mission in that database, although the other missions of SAPU are in the database and are listed in EIS Appendix C, Table C–8. Abo Mission has been added to EIS Appendix C, Table C–8, as occurring under airspace unit IR 133/142. Table C–8 has further been revised to correct the location of Quarai and to include Archeological Site Numbers. AR-03-08-02-409 and R-03-08-02-415, which were not previously known to be beneath the training airspace as their location information is withheld from the National Park Service database. Inclusion of additional National Register of Historic Places-listed properties does not change the results of the results of the environmental consequences analysis, which concludes that noise from F-35A overflights will not adversely affect (damage) cultural resources, such as historic or prehistoric structures.
CU-10	2136	There is no mention of National Park Service units or national monuments in the cultural sections of the Draft EIS, but there are such National Park Service units under Holloman AFB airspace, including Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument (Abo, Quarai, and Gran Quivira units), Carlsbad Caverns National Park, and Guadalupe Mountains National Park. Each park contains cultural resources listed on and eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.	"NPS units" that are historic properties, i.e., listed on the National Register of Historic Places, such as Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument (units) and White Sands National Monument Historic District are listed in EIS Appendix C, Table C–8. A thorough search of the National Register of Historic Places on-line database was performed, and all properties within the Region of Influence (including those that may be within NPS unit boundaries), either on any of the bases/airfields or beneath the airspace, have been included in the analysis and are listed in Appendix C. Abo Mission has been added to EIS Appendix C, Table C–8, as occurring under airspace unit IR 133/142. Table C–8 has further been revised to correct the location of Quarai and to include Archeological Site Numbers AR-03-08-02-409 and R-03-08-02-415, the Ring Midden Sites of the Guadalupe Mountains MPS, the Dark Canyon Apache Rancheria--Military Battle Site, and the Last Chance Canyon Apache--Cavalry Battle Site, which were not previously known to be beneath the training airspace as their location information is withheld from the National Park Service database. Cultural resources eligible for, but not listed on, the National Register of Historic Places were not included in the analysis

CU=Cultural Resources			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			as discussed in Section 3.7.2: "Archaeological and historic architectural resources under airspace, which were unlikely to be affected by aircraft overflights (see Appendix B), were characterized using the records of the NRHP and National Historic Landmarks."
CU-11	3002	Did not see any impact study done in the document for impacts to Bluewater Lookout or archeological sites located below Timberon, which are in the national historic records for historic buildings or facilities.	The Bluewater Lookout Complex is listed in EIS Appendix C, Table C–8., and is one of the National Register of Historic Places-listed properties considered in the analysis of environmental consequences in EIS Section HO 3.9.2.1 and HO 3.9.2.2. The two archaeological sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places near Timberon, have restricted location information and were not included in the GIS-based National Register of Historic Places dataset used to establish the EIS list of properties beneath each of the training airspace units. However, as stated in EIS Section 3.9.2.1, "many more eligible or potentially eligible cultural resources associated with the history of the region are likely to underlie airspace" and these unquantified properties are thus included in the analyses of environmental consequences, which concludes that "no impacts on historic properties under airspace associated with Holloman AFB are expected" under all scenarios. However, having the sites brought to our attention, they have been included in the EIS Table HO 3.9–1 and Appendix C, Table C–8.
CU-12	2136, 2200	Noise from increased airspace use has the potential to change the setting and feeling of cultural resources and potentially impact the integrity of National Register listed and eligible properties.	As stated in EIS Sections HO 3.9.2.2, subsonic noise levels beneath the Holloman AFB training airspace is projected to increase from between 1 and 7 decibels DNL_{mr}, depending on the alternative, and would not exceed 65 decibels DNL_{mr}. Therefore, 'no impacts on historic properties under airspace associated with Holloman AFB are expected. Modest increases in noise of the same type (aircraft overflight) as already occurs under current conditions would not alter the feeling, setting, and character at Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument to such a degree to constitute an adverse effect, as defined by 36 CFR 800.5.
CU-13	2136	Altitude and speed restrictions on training in Military Training Routes and Military Operations Areas are mentioned but not specified. What are they? Anticipated flight altitudes, number of flights per day, number of aircraft per flight, and other details of the proposed training should be explicitly stated so that impacts can be wholly considered and evaluated. This analysis of impacts to cultural resources is very general, making evaluation of impact incredibly difficult.	The anticipated flight altitudes, number of flights per day, number of aircraft per flight, and other details of the proposed F-35A training activities are explicitly described in Sections BO 2.1.1, HO 2.1.1, LU 2.1.1, TU 2.1.1, and in Chapter 2. The analysis of noise impacts to cultural resources is presented in detail in relation to the potential for impacts. The methodology section in Section 3.7, with references to Appendix B, presents a summary of studies of noise impacts to cultural resources, which indicate a very low potential for impacts to structural and non-structural historic properties from F-35A training overflights. The environmental consequences section of each of the basing alternatives contains a shorter summary of noise studies results so it does not include too much repetitive content. Where there is a greater potential for direct impacts, such as demolition of buildings or construction-related ground disturbing activities, the analysis is necessarily in more detail.
CU-14	2136	Potential impacts to the White Sands National Monument are listed on pg HO-121, but not addressed in other scenarios. Are impacts to WHSA expected to be the same for all	Potential impacts to the White Sands National Monument are not explicitly mentioned, but are addressed in all the other scenarios in the EIS by the statement "Therefore, anticipated impacts on archaeological, historic architectural, and traditional cultural resources would be similar to those described for Scenario H1, but with slightly more ground disturbance."

CU=Cultural Resources			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		scenarios?	
CU-15	2166, 2167, 3149	Were all the tribes notified [of the project/meetings]? There was no mention of taking comments on the Section 106 process in the written notices. Members of Tohono O'odham Nation and other may have attended if they had been informed.	The tribes were notified of the initial public scoping meetings in letters sent 8 February 2010, as demonstrated in Table A.4–14 and A.4–15. Letters inviting the tribes to consult with the Air Force on a government to government basis were sent between 28 October and 17 November 2010, as listed in Appendix C.8. Follow-up government to government consultation letters to potentially affected/interested tribes were sent by Holloman AFB on 16 November 2011, and by Luke AFB (for Luke AFB and Tucson AGS) 14 February 2012.

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
DO-1	1002, 1016, 1551, 1552, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1795, 1900, 1912, A1046, A1190, A1234, A1235, A1236, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2101, 2195, 3218	What does the No Action Alternative mean?	As noted in Section 2.5 of the EIS, the No Action Alternative would not base the F-35A training mission at any of the four locations. At each potential alternative location, there are ongoing and currently planned activities and programs that would continue. Known ongoing and planned activities are included as part of the baseline conditions. For the purposes of this EIS, the No Action Alternative constitutes the baseline conditions and is assessed for each alternative location.
DO-2	1002, 1551, 1552, 1567, 1572, 1875, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, A1190, A1210, A1234, A1235, A1236, 1785, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2159, 2166, 2167, 2201, 3218	Will all four locations continue to be F-35 basing candidates even if they are not selected in this EIS? The Draft EIS fails to explain the Air Force's future decision making. If the Air Force plans to tier from this EIS for future decision-making, it should explain how it intends to do that.	Possibly. Once the Record of Decision is signed for this EIS, these four locations will not be considered basing candidates until the basing of the next F-35A Pilot Training Center. At that time, the Air Force will repeat the Strategic Basing Process to determine the alternative bases, which could include the bases not selected in the Record of Decision for this EIS.
DO-3	1016, 1778, 1945, A1161, A1162, A1163	It's difficult to know where the training activities will be. Higher resolution maps would help.	The maps in the Final EIS have been augmented with additional cities and towns to serve as locational reference points to the airspace. These maps are designed to show the distribution of the training airspace at the regional level. For higher resolution maps of the individual airspace units, please visit http://skyvector.com
DO-4	1016, 1192, 1202, 1407, 1414, 1590, 1793, A1076, A1083, A1100, A1163, A1207, A1255, 2057, 2073	Why can't training activities be confined to military-owned land or BLM land where no one lives?	Confining F-35A training activities to military-owned land or BLM land is not feasible to meet training requirements and would create significant delays in completion of training.
DO-5	1016, 1050, 1151, 1163, 1278, 1303, 1305, 1417, 1521, 1885, 1886, A1198,	F-35A is not an affordable option. Air Force should consider another alternative that is affordable and less technologically risky.	The Air Force has decided to purchase the F-35A aircraft. Section 1.5 describes the advanced capabilities of the F-35A. Any weapon system that is designed to be survivable in the 21st century battlespace must

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1201, 2200, 3000, 3005, 3166, 3253, 3277		have technologically advanced capabilities. The F-35A is no more technologically complex for the present and future than fighters such as the F-86, F-104, or F-16 were for their day. Complexity and capability have development costs. The F-35A maintenance capabilities, with self-diagnosing computer systems, will substantially reduce maintenance costs over the service life of the aircraft. For the 21st century, the F-35A provides what is technologically required at an affordable life-cycle cost.
DO-6	1016, 2093	Air Force should consider increasing minimum altitudes over inhabited areas (suggested 2000 feet or more).	The proposed action does not include any changes to airspace or avoidance areas. The Air Force would continue to follow existing agreements.
DO-7	1016, 3005	Need to add reference for the flare failure rate or discuss if information is based on quantitative documentation.	Additional text has been added to Chapter 2, Section 2.4.5 discussing flares and flare failure rates.
DO-8	2013	Will the F-35A fly on weekends, particularly on Sundays?	F-35A training at active-duty Air Force locations would not be expected to take place on the weekend (i.e., Saturday or Sunday). However, mission requirements would dictate the flying schedule. Other weekend flying and ANG weekend training is expected to continue at its current rate.
DO-9	1128, 1578, 1900, 1912, 1984, 1985, A1210, A1235, A1236, 2166, 2167, 3232	Don't understand why so many scenarios were included. Why include basing 24 or 48 aircraft if it would not be cost effective?	As explained in the EIS, the Air Force is also taking into consideration beddown of a range of aircraft numbers to facilitate potential decision making with respect to F-35A basing and provide for comprehensive NEPA analysis.
DO-10	1070, 1592	Holloman alternative should include discussion of cost savings to military from integrating Army, Navy, and civilian testing in F-35A program.	Forty CFR Sec. 1502.23 explains that, if a cost-benefit analysis is being considered relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives, the cost-benefit analysis shall be incorporated by reference or appended to the EIS as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences. Since a cost-benefit analysis was not prepared to attempt to evaluate environmental alternatives, the regulations state that the EIS should at least indicate considerations, including factors not related to environmental quality, which is likely to be relevant and important to a decision. The EIS Section 1.4.1 lists basing criteria considered in the selection of candidate locations and EIS Section 2.2.2 describes the alternative identification process methodology. The objective criteria and the qualitative operational considerations listed in these sections will be considered with the Final EIS, including public and agency comments, in the decision of whether to base a pilot training center and beddown up to 144 F-35A training aircraft at one or more of the alternatives presented in the Final EIS.
DO-11	1070, 1592	Holloman construction figures should be revised because construction for the F-16 move is already completed or in progress. Final EIS should show	The construction figures for Scenarios H1W, H2W, and H3W already include the final construction activities related to the F-16 move in baseline. For Scenarios H1 through H5, the Air Force considered the

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		large decrease in construction expenditures.	F-16 facilities to meet some F-35A requirements.
DO-12	1089, 1284	The Luke planes currently land well past 10:00 p.m. contrary to what the Air Force told us in a prior public meeting in Surprise, Arizona. Operations at night are disruptive/uncalled for around the airport.	Section 2.4.3 describes the F-35A pilot training course and notes that pilot training requires after dark or night training, including intercept training, for each pilot. Section LU 2.1.1 notes that approximately 17 percent of the sorties out of Luke AFB would be flown after dark and up to two percent of the sorties would be flown after 10 p.m.
DO-13	1412, A1037, A1163, 2175, 3016, 3002	Draft EIS does not address chaff. Will chaff be added later or will other electronic countermeasures be used? Would the F-35A's electronic countermeasures interfere with frequencies or internet signals?	Section 2.4.5 of the EIS states that F-35A pilots are not planning to train with chaff and provides additional information on frequency management.
DO-14	1412, A1100, A1255, 2200	Draft EIS does not include information on weight of residual materials for flares or other environmental impacts from flares.	Section 2.4.5 of the EIS provides details on the size of flare residual materials and the weight of the largest residual material is 0.33 ounces. The environmental impacts from flares are addressed in each Vegetation and Wildlife resource section and the Safety resource section for each base in the EIS.
DO-15	1412, A1255	Otero County has regulations against dumping. Draft EIS should include actual numbers of residual materials and how long materials will stay in the environment.	Chaff and flares have been, and continue to be, deployed during military aircraft training throughout the approved airspaces in Idaho, including over Otero County. The EIS Section 2.4.5 describes the flare residual materials, which are deposited during training. The F-35A flares used in training would not introduce any materials different from the existing uses. Flare plastic or nylon residual pieces weather slowly within the arid western environment.
DO-16	1412, 2200	How many days of the year is flare use restricted for Holloman and how does this affect the mission? More information is needed such as historic restrictions and who decides high or extreme fire danger.	The number of days per year that flare use is restricted is variable depending on the amount of rainfall and local conditions. The ability to use defensive countermeasures enhances the realism of training. Training missions have varied requirements, and adequate periods exist when flare use is not restricted. The designation of fire danger for the areas under specific airspaces is as determined by the National Fire Danger Reporting System.
DO-17	1412	Draft EIS fails to reveal other Air Force studies that show altitude is limited in the effectiveness of preventing flare-caused fires. Draft EIS underplays the chance of fire and how the fires would be fought	See response to DO-7 for a description of flare reliability. Flare burn-out rates have not been identified as the cause of flare caused fires. A study of 12 training ranges and MOA airspaces approved for flare use in 1993-1994 identified five flare-caused fires, all at military ranges where the release altitude was 700 feet above ground level or below (Technical Report 6 on Chaff and Flares, updated 1998; Air Combat Command). Where identified, the cause for such fires was pilot error with release of a flare at too low an altitude.
DO-18	1412, 1793, 1953, A1094,	Draft EIS needs to have more information on the	Section BO 3.2.1.2; Section HO 3.2.1.2; Section LU 3.2.1.2; and Section

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1163, 2105, 3003	claims process for damages and injuries or loss of life from sudden noise intrusions including cost, number of claims expected, or number of claims satisfied in the past.	TU 3.2.1.2 of the EIS state how individuals may begin the claims process for any Air Force-related damage by first contacting the Public Affairs Office of the base in question. The Air Force does not track the number of claims expected by a proposed action or the financial value of those future claims and the number of claims previously satisfied does not relate to the current proposed action.
DO-19	1300, A1056, 3221	Concerned about the reasoning for expanding a base that in now situated in the highly populated area.	The Air Force is not proposing to expand the bases beyond the current boundaries.
DO-20	1303, 1305, 1903, 1978, 3168	Concerned with the costs to upgrade Luke or Boise AGS. See no reason why the same money to retrofit this base could be used to outfit a based closer to Gila Bend or split this w/Tucson Int'l Airport Air Guard as well or to use facilities already at Mountain Home AFB.	Section 2.2.2 of the EIS describes the Alternative Identification Methodologies the Air Force followed to determine the list of candidate bases for the F-35A training mission. Mountain Home AFB is a candidate for the F-35A Operational Wing and was therefore excluded from being considered as a training base candidate.
DO-21	1409	The F-35 can only fly in good weather?	The F-35A is an all-weather aircraft. However, as stated in Section 2.2.2 the Air Force evaluated alternative candidate bases with a mission criterion including weather based on the number of days with 3 miles or better visibility at 3,000 feet AGL. These weather conditions are desired to allow for the minimum disruption in training activities due to inclement weather.
DO-22	1403	Why does Luke AFB have to use Auxiliary Airfield 1 when the runway is not functional? Why not consider using other airfields such as Gila Bend, Yuma, or the Ajo Aux fields?	Even without a functional runway, Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 is a valuable training resource, which provides pilots experience with a different airfield than the main base. Gila Bend Air Force Auxiliary Airfield is also proposed for use by the F-35A as an auxiliary airfield as noted in Section LU 2.2.1.
DO-23	1466, 1814, 1856, 1912, A1037, A1062, A1092, A1162, A1163, A1180, A1235, A1236, 2166, 2167, 2184, 2187, 2189, 2190, 3203	The Draft EIS does not consider the actual flight paths occurring in the airspace around the installation. The EIS should fully describe the total number of over flights, how they will be distributed (over a week and over a 24 hour period), type of aircraft, times of day and night, and flight patterns. Impacts might be different than those currently predicted.	The typical flight paths followed by the Air Force are considered in the noise modeling which generated the noise contours around each of the airfields. The fact that airspace is three-dimensional can result in deviation within those corridors during aircraft overflight. The number of flights in the military airspace (Military Operating Areas, Military Training Routes, and Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspaces) is described in HO 2.2.1. Flights within these airspace units are unpredictable as pilots practice maneuvers to complete their training syllabus.
DO-24	1469	Confusion over what military agency (or agencies) will be responsible for the Proposed Action.	As described in Chapter 1.0, the Air Force is the proponent of the Proposed Action.
DO-25	1793, A1037, A1094, A1100, A1255, 2097, 2159, 2191, 2201	Concern that an alternative excluding the Sacramento Mountains in New Mexico was not used or properly explored and/or the reasons for	No changes to airspace currently used for training were included as part of the proposed action in this EIS. Section 2.4.4 explains that existing airspaces and ranges were identified for potential F-35A training. The

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		including this area in the EIS were not adequately justified	alteration of airspace is beyond the scope of this EIS; the purpose and need is for the beddown of the F-35A using existing airspace. The impacts associated with the use of airspace over the Sacramento Mountains are contained in the environmental consequences of Section HO, particularly in Section HO 3.2.
DO-26	1778	Why has no consideration been given to modifying the Military Training Routes and prohibiting the F-35A from flying at altitudes that are detrimental to humans and animal populations given that the dB's generated in the Military Training Routes are a "particular concern"	See response to DO-25, which addresses impacts to human populations and Military Training Routes and Response NO-6, which addresses F-35A overflights. Regarding impacts to wildlife, EIS Section HO 3.6 addresses impacts to wildlife and domestic animals. EIS Section 2.8 identifies mitigations, which would include measures to reduce noise impacts.
DO-27	1778, 2200	If the F-35A is based at Holloman AFB and the residents are exposed to low-level flights exceeding 133 dB what specific management actions and mitigation measures will be implemented to address the impacts to various areas such as noise reduction and monitoring, economic impact, impacts on schools, safety, loss of property values, emergency evacuations.	Mitigation measures and management actions regarding noise were considered for their operational feasibility and effectiveness in ameliorating adverse impacts. EIS Section 2.8 identifies mitigations, which would include measures to reduce noise impacts.
DO-28	1778, A1094	Was an EA done on the impacts of air to ground training including impacts of Radar on frequency spectrums, other frequency users,	All F-35A training is addressed in this EIS. See response to DO-13.
DO-29	A1062, A1093	I would like to see a map of the flight paths over my property.	Please contact your base Public Affairs Office to request information on the base's flight paths.
DO-30	1450, 1900, 1913, A1062, A1093, A1198, A1201, A1256, 2101, 2121, 2124, 2166, 2167, 3145, 3179	Concern that the Draft EIS doesn't address that F-35A aircraft will "sneak" into Davis-Monthan, since it is not permitted to load ordnance at Tucson International Airport, much in the same way that Tornados, Harriers, F-16, F-18, and other aircraft have in the past.	Section TU 2.2.2 of the EIS describes operations to Davis-Monthan AFB to load live weapons. As noted in Section 2.3.4 of the EIS, the F-16s out of Tucson International Airport currently transit to Davis-Monthan AFB for live ordnance loading. The transit of the F-35As to Davis-Monthan AFB would be expected to use the same flight paths as the F-16s. Table TU 2.2–5 in the EIS notes that the F-35As at Tucson International Airport would be expected to have up to 108 live weapons drops in a year. Any future participation by F-35A aircraft in Operation Snowbird would be subject to separate NEPA documentation.
DO-31	1913, A1214, 2101	The EIS only provides a choice between a No Action Alternative that eliminates basing F-35 at all the sites studied in the EIS, or some F-35A basing at all sites. This appears to be illogical, since some sites may be more appropriate than others, as the number of people affected by the environmental effects of such basing differs from site to site.	The No Action Alternative is described as baseline conditions for each location and the consequences for No Action at any location is explained in Section 2.5 to be the baseline conditions for that alternative. Multiple action scenarios and No Action (baseline) are considered for each alternative and the environmental consequences for all scenarios and alternatives are described. The decision maker will use information from the NEPA process and other information to make an informed basing

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			decision.
DO-32	1583, 1663, 1795, 1801, 1834, 1900, 1912, 1985, A1235, A1236, 2123, 2195, 3246, 3247, 3271	How did the Air Force choose these four bases out of the other options available? Were there are considerations made for proximity to metropolitan areas?	Section 1.4.1 explains that the basing criteria included such factors as support, environmental concerns, and cost factors. Section 2.2 describes the alternatives narrowing process used to identify the alternative bases evaluated for the F-35A pilot training center addressed in this EIS.
DO-33	1861, 2035, 2184, 2200	Will afterburner use be a regular feature of training flights, and/or will afterburner use be required under certain conditions (i.e., high temperature and low humidity)? Is use of afterburners necessary below 4,000 ft AGL?	Section 2.4.3.2 explains that an estimated 10 percent of departures will use afterburners. The estimated proportion of afterburner use is based on training requirements and expected meteorological condition. Each base Section 2.1.1 explains that the use of afterburners is base specific. For example, LU 2.1.1 explains that pilots training at Luke AFB would be expected to use afterburner s during take-off 12 percent of the time.
DO-34	2102	Sensor Integration to Support Precision Munitions, Comprehensive Combat Information Systems would suggest new and specialized requirements over existing resource requirements. Are those included in the Draft EIS?	The precision munitions used for training F-35A pilots are the same or comparable precision munitions used to train other legacy fighter pilots, including F-16 pilots with an air-to-ground mission. Additional range instrumentation, emitters, and target structures may be pursued to exploit F-35 capabilities and enhance training value. However, no additional specialized requirements beyond existing resources have been identified. Naturally, weapons systems are always undergoing development, and if additional weapons or targeting capabilities were to become applicable during the projected 50-year operational life of the F-35A, the new systems would receive separate NEPA review.
DO-35	1538, 1543, A1051, A1195, 2172, 3147, 3264, 3285	Why does the EIS lack any discussion/analysis of a proposed alternate air strip south of Gowen Road? One way to reduce impacts on Boise/Treasure Valley would be to construct such a new runway farther away from the city.	Bases requiring the construction of a new runway were excluded from consideration as alternatives. Section 2.2.2 notes that one of the criteria used in identification of alternative basing locations was capacity. Capacity included the base's existing runway length and configuration. All bases were compared equally using the capacity criterion and changes to runway length or configuration were not included in the review of potential bases.
DO-36	1576	The Air Force cannot guarantee that Meridian Air Space will not be used or flown over.	The City of Meridian is approximately five to 10 miles west of the Boise airfield. Commercial, general aviation, or military aircraft currently may fly over Meridian on approach for landing or during take-off. The EIS does not include any proposal to change flight procedures for aircraft operations at Boise International Airport.
DO-37	1576, A1042, A1077	Request that you inform Boise and Meridian residents that a Training Center is operational 24/7/365 all year. So flights will take place any time of day or night, all types of weather, and on weekends and holidays too. The F-35 jets are much louder than the current air traffic noise.	F-35A training at active-duty Air Force locations would not be expected to take place on the weekend (i.e., Saturday or Sunday). However, mission requirements would dictate the flying schedule. Other weekend flying and ANG weekend training is expected to continue at its current rate. Section 2.4.3 describes the F-35A pilot training course and notes that pilot training requires after dark or night training for each pilot. Section BO 2.1.1 explains that up to 10 percent of the 58 training events in the

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			F-35A have the potential for at least part of the flight after 10:00 p.m.
DO-38	1576, 3230	EIS should include affects on Meridian area and air space.	The City of Meridian is approximately five to 10 miles west of the Boise airfield. Aircraft currently fly over Meridian on approach for landing or during take-off. The EIS includes, as part of the noise evaluation in Section Bo 3.2.1.2, a location (Second Baptist Church) approximately four miles west of the runway, between the runway and Meridian. The noise conditions at that location are below 65 dB DNL for all basing scenarios. The quantified number of noise events per day under each basing scenario is presented for the location. Although the nearest parts of Meridian are more distant and would be subject to lower noise levels and fewer noise events, the data can be used to approximate the noise effects potentially experienced within the city limits of Meridian closest to the airport.
DO-39	2164, 2207	Concern that white phosphorous will be used during training activities	Section 2.4.5 presents the projected annual ordnance use in F-35A training. White phosphorous rockets are not included in the F-35A training syllabus evaluated in this EIS. Munitions would only be used on approved ranges. If white phosphorous rockets were approved for a range, other aircraft could use that type of munition on that range.
DO-40	A1210, 2128, 2166, 2167	In Chapter 2 a No-Action Alternative is offered, but in Chapter 4 it appears this option is no longer available and the choice in only among basing 24-144 aircraft at different locations. The No Action alternative must be analyzed as a real alternative for each site.	As noted in Section 2.5 of the EIS, the No Action Alternative would not base the F-35A training mission at any of the four locations. At each potential alternative location, there are ongoing and currently planned activities and programs that would continue. Known ongoing and planned activities are included as part of the baseline conditions. For the purposes of this EIS, the No Action Alternative constitutes the baseline conditions and is assessed for each alternative location.
DO-41	2128, 3269	If one location is chosen, could one of the other locations still be used for training purposes? For example, if Luke AFB was chosen, could training flights use Tucson International Airport or Davis-Monthan AFB, or utilize their airspace?	No regularly scheduled training would take place except at locations identified in the EIS for the respective basing alternatives. Incidental use of another field by a training aircraft is always possible as part of the airfield's transient operations.
DO-42	1900, 1925, 1985, A1144	Draft EIS ignores limitations upon training pilots flying in and out of Tucson International Airport. Restrictions such as hours of operation, flight paths, power settings, and number of operations permitted per years will make pilots' training suffer.	The EIS analysis includes characteristics of the different base alternatives. For example, Section TU 2.1 explains that Tucson International Airport operations would use afterburners approximately seven percent of the time where other bases have different afterburner use percentages. Tucson International Airport is currently used for F-16 pilot training and the pilots receive high quality training while adhering to Tucson International Airport flight requirements. There is no reason to believe that F-35A pilot training would suffer from adhering to the same operational requirements, which apply to F-16 pilot training.
DO-43	3001	I wasn't able to really find information specifically	Potential environmental consequences under the training airspace,

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		concerning the F-35 flying in our areas and in particular beneath the Military Training Routes that would be used in our area.	including Military Training Routes, are addressed in the Airspace Environmental Consequences, Section HO 3.X.2.2 of each environmental resource.
DO-44	2124, 2195, 2200	The Draft EIS provides no specific scientific analysis of the cumulative effects to areas in proximity to the base/airfield, which includes residences, businesses, schools, churches, medical complexes, police and fire departments, and various other facilities	The EIS provides in each installation-specific Section 3 analysis of baseline impacts to on- and off-installation locations and facilities. The impacts of the beddown scenarios are, in some instances, calculated for a particular location (e.g., supplemental noise metrics for a representative noise-sensitive location), an area (e.g., noise contours), or a type of location (e.g., number of child care centers within a certain noise contour interval). Calculation of baseline conditions and the impacts under F-35A scenarios take into account all ongoing activities at the installation/airport and all activities included in the Proposed Action, as appropriate. Analysis of cumulative impacts of the F-35A beddown scenarios and other concurrent actions is included in each installation-specific Section 4.
DO-45	3010, 3111	Would like to see a comparison of the frequency of F-22 and F-16 flights and proposed F-35A flights.	Chapter 2 of the EIS does present a comparison of F-16 and F-35A aircraft operations. F-22 aircraft operations will cease at Holloman AFB prior to any F-35A operations occurring at Holloman AFB.
DO-46	2136	How were the Mission Personnel Change numbers calculated? In some instances, they seem low and perhaps do not take metropolitan or regional population growth into consideration.	Mission Personnel numbers were based on Air Force estimates of personnel needed to operate, train, and maintain the F-35A aircraft system.
DO-47	A1093, 2136, 3166	The discussion of environmental consequences and impact analysis in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 does not seem to take the effects of low altitude flights (which include supersonic activities) into consideration. Nor do they consider multiple flight impacts (tactical maneuvers of up to eight aircraft simultaneously).	As stated in base Sections 2.2.1, F-35A aircraft will not fly at supersonic speeds at low altitudes. Most airspace that allows supersonic flight specifies supersonic flight is allowed at or above 10,000 AGL. The EIS takes into account all training sorties including those flown by a training instructor, and this noise is incorporated into calculated time-averaged noise levels . Text has been added to the EIS describing the noise generated by multiple aircraft flying together.
DO-48	3138	Don't understand how the number of sonic booms per day is the same (or nearly the same) regardless of the number of aircraft.	As shown in Table HO 2.2–3, the training airspace units support numerous aircraft operations under baseline conditions, and these baseline operations generate sonic booms that would not change regardless of the beddown of F-35A aircraft. The F-35A is expected to generate a similar number and intensity of sonic booms per sortie to F-16 aircraft. The average number of sonic booms per day at a location near the center of the training airspace is not expected to increase substantially relative to baseline conditions under F-35A beddown scenarios.
DO-49	3005	Table 2–12 was too long and difficult to read (small fonts) for a 'quick review'	Table 2–12 was created to provide as detailed a summary as possible of all of the potential impacts of concern to the public.

DO=DOPAA			
Code	***Letter Number***	***Description***	***Response***
DO-50	2136	The National Park Service is concerned for noise in recreational areas, as they potentially affect natural soundscapes of park units. National Park Service would appreciate any consideration of varied use of airspace to minimize direct impacts to National Park Service units. If low level (<2,000 ft AGL) flights could occur outside National Park Service units, this would assist in preserving the natural quiet of parks consistent with National Park Service Management Policies (Section 4.9 [Soundscape Management]) and 40 CFR 1508.27b.	The proposed action does not include any changes to airspace or avoidance areas. The Air Force would continue to follow existing agreements with the National Park Service.
DO-51	2136	For the four Projected F-35A Annual Munitions Use tables, it would be helpful to see baseline conditions.	The F-35A would be conducting similar weapons training to the F-16s and A-10s currently stationed at the locations under consideration. It is expected that the volume of F-35A munitions used would be similar to those currently being expended by the F-16s and A-10s.
DO-52	2136	On Page 3-33, the text states, "The F-35A is normally flown at higher altitudes than other fighter aircraft to perform air-to-ground missions. Considering this, intrusion from high altitude operations of the F-35A is less likely to cause startle effects on users of quiet recreational settings." However, earlier in the document, text noted that F-35A training would require low altitude flights. Which is true?	Both. As shown in Table 2–9 a higher percentage of F-35A sorties would take place at higher altitudes when compared to existing F-16 and A-10 aircraft.
DO-53	3000, 3215	Suggests providing advanced warning of flyovers or sonic booms such as sonic booms during certain times of day. Advanced warning would allow people to prepare for sonic booms, particularly if working with horses or other animals.	Holloman AFB has on its web page a notification of flying activity and information on Sonic booms.
DO-54	3215	Believe that the construction costs are too high.	As referenced in Section 2.2.2 construction costs were based on the DoD Facilities Pricing Guide, dated June 2007 (DoD 2007), as updated by the June 2009 draft OSD Pricing Guide (DoD 2009). Once a decision for the beddown of the F-35A Pilot Training Center, the government will obtain competitive bids for the construction projects.
DO-55	A1125, A1261, 2168, 3219	I question the baseline condition that were used, where did this information come from	Baseline conditions in the EIS were developed from environmental assessments and environmental impact statements as well as recently published annual reports of flight activity, manpower estimates, and 2010 Census data.
DO-56	3231	How will the south runway be used when the planes start flying; the 2A departure and approach goes	Aircraft operations from the future runway will be evaluated in a future environmental analysis if the project moves forward. At that time, the mix

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		right over Senator Risch's house.	of aircraft using that runway and the potential environmental consequences will be identified.
DO-57	2111	In Table 2–5 (F-35A Basic Course Training Missions) – It is unclear why minimum number is 10 and the recommended number is 5. Can a recommendation be lower than the minimum? Do these numbers relate to Table 2–9 (Percentage of Flight Hours by Altitude)? If Table 2–5 has incorrect figures, would this change Table 2–9?	To clarify, Table 2–5 presents the minimum and recommended floor and ceilings for various airspace units needed to conduct training activities. The minimums portray the smallest airspace dimensions that can accommodate the indicated training mission without unduly compromising successful execution. On the other hand, the recommended dimensions portray judiciously appropriate sized airspace that better provides the latitude in terms of breadth and altitude span to realistically accommodate mission scenario execution. Therefore, you willl see the recommended airspace providing larger maneuvering room than the minimum. Table 2–5 is correct, as well as Table 2–9.
DO-58	2111	Pages 2–50 and 2–127 - The number of acres off station affected by >65 dB is not consistent. Boise AGS number of acres affected on 2-71 for scenario B-1 is 3,032 and in the Land Use/Recreation 2-5, scenario B1 has total acres listed as 2,944.	In the EIS, the number of acres affected by > 65 dB is consistent between the Noise and Land Use/ Recreation sections. The commenter was incorrectly comparing the Total Area Affected against the Total Change.
DO-59	2111	Executive Summary, Page 65 states, "Outside the base, noise levels about 65 dB DNL could exceed as far as the CJ Strike Dan Recreation Annex…" This conflicts with BO-122 where it states, "There are no public recreation sites outside the base within the noise impact area." In addition, the noise Figures BO 3.2–4 through BO 3.2–6 all show the >65 dB line far removed from the CJ Strike Annex. Recommend removing text in Executive Summary.	See response to CM-4.
DO-60	A1037	Also the supersonic flights in the "Cowboy" flight areas (Holloman) need to limited in altitude to flight altitudes that are below the DOD and FCC's minimum noise levels in dB not dBA or dBC to prevent hearing damage and potential hearing loss.	As stated in EIS table HO 2.2-1, the lowest altitude at which supersonic operations in Cowboy ATCAA are permitted to be conducted is Flight Level (FL) 230 (23,000 feet above mean sea level). Ground elevation in the town of Weed, is approximately 7,100 feet above mean sea level, which means that supersonic operations are not permitted at less than approximately 15,900 feet above the town. Higher ground elevations would be nearer to the lowest supersonic flying operations. F-35A sonic booms would generally be expected to be less intense than sonic booms generated by F-22 aircraft and slightly more intense than sonic booms generated by F-16 aircraft. Supersonic flying maneuver expected to be conducted by the F-35A would be similar, in terms of time spent at supersonic airspeeds per sortie, the types of maneuvers being conducted, and the Mach numbers used during training. The supersonic noise environment is expected to be similar to the supersonic noise

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			environment generated by the operations of fourth generation fighter aircraft, such as the F-16. As stated in EIS Section 3.2.1, military aircraft noise is not federally regulated. Under F-35A beddown scenarios, supersonic operations would continue at altitudes and in airspace units in which they are currently approved.
DO-61	3283	Aside from the Royal Saudi Air Force, how many other royal Air Force bases from other countries are going to come and train over our populace?	Section 1.1 of the EIS notes that the Joint Strike Fighter program is a joint, multinational program among the U.S. military as well eight international partners including the United Kingdom, Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey, Canada, Australia, Denmark, and Norway. More recently, Japan has also decided to purchase Joint Strike Fighters.
DO-62	A1125, A1261, 2168, 3219	Since the Air Force decided to have the F-35A at Luke AFB in 2010, think the Air Force could have saved taxpayer money by preparing the EIS for only Luke AFB.	No decision can be made until the Environmental Impact Statement has been completed and a Record of Decision signed. In compliance with NEPA, the Air Force has evaluated all four locations identified by the alternative identification process methodology presented in Section 2.2.2 of the EIS.
DO-63	A1037, A1163, 2164, 2207, 3150	To date, the Air Force has failed to adequately respond to the community's complaints about over flights of military aircraft. The EIS must fully evaluate and address all potential for noise associated with the proposed alternatives and its impacts on public health, quality of life and wildlife and "taking" of life quality.	The base Public Affairs Office takes noise complaints and makes every effort to respond to each complaint. See Responses NO-6 and NO-36.
DO-64	2174, 2200	Why would the Air Force consider flying planes with flares over an area (such as the Lincoln National Forest) with a long history of devastating wildfires and loss? Was this proposal coordinated in any way with the U.S. Forest Service?	Section 2.4.5 of the EIS provides details on the use and conditions of flare use. The environmental impact from flares is addressed in each Vegetation and Wildlife resource. The U.S. Forest Service has been coordinated with from the start of this EIS.
DO-65	A1138, 3184	Draft EIS only identifies one alternative for each base because it admits than one and two squadrons are not cost effective and that the total training requirements for the F-35A would necessitate up to 15 squadrons of F-35A (pg 1-2 of the Draft EIS) which would put 6 squadrons at Luke and 3 squadrons at the remaining locations. Draft EIS fails to comply with 40 CFR Section 1500.2.	As explained in EIS Section 1.4 and in Section 2.1 there are four action alternatives: Boise AGS, Holloman AFB, Luke AFB, and Tucson AGS evaluating the basing of up to 144 F-35A aircraft. The Air Force will repeat the Strategic Basing Process to determine the alternative bases for subsequent F-35A Training Centers, which could include the bases not selected in this EIS.
DO-66	A1062, A1138, A1210, 2166, 2167, 3168, 3184	During scoping, commenters identified reasonable alternatives including Libby Army Airfield, Gila Bend Air Force Auxiliary Field, Pinal Air Park, or construction of a new facility. None of these locations has adequate facilities but neither does	As noted in Response DO-35, bases requiring major construction, such as the construction of a new runway, were excluded from consideration as alternatives. Section 2.2 describes the alternatives narrowing process used to identify the alternative bases evaluated for the F-35A pilot training center addressed in this EIS. Section 1.4.1 explains that the basing

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		Tucson International Airport, which would require construction. None of these reasonable alternatives were considered in the Draft EIS. An evaluation should be done of all of these alternatives in comparison to the effects of the F-35A at Tucson International Airport.	criteria included such factors as support, environmental concerns, and cost factors. The accessibility of a base to community services was incorporated into these criteria.
DO-67	A1037	Besides concerns about public safety as it applies to hazardous materials and wastes, the EIS must analyze all potential impacts including potential accidents.	Section 3.4 in all base sections of the EIS includes an analysis of potential impacts to public safety as a result of the F-35A basing. Included in these sections are an evaluation of potential aircraft mishaps or crashes, bird strikes, weapons loading, and safety risks from flares.
DO-68	A1037	Chaff can degrade into small particles that may cause lung damage. The Air Force must study chaff deterioration over time and address the impact on animal and human health.	The F-35A aircraft is not planning to use chaff as a defensive countermeasure.
DO-69	A1037, A1163	Where is the data specific to the F-35A flight operations and ordnance? Why is it not included?	The number, distribution, and altitude profile of F-35A flight operations are presented in the EIS. The number and types of ordnance planned for use by the F-35A aircraft are presented in Table 2–10.
DO-70	2166	Draft EIS references relocation of F-16s from whatever base is selected for basing the F-35As but there is nothing in the Draft EIS to explain why the analysis of this potential connected action is not included in the Draft EIS and where the F-16s might be moved or whether they would be potentially located in the same area as the alternative locations.	These are not connected actions and have independent utility. The F-16 relocation to Holloman AFB was implemented in order to utilize the assets provided by Holloman AFB.
DO-71	2167, 2168	Draft EIS is based on simplistic assumption that the increase in aircraft and/or number of flights is linear and that there are no cumulative changes or effects as the numbers increase.	The EIS proposed action and alternatives contains flight operations based upon Air Force training experience with high performance fighter aircraft. Pilot training would require the types of flight operations explained in EIS Section 2.4.3. Complex exercises were run to describe training flight operations of the F-35A and those exercises, in combination with field noise measurements, were used to quantify aircraft noise effects. The aircraft numbers in each F-35A basing scenario result in different noise contours as depicted in base Sections 3.2.1.2. Those noise effects were used to provide an assessment of consequences throughout the EIS resource sections. A review of Appendix B demonstrates that the noise consequences are non-linear.
DO-72	2168, 2200	Draft EIS is a cut and paste document using out of date stock references and citations.	The EIS is a valid and reliable document for use by agencies, the public, and decision makers.
DO-73	3268, 3269	Is it 72 planes or nothing? If they bring in more than	Section 2.4 explains that the Air Force has included multiple alternative

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		24 planes, are they going to ship the A-10s somewhere else? Where? And what is the Idaho Air Guard going to fly?	locations and aircraft basing scenarios so that decision makers and the public have a comprehensive understanding of the potential environmental consequences for planning purposes. Section BO 2.0 explains the three basing scenarios the Air Force is considering as part of the Boise AGS alternative. If more than 48 F-35A aircraft were based at Boise AGS, capacity limitations would require the A-10s to relocate. The Idaho Air National Guard would train on the F-35A aircraft.
DO-74	2195	The nature and extent of urban encroachment here makes basing the F‑35A incompatible with substantial portions of residential and business communities. Simply having selected Tucson International Airport AGS as one of four possible sites for basing of the F-35A does not make it a suitable site, yet this is what apparently is assured by the way the Air Force framed the Draft EIS.	The EIS is intended to inform decision makers of the potential environmental consequences of basing the F-35A training mission at Tucson AGS or the other three basing alternatives. The Draft EIS provides a full and fair discussion of these consequences. The Final EIS will include the Air Force's consideration and responses to comments provided by the public and agencies during the public comment period. It will be published for a 30-day waiting period for an additional public review while the Air Force considers the basing alternatives. The Air Force will make its decision in a Record of Decision, which will not be released until after the 30-day waiting period has elapsed.
DO-75	2195	The Air Force claims beddowns of 24 or 48 F-35As would not be cost effective, yet includes this as alternatives to future analysis to "facilitate potential future decision making." (Draft EIS, p. 2-7) This contention poses two problems: first, the Air Force is required to offer alternatives that are "reasonable", and second, the Air Force does not explain how this will relate to future decision making". Again, the public is required to comment on this but since we are told that the alternative provided is not "reasonable" it is nonsensical and unfair.	Section 2.4 explains that the Air Force has included multiple alternative locations and aircraft basing scenarios so that decision makers and the public have a comprehensive understanding of the potential environmental consequences for planning purposes. Scenarios with 24 or 48 aircraft are not now considered cost-effective, as stated in the section. The section also notes, “Eventually, the number of aircraft assigned and bases used in support of the F-35A mission could change in light of national strategic considerations and F-35A production and availability”. It is entirely appropriate for the Air Force to assess the environmental consequences of a variety of alternatives from which basing selections could reasonably be made.
DO-76	A1093	Please define infrequent in the following: Occasional use airspace and ranges would generally receive only infrequent use by the F-35A.	Occasional use airspace and ranges when primary airspace is not available because of unexpected weather or scheduling conflicts.
DO-77	A1094	The Draft EIS does not state the environmental impacts for ALL communities that are located under the Military Training Routes. It is incumbent upon the Air Force to conduct and present the results of thorough, valid and reliable environmental for ALL communities. These findings and the methodologies used in the assessment should be presented as an Appendix to the Draft EIS and	The full disclosure of potential environmental consequences for the public, agencies, and the Air Force decision maker of environmental impacts to communities under Military Training Routes, Military Operations Areas, and all other training airspace has been accomplished in this EIS. All communities located beneath the training airspace were evaluated at the same level of detail using consistent methodologies. The methodologies used in the assessment of environmental impacts are described in Chapter 3.0 of the EIS and the findings are presented in

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		included in the Final EIS.	Chapter 4.0 in the base-specific sections. The EIS includes forty-six pages of references detailing the peer-reviewed documents, technical research, and scholarly journals used to support the evaluation of environmental impacts.
DO-78	A1094	Since no environmental assessment has been completed for Sacramento Mountain communities that lie under the F-35A's Military Training Routes, explain how an Environmental Management System (EMS), required per Executive Order (EO13423). Specific to the needs of our mountains be designed? Please site the pages in the Draft EIS where the EMS plan can be found regarding the Sacramento Mountains.	The Air Force will comply with EO 13423 after the basing decision has been made.
DO-79	A1094	With regard to the Sacramento Mountains, where in the Draft EIS is post-decision monitoring and mitigation addressed that is required in an EMS?	The Air Force will comply with EO 13423 after the basing decision has been made.
DO-80	A1094	Who were the community members from Weed, Sacramento, Mayhill, and Pinon New Mexico that were involved in the development of the EMS for the Sacramento Mountains; will they be included in post-decision monitoring and mitigation?	The Air Force will comply with EO 13423 after the basing decision has been made.
DO-81	2200	As per NEPA, should these adverse affects or other unknowns surface which impact the human environment, a Supplemental EIS for this F-35 EIS will be required. The full range of impacts should have already been addressed in the document detailing information on the F-35 aircraft proposed project. An EIS should have been done for other Holloman major projects as well instead of flawed and insufficient Environmental Assessments when NEPA requires an EIS.	The EIS appropriately analyzes the impacts under NEPA. Should the proposed action substantially change or if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts, a supplemental environmental document can be prepared to assess the environmental consequences of the changes (40 CFR 1502.9[c]).
DO-82	2200	Sonic booms are weapons of war and terror. They shouldn't have a place in airspace over our communities. Sonic booms were even unacceptable in the Middle East when Israel used sonic booms as a weapon in Gaza. Yet our Air Force is using this weapon of war over populated areas in New Mexico. "We simply think that [the sonic booms are] a violation of basic human rights, especially rights of children to live in peace and to	Military test and/or training of supersonic aircraft have been occurring in approved airspace over the U.S. since 1947. Such training is required for F-35A aircrews (see Sections 2.1 and 2.4).

DO=DOPAA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		be educated in peace" Kham Abdul Shafi (UN spokesman in Gaza).	
DO-83	2200	The F-35 EIS left out the F-22 Raptor from the majority of evaluations stating that the F-22 left recently, or mentions the F-22 in the past tense, although it is mentioned briefly in various places. The F-22 should have been included in all evaluations and charts since this project was started over two years ago and the F-22 was present then and is still an aircraft that is based at Holloman AFB and its presence continues to affect many communities negatively.	F-22 aircraft would not be present when F-35A aircraft would arrive if Holloman AFB were chosen as the Pilot Training Center.
DO-84	2200	Aircraft should not require flight time around the clock for the purpose of training. Pilot trainees should not be over populated private properties and public properties at all hours of night either.	Mission training requirements and the flight training activities to support those requirements include flying a portion of the operations at night. Each base specific Section 2.1.1 provides the percentage of training events that would occur after 10:00 p.m.
DO-85	2200	This Draft EIS conveniently fails to acknowledge already known information from what has already been experienced in New Mexico due to noise impacts from Holloman AFB aircraft that are using airspace over communities within our state.	Section 2.2.3 for each basing alternative summarized the public and agency concerns expressed during the scoping process. Environmental concerns from scoping are addressed in the Draft EIS for the alternative location where such concerns were raised. The EIS presents data and analysis to identify projected environmental impacts based in part on the concerns expressed during scoping. Many of the concerns expressed by participants in the public hearings and submitted as part of the EIS process identify as the source of their concerns the information on potential impacts presented in the EIS.
DO-86	2200	It appears that the F-35 was recently tested at Holloman AFB. It should not have been tested without proper public disclosure.	F-35A test and training activities have been limited to Edwards AFB, CA and Eglin AFB, FL.
DO-87	2199	I believe that the real alternative preferred by the Air Force is 144 F-35s at Luke AFB. They would not be spending all this money if they didn't eventually want this scenario.	The Air Force has identified its Preferred Alternative for a Pilot Training Center as 72 F-35A aircraft at Luke AFB, AZ.

EJ=Environmental Justice			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
EJ-1	1002, 1551, 1552, 1562, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1785, 1795, 1801, 1884, 1912, 1985, 1993, A1046,	What mitigations will be done for the schools and day care centers affected by high noise levels and increased pollution?	While Congress has given the FAA authority to spend taxpayer money for mitigating noise at private residences and noise-sensitive receptors in relation to airport construction or expansion, it has not given the military Services any similar general authority.

EJ=Environmental Justice			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1048, A1050, A1065, A1077, A1093, A1095, A1098, A1110, A1187, A1190, A1193, A1195, A1196, A1214, A1231, A1232, A1234, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2189, 2190, 2200, 3137, 3197, 3218, 3248, 3263		
EJ-2	1182, 1303, 1305, 1412, 1430, 1454, 1467, 1472, 1485, 1486, 1493, 1566, 1582, 1639, 1643, 1644, 1699, 1719, 1730, 1747, 1748, 1756, 1760, 1767, 1781, 1790, 1794, 1799, 1822, 1853, 1856, 1895, 1900, 1902, 1906, 1911, 1913, 1915, 1918, 1923, 1934, 1938, 1954, 1959, 1971, 1977, 1980, 1983, 1986, A1021, A1022, A1064, A1067, A1069, A1076, A1077, A1083, A1086, A1087, A1093, A1095, A1108, A1110, A1122, A1162, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1180, A1184, A1191, A1198, A1202, A1214, A1227, A1231, A1234, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, A1255, A1257, A1258, A1259, A1260, A1264, A1267, 2071, 2105, 2115, 2119, 2120, 2128, 2129, 2151, 2163, 2164, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2179, 2187, 2188, 2200, 2203, 2204, 2207, 3016, 3115, 3012, 3238, 3254, 3262, 3165, 3169	Concern with impact on children's hearing, learning and on lost productivity. The Draft EIS does not consider several relevant studies that address aircraft noise on learning, cognition, and health. For example, a 2011 World Health Organization Study presents massive numbers of scholarly research articles on the impact of airport noise on blood pressure and learning ability, including studies of before and after impact of an airport in proximity to a metropolitan area.	The Air Force is aware that children are more sensitive to aircraft noise than adults are. In compliance with Executive Order 13045, the EIS evaluates disproportionate impacts to children. Each Base Section 3.12 identifies the schools and child care centers which would be affected by noise considered to be incompatible with educational services as developed by the American National Standard's Institute's 2009 Acoustical Performance Criteria, Design Requirements, and Guidelines for Schools (for example see Section BO 3.12.2. Appendix B provides more information on the impacts of noise on learning, development, and health of children. Appendix B cites several studies from the American National Standards Institute, the World Health Organization, and other studies evaluating the impacts of noise on children in the vicinity of airports in Munich, Los Angeles, New York, and London. These references were also used in the development of the 2011 World Health Organization's Burden of Disease from Environmental Noise. These references are listed in Appendix B, Section B.4 of the EIS.
EJ-3	1412, A1037, A1094.	Concern that the claims process for damages would disproportionately discriminate against minorities and low-income due to red tape and high court costs.	Section BO 3.2.1.2; Section HO 3.2.1.2; Section LU 3.2.1.2; and Section TU 3.2.1.2 of the EIS state how individuals may begin the claims process for any Air Force-related damage by first contacting the Public Affairs Office of the base in question.
EJ-4	1455, 1484, 1485, 1486, 1758, 1760, 1790, 1814, 1895, 1900, 1913, 1915, 1931, 1938, 1942, 1979, 1985, A1037, A1064, A1067, A1069, A1093, A1094, A1162, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172,	A higher percentage of low-income and minority residents would be affected. Disproportionate detrimental impacts would constitute environmental injustice. Draft EIS has no specific plan for mitigation.	Section 3.10 of the EIS explains the methodology used for determining disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income residents based on the Air Force's 1997 Guide for Environmental Justice Analysis with the Environmental Impact Analysis Process. Potential disproportionate impacts to minority and/or low-income residents from the F-35A basing were determined under the Boise

EJ=Environmental Justice			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1173, A1196, A1210, A1235, A1236, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, 2105, 2128, 2151, 2176, 2187, 2189, 2190, 2195, 2200, 3016, 3194, 3203		AGS alternative (see Section BO 3.12), the Luke AFB alternative (see Section LU 3.12), and the Tucson AGS alternative (see Section TU 3.12). EIS Section 2.8 explains mitigation measures and Section 2.8.1 identifies mitigations and management actions incorporated into the project alternative actions to reduce the potential for environmental impacts (40 CFR 1502.14 (f)). Section 2.8.2 explains that certain F-35A beddown activities are projected to result in disturbance and/or noise within areas not previously or recently subject to these effects. To the extent practicable, mitigation measures would be applied to reduce potential effects to acceptable levels. However, impacts that cannot be mitigated could occur. Some of these impacts could be considered adverse or annoying to potentially affected individuals. Unavoidable, adverse impacts are impacts identified during the public and agency review of the Draft EIS that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level. Such unavoidable, adverse impacts will be identified for decision makers in the Final EIS and Record of Decision (ROD).
EJ-5	1457, 1900, 1912, 1985, A1062, A1180, A1196, 2166, 2167, 2189, 2190, 3145, 3149, 3164	Concern that public materials were not distributed in a language other than English (i.e., Spanish or Native language) or that translator was not present at public meetings.	No requests for materials in a language other than English were received by the Air Force during scoping. Tucson AGS did provide translators at the public hearings conducted in February 2012.
EJ-6	1915, 1923, A1122, A1162, A1232, 2115, 2128, 2168, 2200, 2204, 2207, 3006, 3262, 3263, 3137, 3165, 3197	Concern for noise and the effect on children playing outdoors at schools on playgrounds and sports fields. Where will youth be able to play soccer and baseball?	See Response EJ-2. Appendix B of the EIS also has references and information on the potential impacts of children from exposure to noise while outdoors. Additional information on impacts to children has been added to base Sections 3.2 of the Final EIS.
EJ-7	2136	The Draft EIS does not appear to consider the potential increase in demand for water and if this would result in increased cost for low-income populations.	As explained in base Sections 3.11.1.2, the number of employment opportunities associated with F-35A basing would be expected to be filled by the available labor within the ROI at all locations except Holloman AFB. In the case of Alamogordo, Section HO 3.13.2 identifies the potential for significant impacts to water resources from an increased water demand if the population increased by 18.4 percent with H3W. This would represent a potential increase of about 6.95 percent of the latest water demand statistics. Significant impacts associated with increases in potable water usage may occur under scenarios in which water usage may increase between 6 and 10 percent. An increase of about 6.95 percent in demand is potentially significant when tied to water usage. Currently, the city is developing new conservation measures and trying to secure additional water supplies to meet current and projected demands. There is no basis for assuming that low-income populations are disproportionately impacted by a water shortage.

EJ=Environmental Justice			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
EJ-8	3003	Concern for impacts and lack of mitigations on home-schooled children.	See Response to EJ-1, EJ-2, EJ-6
EJ-9	2175, 3003	German studies show that children are severely affected by noise levels over 115 dB and they take into account the rise in noise. Same studies show there's likely to be convulsions with babies at that noise level.	Appendix B of the EIS includes several references and details on the effects on children of aircraft noise including information developed in a 1999 study by H. Ising on the noise effects from low altitude aircraft training.
EJ-10	3230	The report did not address the 10,000 kids between birth and 18 years old that are going to be subjected to 100 and 125 dBs, not 65 dB, even more after afterburners.	Base Sections 3.2 and 3.12 the EIS evaluate noise effects to children and recognize that adverse effects could be possible. Additional information on the development and health of children exposed to noise levels is provided in Appendix B of the EIS.
EJ-11	2111	BO-135 Paragraph 3 The noise generated for Jarbidge North Military Operations Area/Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace as shown in table BOI 10-5 and BOI 10-8 show scenario B1=65 dB and only B2 and B3 >65 dB, 66 and 67 dB respectively. Recommend rewriting paragraph to reflect only B2 and B3 >65 dB impacting the minority and low-income population. For example: “The noise levels generated in the training airspace under all scenarios would not exceed 65 dB DNL_{mr} with the exception of scenarios B2 and B3 for Jarbidge North Military Operations Area/Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace, which would experience levels of 66 and 67 dB DNL_{mr}. Therefore, there is potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income population for scenarios B2 and B3."	Text was revised in the EIS to the following: "The noise levels generated in the training airspace under all of the scenarios would not exceed 65 dB DNL_{mr}, with the exception of the Jarbidge North MOA/ATCAA, which would reach noise levels of 66 dB DNL_{mr} and 67 dB DNL_{mr} under Scenarios B2 and B3; ..."
EJ-12	2111	On Page BO-136, paragraph 2, text states that schools and child care center located on MHAFB would be affected by noise impact >65 dB DNL under baseline conditions and the F-35A aircraft scenarios; however, they currently are affected by these levels. The text should be changed to read that those areas would remain above 65 dB with the addition of the F-35 scenarios and therefore not have an increase over the current affect.	Text was revised in the EIS to the following: "The school and child care center located on Mountain Home AFB would be affected by noise levels greater than 65 dB DNL under baseline conditions. Under the F-35A aircraft scenarios, noise levels would continue to be above 65 dB DNL. Therefore, the noise levels generated under the F-35A aircraft scenarios in regard to schools would have potential adverse impacts on children at these locations."

GE=General			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
GE-1	1001, 1004, 1007, 1010, 1025, 1072, 1073, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1104, 1107, 1111, 1112, 1115, 1120, 1126, 1131, 1132, 1134, 1136, 1142, 1149, 1177, 1188, 1190, 1199, 1204, 1214, 1300, 1301, 1304, 1375, 1381, 1407, 1409, 1417, 1442, 1448, 1449, 1455, 1466, 1475, 1488, 1493, 1495, 1515, 1516, 1519, 1520, 1521, 1524, 1529, 1534, 1542, 1552, 1554, 1557, 1559, 1573, 1588, 1593, 1621, 1622, 1628, 1630, 1639, 1643, 1655, 1656, 1661, 1662, 1664, 1681, 1689, 1703, 1706, 1707, 1715, 1717, 1726, 1730, 1734, 1737, 1738, 1743, 1747, 1750, 1769, 1774, 1775, 1776, 1781, 1795, 1701, 1807, 1809, 1813, 1815, 1816, 1824, 1830, 1834, 1838, 1854, 1855, 1862, 1863, 1865, 1887, 1889, 1895, 1896, 1898, 1899, 1914, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1924, 1925, 1929, 1932, 1934, 1942, 1944, 1945, 1953, 1954, 1961, 1963, 1964, 1973, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1980, 1984, 1986, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1999, A1003, A1004, A1006, A1011, A1021, A1023, A1029, A1031, A1034, A1038, A1040, A1042, A1043, A1044, A1047, A1048, A1049, A1050, A1052, A1053, A1054, A1056, A1060, A1086, A1087, A1088, A1092, A1093, A1094, A1095, A1108, A1112, A1116, A1121, A1122, A1132, A1134, A1135, A1175, A1179, A1182, A1183, A1185, A1187, A1189, A1192, A1196, A1198, A1201, A1206, A1207, A1210, A1211, A1213, A1220, A1227, A1231, A1232, A1235, A1236, A1263, A1268, 2028, 2044, 2045, 2065, 2066, 2071, 2073, 2074, 2083, 2096, 2101, 2103, 2107, 2115, 2119, 2125, 2139, 2144, 2163, 2175, 2179, 2182, 2188, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2204, 3110, 3134, 3149, 3159, 3168, 3184, 3187, 3219, 3223, 3225, 3229, 3231, 3265	F-35A should be based somewhere else, at another more suitable location, or in a remote area away from homes, businesses, and schools or any large population areas.	In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Air Force is considering the environmental impacts of the basing of the F-35A Training Center, which includes full consideration of comments provided during the public comment period of the Draft EIS. Section 2.2 of the EIS discusses the alternative narrowing process used to identify the four alternatives considered in the EIS.
GE-2	1002, 1022, 1112, 1460, 1484, 1485, 1486, 1540, 1551, 1552, 1556, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1612, 1613, 1631, 1659, 1725, 1758, 1760, 1785, 1790, 1807, 1852, 1854, 1864, 1900, 1925, 1938, 1952, 1971, 1985, 1987, 1995, A1000, A1042, A1045, A1046, A1062, A1064, A1067, A1069, A1092, A1108, A1153, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1180, A1185, A1190, A1193, A1212, A1224, A1231, A1234, A1235, A1236, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240,	The Air Force should bring several F-35A aircraft to conduct typical daily training schedule for residents to judge the noise for themselves. Indicating that public flyovers of the F-35 cannot occur due to a shortage of aircraft is neither appropriate nor reasonable.	There is not a sufficient number of F-35A aircraft available or enough trained pilots to provide a demonstration of the F-35A aircraft. F-35A noise level measurements used in this EIS are the most accurate data available for the aircraft. Flight profiles expected to be used by the F-35A were derived by repeated flight simulator tests, and were applied to local flying conditions at the beddown installation. Individual overflight noise levels are compared in the Base and Airspace Noise Environmental consequences sections for each base. Field checks have

GE=General			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, 2035, 2051, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2151, 2184, 2187, 2195, 3141, 3147, 3159, 3182, 3188, 3194, 3201, 3203, 3218, 3231, 3242, 3245, 3253, 3259, 3261, 3278, 3280		been conducted which indicated good agreement between levels predicted by NOISEMAP and actual noise levels.
GE-3	1003, 1005, 1006, 1008, 1011, 1012, 1014, 1015, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1023, 1024, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1035, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081. 1082, 1083, 1084, 1090, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1102, 1103, 1108, 1109, 1113, 1114, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1119, 1121, 1122, 1124, 1127, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1133, 1135, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1147, 1150, 1154, 1155, 1156, 1157, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1166, 1169, 1170, 1171, 1178, 1179, 1181, 1183, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1189, 1191, 1193, 1196, 1197, 1200, 1201, 1203, 1206, 1208, 1209, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1215, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1222, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1229, 1229, 1230, 1231, 1232, 1234, 1235, 1236, 1237, 1237, 1239, 1240, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1250, 1252, 1253, 1254, 1255, 1256, 1257, 1258, 1259, 1260, 1261, 1262, 1264, 1265, 1266, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1271, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1276, 1277, 1279, 1280, 1281, 1282, 1283, 1283, 1287, 1288, 1289, 1290, 1291, 1292, 1293, 1294, 1295, 1296, 1297, 1299, 1307, 1308, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1315, 1316, 1317, 1318, 1319, 1320, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1326, 1327, 1328, 1329, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1333, 1334, 1335, 1336, 1337, 1338, 1339, 1340, 1341, 1342, 1343, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1349, 1350, 1351, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1356, 1357, 1358, 1359, 1360, 1361, 1363, 1364, 1365, 1366, 1367, 1368, 1369, 1370, 1371, 1372, 1373, 1374, 1376, 1377, 1379, 1380, 1382, 1383, 1384, 1385, 1386, 1387, 1389, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1393, 1394, 1395, 1396, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1401. 1402, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1408, 1413, 1415, 1416, 1418, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1423, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, 1435, 1436, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1441, 1443,	Support F-35A basing.	Thank you for your comment.

GE=General			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	1446, 1447, 1451, 1458, 1459, 1461, 1462, 1463, 1464, 1465, 1468, 1476, 1478, 1481, 1483, 1487, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1492, 1494, 1496, 1497, 1498, 1499		
GE-3	1500. 1501, 1502, 1503, 1504, 1505, 1506, 1507, 1508, 1509, 1512, 1513, 1514, 1522, 1523, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1528, 1530, 1531, 1532, 1533, 1535, 1537, 1539, 1541, 1545, 1546, 1547, 1549, 1550, 1558, 1571, 1581, 1592, 1594, 1595, 1596, 1597, 1598, 1600, 1601, 1602, 1603, 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, 1610, 1611, 1614, 1615, 1616, 1617, 1618, 1620, 1623, 1624, 1626, 1631, 1632, 1633, 1634, 1635, 1636, 1637, 1638. 1642, 1645, 1648, 1651, 1652, 1653, 1654, 1657, 1658, 1665, 1666, 1670, 1671, 1673, 1676, 1677, 1679, 1680, 1682, 1683, 1686, 1687, 1690, 1691, 1692, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1701, 1704, 1705, 1709, 1710, 1711, 1712, 1713, 1716, 1718, 1720, 1721, 1722, 1723, 1727, 1728, 1729, 1731, 1732, 1735, 1739, 1740, 1741, 1742, 1744, 1745, 1749, 1752, 1754, 1761, 1762, 1764, 1765, 1768, 1771, 1777, 1780, 1782, 1789, 1796, 1797, 1798, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1808, 1812, 1817, 1818, 1820, 1827, 1829, 1832, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1839, 1840, 1842, 1843, 1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, 1857, 1858, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1877, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1888, 1890, 1892, 1894, 1907, 1916, 1917, 1922, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1930, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1939, 1940, 1950, 1955, 1958, 1968, 1974, 1981, 1988, 1990, 1991, 1997, 1998, A1002, A1008, A1009, A1010, A1013, A1015, A1016, A1017, A1018, A1019, A1020, A1024, A1032, A1033, A1035, A1036, A1039, A1057, A1058, A1059, A1072, A1075, A1096, A1101, A1102, A1105, A1106, A1111, A1113, A1114, A1115, A1117, A1118, A1123, A1124, A1127, A1129, A1174, A1176, A1178, A1181, A1186, A1188, A1194, A1200, A1205, A1208, A1209, A1215, A1216, A1219, A1221, A1222, A1225, A1226, A1228, A1271	Support F-35A basing.	Thank you for your comment.
GE-3	2001, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2010, 2012, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2033, 2034, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2063, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2058, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2069, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2080, 2082, 2084, 2085, 2086,	Support F-35A basing.	Thank you for your comment.

GE=General			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	2088, 2091, 2093, 2094, 2094, 2104, 2106, 2109, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2116, 2118, 2122, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2138, 2140, 2141, 2142. 2143, 2145, 2146, 2148, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2180, 2183, 2186, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2197, 2206, 2208, 3015, 3018, 3019, 3020, 3021, 3022, 3023, 3024, 3027, 3028, 3029, 3030, 3031, 3033, 3035, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3044, 3045, 3046, 3047, 3050, 3051, 3052, 3053, 3043, 3057, 3058, 3059, 3060, 3061, 3063, 3064, 3065, 3066, 3067, 3068, 3070, 3072, 3075, 3076, 3077, 3078, 3079, 3080, 3081, 3083, 3084, 3085, 3086, 3087, 3088, 3089, 3091, 3092, 3093, 3094, 3095, 3096, 3097, 3098, 3099, 3101, 3102, 3103, 3104, 3105, 3106, 3107, 3108, 3112, 3113, 3116, 3117, 3118, 3119, 3121, 3122, 3123, 3124, 3125, 3127, 3128, 3129, 3130, 3131, 3133, 3135, 3136, 3138, 3139, 3142, 3146, 3151, 3152, 3153, 3154, 3156, 3157, 3158, 3161, 3162, 3171, 3174, 3181, 3185, 3186, 3189, 3190, 3193, 3196, 3198, 3200, 3206, 3207, 3208, 3210, 3212, 3213, 3216, 3220, 3222, 3231, 3236, 3251, 3264, 3272, 3275, 3286		
GE-4	1007, 1025, 1026, 1050, 1100, 1101, 21104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1111, 1120, 1123, 1126, 1131, 1136, 1141, 1143, 1146, 1148, 1149, 1151, 1152, 1162, 1164, 1167, 1168, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1177, 1180, 1190, 1192, 1195, 1214, 1302, 1303, 1305, 1422, 1442, 1448, 1453, 1454, 1456, 1469, 1470, 1480, 1493, 1510, 1511, 1517, 1519, 1521, 1524, 1534, 1538, 1543, 1544, 1548, 1553, 1555, 1556, 1557, 1560, 1561, 1562, 1563, 1565, 1566, 1567, 1568, 1573, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1593, 1599, 1608, 1609, 1621, 1625, 1629, 1644, 1647, 1649, 1650, 1659, 1660, 1663, 1668, 1674, 1678, 1681, 1685, 1689, 1693, 1698, 1699, 1702, 1703, 1706, 1714, 1719, 1724, 1730, 1733, 1736, 1743, 1746, 1751, 1753, 1756, 1757, 1763, 1767, 1770, 1772, 1774, 1775, 1776, 1781, 1783, 1784, 1787, 1788, 1795, 1799, 1801, 1809, 1811, 1813, 1814, 1815, 1816, 1819, 1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1826, 1828, 1831, 1834, 1841, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1856, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1870, 1876, 1878, 1884, 1889, 1893, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1901, 1902, 1902, 1905, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1915, 1918, 1925, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1951, 1952, 1954, 1956,	Opposed to basing the F-35A in my area.	Thank you for your comment. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Air Force is considering the environmental impacts of the basing of the F-35A Training Center, which includes full consideration of all comments provided during the public comment period of the Draft EIS.

GE=General			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	1957, 1959, 1961, 1962, 1965, 1967, 1970, 1972, 1975, 1982, 1983, 1986, 1987, 1989, 1995		
GE-4	A1000, A1001, A1003, A1004, A1005, A1006, A1012, A1014, A1021, A1022, A1025, A1028, A1038, A1040, A1043, A1044, A1047, A1048, A1049, A1050, A1051, A1052, A1055, A1060, A1066, A1069, A1070, A1071, A1073, A1074, A1076, A1077, A1078, A1080, A1082, A1083, A1084, A1085, A1085, A1087, A1088, A1089, A1091, A1092, A1098, A1099, A1107, A1109, A1110, AZ1119, A1120, A1126, A1128, A1130, A1131, A1135, A1136, A1137, A1138, A1148, A1155, A1156, A1157, A1158, A1182, A1183, A1187, A1191, A1192, A1195, A1196, A1201, A1206, A1213, A1214, A1220, A1224, A1229, A1231, A1235, A1236, A1257, A1259, A2362, A1264, A1268, A1269, A1270, 2028, 2032, 2044, 2051, 2066, 2071, 2079, 2081, 2083, 2101, 2103, 2107, 2115, 2120, 2121, 2123, 2128, 2129, 2139, 2144, 2149, 2151, 2163, 2164, 2172, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2182, 2184, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2195, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2207, 3008, 3016, 3110, 3114, 3137, 3140, 3159, 3169, 3175, 3176, 3179, 3183, 3195, 3197, 3214, 3227, 3230, 3246, 3247, 3249, 3254, 3256, 3262, 3263, 3266, 3267, 3281, 3285,	Opposed to basing the F-35A in my area.	Thank you for your comment. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Air Force is considering the environmental impacts of the basing of the F-35A Training Center, which includes full consideration of all comments provided during the public comment period of the Draft EIS.
GE-5	1013, 1132	Experiencing problems with the website.	We apologize for any difficulties you may have experienced in using the website. Any identified problems were corrected as soon as they were identified.
GE-6	2009	Proposal will have no impact on area in jurisdiction.	Thank you for your review of the Draft EIS.
GE-7	1142, 2199, 3246	The Air Force was sued by citizens of Valparaiso because of the F-35 at Eglin AFB noise. What is the outcome of these lawsuits?	An EIS and Record of Decision were signed providing for the training of 59 F-35A, F-35B, and F-35C from Eglin AFB. A Supplemental EIS is in preparation to address alternative runway and airspace usage.
GE-8	1297, A1013, 3029	Reviewed the document and found it to be complete and adequate.	Thank you for your review of the Draft EIS.
GE-9	1403	Page LU 98 states Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 is situated near Wittmann Arizona. Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 is actually located in the city of Surprise Arizona	The reference has been changed in the Final EIS to state that Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield is situated near Wittmann, Arizona within the city limits of Surprise, approximately 13 miles north of Luke AFB.

GE=General			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
GE-10	1144, 1145, 1411, 1479, 1617, 1619, 1669, 1670, 1675, 1684, 1688, 1786, 1960, 1969, A1103, A1133, A1215, 2046, 2059, 2089, 2090, 2194, 2196	Support F-35A basing at Davis-Monthan AFB.	Davis-Monthan AFB is not a candidate for F-35A basing. If based at Tucson AGS located at the Tucson International Airport, the F-35A training aircraft would use Davis-Monthan AFB airfields and facilities for loading live weapons (see Section TU 2.2.2).
GE-11	1407, A1094	Tort claims have been historically lengthy in resolution with the military. A more expedient method should be developed if training is to continue.	Section BO 3.2.1.2; Section HO 3.2.1.2; Section LU 3.2.1.2; and Section TU 3.2.1.2 of the EIS state how individuals may begin the claims process for any Air Force-related damage by first contacting the Public Affairs Office of the base in question.
GE-12	1510, 1548, 1556, 1557, 1561, 1576, 1587, 1606, 1655, 1660, 1724, 1738, 1748, 1751, 1767, 1785, 1794, 1799, 1819, 1833, 1856, 1862, 1864, 1898, 1899, 1903, 1919, 1823, 1843, 1946, 1952, 1957, 1971, 1976, A1044, A1184, A1185, A1220, 2068, 2083, 2100, 2123, 2149, 2204, 3217	Support F-35A basing at Mountain Home AFB.	Mountain Home AFB is being considered for basing of the F-35A as an alternative in Operational Wing of the F-35A in a separate EIS. Information on this proposal is described in Section BO 4.0 of the EIS. The cumulative impacts from basing the F-35A at Boise AGS and Mountain Home AFB are evaluated in this section as well. In the Air Force's selection criteria described in Section 2.2.2 of the EIS, ensured that no base was considered for both training and operational F-35A basing.
GE-13	1233, 1403, 1440, 1469, 1471, 1510, 1538, 1543, 1576, 1648, 1761, 1788, 1793, 1799, 1828, 1878, 1905, 1931, 1954, A1043, A1055, A1062, A1079, A1093, A1210, 2028, 2032, 2066, 2071, 2102, 2105, 2128, 2164, 2168, 2174, 2182, 2189, 2190, 2195, 2199, 2200, 2207, 3009, 3041, 3074, 3127, 3155, 3204, 3231, 3256, 3271, 3273, 3281, 3285,	These comments include issues that are outside of the purpose and context of this EIS.	Thank you for your comment. These comments indicate issues that are outside of the purview of this EIS either because they describe current operations or because they describe broader Air Force or Department of Defense policy decisions. For further assistance with the issue, please contact your local base Public Affairs Office or the Air Education and Training (AETC) Public Affairs Office at 210-652-4400.
GE-14	1627, 1643, 1788, A1037, A1153, 2066, 2071, 2083, 2172, 2200, 3225, 3230, 3250	Indicates that litigation will be undertaken if the F-35A is based in their area.	The EIS was conducted in accordance with law and regulation.
GE-15	1778	What methodologies did the Air Force use to determine the interactions of the project elements (e.g., flying at 500 feet AGL and the 129 dB that will be generated at these flight altitudes on the Military Training Routes in which the Sacramento Mountains and the communities of Weed Pinon, Mayhill Sacramento New Mexico are located	The definition of resource, regulatory settings, and the methodologies used in determining environmental impacts to all areas affected by F-35A basing, including communities under the training airspace such as Weed, Pinon, Mayhill, and Sacramento, are described in Chapter 3 of the EIS. Specifically the methodology used in the analysis of noise is described in Section 3.2 of the EIS with more detailed information provided in Appendix B.

GE=General			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		and the potential environmental, social health and economic impacts.	
GE-16	1861, 2105	Support F-35 basing in my area, provided modifications to the proposed action are made	The Air Force tries to reduce noise to the extent possible. Mitigation measures and management actions regarding noise were considered for their operational feasibility and effectiveness in ameliorating adverse impacts. Mitigation measures, which include identification of avoidance areas, including seasonal avoidance areas, are described in Section 2.8 of the Final EIS.
GE-17	1125, 1708, 1860, 2105, 2152	Opposed to F-35A basing at Davis-Monthan AFB.	Davis-Monthan AFB is not a candidate for F-35A basing.
GE-18	1579, A1062, 2168	The documents are too technical for the average interested public. Executive Summary should be rewritten to include citizen friendly statistics. The way the Draft EIS is structured is very difficult for the public to understand and isn't adequately explained in the document or in the educational materials.	The EIS is written to be technically accurate and easily understandable to the extent possible. The Executive Summary was designed to provide those statistics and summary information that members of the public would be most interested in.
GE-19	1889, 1915, 2218, 2164, 2207	Supports the no-action alternative.	In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Air Force is considering the environmental impacts of the basing of the F-35A Training Center, which includes full consideration of all comments provided during the public comment period of the Draft EIS.
GE-20	2121, A1046, A1047, A1065	The Draft EIS makes no mention of any efforts to mitigate the damage, discomfort, and financial loss that could be incurred by local residents from the basing of F-35s in this area.	Mitigation measures and management actions regarding noise were considered for their operational feasibility and effectiveness in ameliorating adverse impacts. Mitigation measures are described in Section 2.8 of the EIS.
GE-21	A1025, 3120	Read articles that said that studies done for basing in Florida indicated sound levels would be the same following placement of jets as before. And that the population indicated that the information received was not consistent with their experience. And that they asked for the F-35s to be removed and did	A total of 59 F-35A, F-35B, and F-35C are scheduled to be operating from Eglin AFB. Those aircraft began flights in the first quarter of 2012.

GE=General			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		accomplish that after a few months of inputting into the authorities.	
GE-22	A1211	If there are orders for 7000 of these jets, why don't we re-open one of our closed air force bases?	Installations without a functioning runway (such as Malmstrom AFB), the creation of a new base, or the re-opening of a closed base were not considered to be viable alternatives.
GE-23	A1163	Supersonic commercial flights were prohibited over the United States. What is your understanding of this prohibition and why are military supersonic operations permitted?	The FAA regulates commercial flight. Military test and/or training of supersonic aircraft have been occurring in approved airspace over the U.S. since 1947. Such training is required for F-35A aircrews (see Sections 2.1 and 2.4).
GE-24	A1197, 3204	Studies of pilot psychology and pilot skills/training should be added to the subjects the Draft EIS should investigate.	Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 explain pilot training to sharpen combat skills so pilots are highly educated and trained individuals and F-35A pilots will have undergone extensive training in multiple aircraft and simulators before being trained to fly the F-35A.
GE-25	A1037	Has the Air Force at Holloman acted in good faith in regards to damage claims? What percent of claims submitted are "allowed" from Holloman AFB? How does this compare to the other Air Force bases?	As noted in Response DO-18, Section BO 3.2.1.2; Section HO 3.2.1.2; Section LU 3.2.1.2; and Section TU 3.2.1.2 of the EIS state how individuals may begin the claims process for any Air Force-related damage by first contacting the Public Affairs Office of the base in question.
GE-26	A1203, A1214, 2164, 2207	Please acknowledge attached materials and consider for inclusion in analysis for the Final EIS and/or apply to the current comment period.	Thank you for the additional materials provided. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Air Force is considering the environmental impacts of the basing of the F-35A Training Center, which includes full consideration of comments provided during the public comment period of the Draft EIS.
GE-27	A1093	SUA is not defined in the Executive Summary list of acronyms.	The definition for Special Use Airspace has been added to the Executive Summary of the Final EIS.
GE-28	A1093	Have the construction contracts already been awarded, and if so, to whom? Also, would re-built building be larger than current, otherwise why tear down just to put up another? Seems very inefficient.	No construction contracts have been awarded at this time. Each aircraft type has specific facility requirements that may not be comparable to other aircraft types.

Hazardous Materials and Waste			
Code	***Letter Number***	***Description***	***Response***
HW-1	1983, 2168	Quantities of hazardous materials and waste would increase.	Section BO 3.15.1.2 of the EIS identifies that the quantities of hazardous materials used and the quantity of hazardous waste generated would increase as additional aircraft are serviced under scenarios B1, B2, and B3. The Air Force manages these materials in accordance with the installation Hazardous Waste Management Plan.
HW-2	A1162, A1163	EIS should have a cradle-to-grave and epidemiological analysis on the impacts of hazardous materials and wastes on the public health and environment. What is the Air Force's track record regarding compliance with clean-up standards?	The Air Force manages the purchase, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and waste in accordance with New Mexico (NM) and US EPA regulations. This information is presented in Section HO 3.15.1.1 of the EIS. The need to conduct an epidemiological analysis of hazardous materials and wastes associated with the F-35 program has not been identified. The Air Force manages cleanup of contaminated sites under the Environmental Restoration Program, through the Base Restoration Advisory Board and with participation by the State of NM.

IN = Infrastructure			
Code	***Letter Number***	***Description***	***Response***
IN-1	2136	Increases in personnel associated with the proposed action could increase water demand throughout the Tularosa Basing. White Sands National Monument rests on a perched aquifer that holds the dunes in place. If regional water demand increases to a point where the water table begins to drop, the entire dune system (and any associated cultural resources) could be compromised.	As identified in Section HO 3.13 of the EIS, the City of Alamogordo uses both surface and groundwater supplies to meet current and projected demands including the development of new conservation measures and trying to secure additional water supplies. These supplies can be available without potential comprise to the dune system at White Sands National Monument.
IN-2	1037, A1162	Concerned about the impact of the proposed alternatives on Weed's water quality and availability. Where will the Air Force obtain the water it plans to use for expansion, how much water will be used and what impact will that usage have on our aquifers and access to water? What will be the resulting impacts to the animals and forest? All estimates must consider drought and other potential water shortages.	Sections HO 3, 5, and 3.13 the EIS identify the potential sources and use of potable water for Holloman AFB and the City of Alamogordo. These sources include existing well fields, surface waters including Bonito Lake, and future water supplies being considered by the city of Alamogordo. The base and the city are already developing waste conservation programs to respond to potential water shortages. Water use for the F-35A program would come from these sources and have no direct effect on Weed and the animals and forest in that area. Water supplies in the Sacramento Mountains are drawn from groundwater wells and local surface impoundments, the use of which may actually reduce the long-term availability of water to downstream water users.
IN-3	A1037	In the Draft-EIS, it is stated that water rationing will occur on the base and how is that acceptable in any way? If the water is NOT currently available, what is the plan to mitigate this situation?	In Section HO 3.13 of the Draft EIS, it is noted that the City of Alamogordo is developing a water conservation measures. There is no statement of water rationing on base. Air Force construction is conducted in accordance with EO 13514 Guiding Principles for Federal Leadership in High Performance and Sustainable Buildings, which specify water-conserving devices.

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
LU-1	1002, 1430, 1551, 1552, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1667, 1785, 1913, A1046, A1093, A1190, A1234, 2070, 2071, 2072, 3218	What land use actions will take place to address land use conflicts? Will areas be re-zoned or a Joint Land Use Study be authorized?	The EIS points out that implementation of certain scenarios would result in existing land uses becoming incompatible with noise due to the increased noise level. Depending on the specific locations, regulation of land use and approval of development permits in areas surrounding military airfields, other than on military owned lands, is the responsibility of local jurisdictions.
LU-2	1070, 1592	No Encroachment issues at Holloman, away from populated areas and should be reflected in the final EIS	The EIS address the issue of encroachment by describing existing land uses in the vicinity of Holloman AFB and estimating baseline and projected populations and acreage by land use category that would be affected by noise levels of 65 dB DNL or greater. See Section 3.10.1.2, Table 3.10–2 and Figures 3.10–1 through 3.10–8.
LU-3	1091, 1485, 1486, 1566, 1639, 1643, 1699, 1756, 1758, 1790, 1801, 1915, 1938, 1948, 1985, A1064, A1067, A1069, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1190, A1196, A1214, A1232, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, 2065, 2128	Concern that campers, sporting events, and enjoyment of parks will harmed or disturbed by overflights.	For operations around the primary staging airfields, the EIS provides information for the Runway Protection Zones or Accident Potential Zones in Section BO/HO/LU/TU 3.4.1.1 and BO 3.4.1.1, and the clear zones and accident potential zones in LU 3.4.1.1 and HO 3.4.1.1. The F-35A operations would not generate any new hazards for surrounding public recreational facilities or parks. The EIS also provides current and projected noise levels as surrounding public recreational sites in Tables TU 3.10–4, LU 3.10–5, HO 3.10–4, HO 3.10–5, and BO 3.10–4. The EIS text has been revised to include seasonal outdoor events as part of local recreational opportunities. Specific concern was expressed for the annual Boise Shakespeare Festival during the summer months and additional text was added to Section BO 3.10.1.2. The EIS addresses noise levels in residential areas surrounding the airfields in Sections BO/HO/LU/TU 3.10.1.1 and 3.10.1.2. For areas underlying training airspace, particularly MTRs with low-level operations, loud and sudden-onset noise from low-flying aircraft may startle persons on the ground. These effects are described in Section 3.8.2. This may be disruptive to campers, but these events would occur infrequently at any given underlying location.
LU-4	1016, A1162, 3005	Noise levels would impact southern Otero County, particularly the potential wilderness or national monument of Otero Mesa.	The EIS present baseline and projected noise levels that would affect southern Otero County and portions of Otero Mesa under R-5103, Talon MOA and IRs 134/195 and 192/194 (in Tables 3.10–6, through 3.10–9). As indicated, noise levels would increase, most noticeably for portions of Otero County and Otero Mesa within the military withdrawn lands of McGregor Range of Fort Bliss. The F-35A proposal would make use of an existing bombing range and would not expand areas of surface disturbance. Otero Mesa is the subject of interest for several conservation organizations for its unique vegetation and other natural and cultural qualities. It is also valued locally for the diverse outdoor recreational opportunities it provides including game and bird hunting. The F-35A proposal would not alter the current policies and protocols for public access to portions of Otero Mesa on McGregor Range. Most of Otero Mesa extends beyond

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			McGregor Range on public lands managed by Bureau of Land Management. At this time, Otero Mesa has no special management status or protection.
LU-5	1403	The EIS should address land uses within Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones in the vicinity of Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 and discuss any inconsistent development plans from encroaching communities.	Regarding Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1, Section LU 3.10.2.1 discusses the Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones and related items such as the Compatible Land Use Plan and a "vicinity box" in which disclosure and notification procedures apply. Figures in that section illustrate the location of noise contours for the Joint Land Use Study, baseline, and aircraft scenarios for Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 and the text discusses populations affected.
LU-6	1440, 1469, A1076, A1090, A1098, 2124, 2144, 2164, 2176, 2179, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2195, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2204, 2207, 3016, 3042, 3145, 3183, 3246, 3263, 3266, 3280	Concern that current residential or other land use category will be rezoned, deemed incompatible, and/or will result in possible confiscation/taking of property.	There are no plans to acquire residences as part of the F-35A beddown. Section TU 3.10.1.2 of the EIS discloses locations in which residential land use would be considered incompatible with baseline and projected F-35A noise levels of 65 dB DNL or greater (also see Table B–4 in Noise Appendix B). Local governments have the authority to regulate land use and approve development permits in the vicinity of the airfields, however, the Air Force works with local entities to reduce encroachment and promote compatible uses to the extent feasible, taking into consideration military missions.
LU-7	2102	The Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Regional Park located 7 miles to the west of Luke AFB is the White Tank Regional Park. It is incorrect in following tables and text.	The EIS text in Section LU 3.10.1.1 and LU Table 3.10-3 has been revised to reflect the correct name as White Tank Mountain Regional Park.
LU-8	2105, 2189, 2190	If the proposed increase in Davis-Monthan overflight activity both in terms of numbers and power of the jets was projected to have only minimal increased impact and concern to our citizens then why was Julia Keen school closed and why were 'notional' noise contours extended over homes all the way into the Broadmoor neighborhood designating them "incompatible with residential use"? And because of the real greater energy footprint from the F-35 to the F-16 how much further into the city will those overlay zones extend?	The use of Tucson International Airport by the 162 FW with either its current F-16 aircraft or the potential use by F-35A aircraft is not related to the closure of the Julia Keen school or the extension of noise contours into the Broadmoor neighborhood. The use of Davis-Monthan AFB by F-35A aircraft stationed at Tucson International Airport would consist of six-tenths of one percent of the annual sortie count at Davis-Monthan AFB if Scenario T3 was implemented and would not have a measurable effect on the DNL noise levels and no changes would be made to the noise contours around Davis-Monthan AFB (see Section TU 3.2.1.2).
LU-9	1578, 3232	Believes project allows unrestricted access to your property.	The Air Force does not propose acquiring any residences or other private property in connection with the F-35A training beddown. The EIS points out that implementation of certain scenarios would result in existing land uses becoming (or continuing to be) incompatible with noise due to the increased noise level. As described in Section BO 3.2.1.2, any claims for Air Force-related damage would begin by contacting the Boise AGS Public Affairs Office with details of the claim. The ANG would then investigate to establish the exact nature and extent of any

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			damage.
LU-10	2110	The EIS lists the old Wilderness Study Areas and not the wilderness areas or designated rivers that were established in 2009 (P.L 111-11, 2009).	The information on Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas and designated rivers has been updated in the EIS in Sections BO/HO/LU/TU 3.10 with new GIS information provided by BLM. The changes are primarily reflected in Sections BO 3.10.2.1 and Tables BO 3.10-5 through BO 3.10– 9. The following data was used: U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Idaho State Offices, Engineering and Geographic Sciences. Idaho BLM Wilderness Area (Polygon).” GIS Data. August 29, 2011. Downloaded at http://insideidaho.org. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Idaho State Offices, Engineering and Geographic Sciences. “Idaho BLM Wilderness Study Area (WSA) (Polygon). ”GIS Data. July 2011. Downloaded at http://insideidaho.org.
LU-11	1900, 1912, 1985, A1093, 2120, 2124, 2166, 2167, 3144	Draft EIS shows the 65 dB DNL contours but does not address their significance and how the Arizona Revised Statutes (including 28-8481) place substantial legal restrictions on the properties within these contours. Why doesn’t the Draft EIS consider the legal and financial impacts upon the residents affected?	Land use-related statutes and regulations applicable to Tucson AGS are addressed in Section TU 3.10.1.1. Information about the ongoing Part 150 Study and actions already taken by Tucson Airport Authority (TAA) to address noise are contained in Section TU 3.2.1.1. ARS 28-8481 and related provisions (described in Section LU 3.10.1.1) apply to "a territory in the vicinity of a military airport". Tucson International Airport is a joint use airfield and is therefore subject to different regulations. With regard to the enactment of land use laws that could affect private property rights, no such laws are proposed as part of the F-35A training beddown at Tucson AGS. Availability of compensation and any related rights would depend on the statutes or agreements applicable to a particular property. As noted in Response EJ-1, the military Services do not have the authority to spend taxpayer money for mitigating noise at private residences and noise-sensitive receptors.
LU-12	2136	Several National Park Service areas are not listed in the Draft EIS that would be affected by F-35 activities, including, but not limited to: Craters of the Moon National Preserve and Great Rift Wilderness Study Area (WSA). Were all National Park Service (NPS) areas potentially affected included in the Draft EIS analysis.	Updated information on NPS boundaries was incorporated in the EIS using NPS “Current Administrative Boundaries of National Park System Units 01/19/2012” Geographic Information System (GIS) data. January 11, 2012. Downloaded at http://geo.data.gov/ geoportal/catalog/main/home.page. All Special Use Land Management Areas (SULMAs) listed in tables in Sections BO/HO/LU 3.10.2 (and acreage) have been revalidated, in addition to updated information on wilderness areas and WSAas as described in the response to LU-10. WSAs are included in the SULMA tables. The recreation tables list wilderness areas and refer to the listing of WSAs in the preceding SULMA tables under each of the four locations. As per the request in the DOI comment letter (2136) the following NPS locations are accounted for below: Boise AGS • City of Rocks National Preserve (as reported in EIS Tables BO 3.10–5,

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			BO 3.10–8, and BO 3.10– 9) • Craters of the Moon National Monument (as reported in EIS Tables BO 3.10–5 through BO 3.10– 9) • Big Hole National Battlefield (as reported in EIS Tables BO 3.10–5, BO 3.10–8, and BO 3.10– 9) • Nez Perce National Historic Park (closest unit is 6 miles outside IR-301/307) • Great Rift WSA (included in Table BO 3.10–5) Holloman AFB • White Sands National Monument (revised for R-5107B/D in Tables HO 3.10–6 through HO 3.10–10) • Salinas Pueblo Mission National Monument (revised Tables HO 3.10–6 through HO 3.10–10 to distinguish three units of SAPU)Carlsbad Caverns NationalPark (<1 percent under IR 134/195, revised Tables HO 3.10–6, HO 3.10–9, and HO 3.10–10) • Guadalupe Mountains National Park (<1 percent under IR-192/194, revised Tables HO 3.10–6 through HO 3.10–10) Fort Davis National Historic Site (54 miles outside IR-192/194) Luke AFB • Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (as reported in Tables LU 3.10–6, LU 3.10–9, and LU 3.10–10 underlies Sells MOA/ATCAA) • Tonto National Monument (as reported in EIS Tables LU 3.10–6, LU 3.10–9, and LU 3.10–10) • Saguaro National Park (15 miles to VR-241) • Casa Grande National Historic Park (15 miles to VR-241) • Hohokam Pima National Monument (24 miles to VR-242) • Tonto National Monument (reported in Table LU 3.10–6, LU 3.10–9, and LU 3.10–10) Tucson AGS • Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (as reported in Tables TU 3.10–6, TU 3.10–9, and TU 3.10–10 underlies Sells MOA/ATCAA) • Fort Bowie National Historic Site (15 miles outside Tombstone MOA) • Chiricahua National Monument (5 miles outside Tombstone MOA) • Saguaro National Park (15 miles to VR-241, 21 miles to Sells MOA) • Tumacacori National Monument (3 miles outside Ruby MOA) • Coronado National Memorial (13 miles outside Tombstone MOA) Specifically, for the Boise recreation analysis, the EIS includes the following text in Section BO 3.10.2.2: Increased airspace use and increases of 2 to 3 dB DNL_{mr}

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			over National Park Service units (Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve, Big Hole National Battlefield, City of Rocks National Reserve), Sawtooth National Recreational Area, seven Wilderness Areas and one wild and scenic river (see Table BO 3.10–8) has the potential to impact visitor experience and the setting and feeling of the areas. Similarly, increases in noise in wilderness areas where noise is already elevated (64 dB DNL_{mr} and above), would affect qualities of naturalness and potential for pristine outdoor experiences.
LU-13	2136	The EIS lumps together all Special Use Land Management Areas without identifying those that are particularly sensitive to additional aircraft noise.	Section 3.8.2 of the Final EIS has been revised to clarify management characteristics applicable to Wilderness Areas and Wilderness Study Areas. Land use and recreation-related noise tables for Boise AGS airspace in Section BO 3.10.2 have been revised. Both Wilderness Areas and Wilderness Study Areas are already identified in the airspace figures and tables in Section 3.10.2 of the EIS. For this reason and because of the number of Special Use Land Management Areas involved and desire to reduce the length of the EIS, Wilderness Areas and Wilderness Study Areas not also individually called out in the text of the EIS.
LU-14	1945	Report discusses how land is zoned by using the specific coding such as A1A B/C. Report should clearly state the land is zoned residential, etc.	Section BO 3.10.1.1 of the EIS identifies residential and other zoning designations in the vicinity of the airport under the topic of Surrounding Land Use. In addition, it discusses local regulations and ordinances such as the City of Boise Comprehensive Plan which designations land uses, for example, Airport Influence Areas (AIA) using letter codes such as A, B/C and B-1 for different noise levels .
LU-15	1945, 3249	My subdivision was issued a conditional land use permit when it was built stating it was compatible with other land uses. Believe the proposal would violate the conditional land use permit.	Conditional land use permits are generally issued when a particular proposal or new development is determined to be compatible with its site or surrounding land uses when it satisfies certain conditions, as opposed to all proposals for that same type of development or use being suitable or compatible in the particular location. The EIS points out that implementation of certain scenarios would result in existing land uses becoming incompatible with noise due to the increased noise level. Whether this applies to any particular subdivision would depend on its location and conditions. Refer to Figures BO 3.10–1 through BO 3.10–3.
LU-16	1948	Other boundaries should be added to the noise contours maps labeling areas as "Disturbing for Residential Use", "Irritating for Residential Use", and "Often Annoying for Residential Use."	The noise contours shown in the EIS figures are intended to display noise modeling results only and not an analysis of those results, which is provided in the related text where noise impacts are discussed, such as Noise Section BO 3.2.1.2 and Land Use Section BO 3.10.1.2. Additional information on the interpretation of noise results is included in Section 3.2.2 Noise Methodology and Appendix B.
LU-17	2136	The list of land use categories on Page 3-30 doesn't account for the fact that some areas may fall into multiple categories. How are	The land use categories presented on Page 3–30 of the EIS address mapping conventions used for areas in the vicinity of the primary airfield (Base), whereas National Park Service units are addressed subsequently under the heading

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		such multi-land use areas accounted for in the document? For example, National Park Service (e.g., Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument, Carlsbad Caverns National Park) units would fall under both the Public and Recreational categories.	Training Airspace. With regard to the analysis of effects on National Park Service units, this depends on the type of resource or use affected, for example, the Cultural Resource section of the EIS addresses cultural and historic resources whereas the land use section discusses land management issues and recreation impacts.
LU-18	2136	There are three separate areas of Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument (Abo, Quarai, and Gran Quivira), each of which is a discontinuous unit in a separate location, approximately 30 miles from each other. Analysis and potential impacts discussed in the document should identify which of these areas would be affected.	The EIS is revised to distinguish the three separate units. These changes are reflected in the EIS Tables HO 3.10–6 through HO 3.10–10 as appropriate. Other changes and corrections to Special Use Land Management Areas for the Holloman locations include: Salinas Pueblo National Monument broken into 3 units: Gran Quivira (#21), Abo (#30), and Quarai (#31) are named for IR-133/142. Gran Quivira unit of the Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument underlies R-5107 Mesa. Supersonic operations occur in this airspace. This unit also underlies IR-133/142. Supersonic operations do occur on the low-level instrument routes. Added Carlsbad Caverns National Park (#32) to IR134/195; less than 1% affected Added Guadalupe Mountains National Park (#33) to IR192/194; less than 1% affected, over entry roadway. In addition to R-5107 Yonder, Lava and Mesa, added airspace units R-5107B and R5107B/D above WHSA 15% and 34%, respectively
LU-19	2136	Please include the National Park Service in the list of federal land agencies potentially affected, where applicable. Though the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service manage larger land holdings within the airspace, the National Park Service has a unique mission that includes the preservation of resources within National Park Service units.	Text has been added to Section HO 3.10.2.1, paragraph 2 to indicate that the majority of Federal land under the airspace is administered by the Bureau of Land Management, followed by the Department of Defense, the U.S. Forest Service, and the National Park Service.
LU-20	2136	In part of the text where areas affected by 65 dB DNL are mentioned, would it be possible to list them specifically instead of flipping back to tables and charts, since this is a bit cumbersome. For example, Page	Because the number of Special Use Land Management Areas identified for training beddown locations and scenarios is fairly large, the length of Section 3.10.2.2 was reduced by listing the specifically affected Special Use Land Management Areas in the noise-related land use tables, rather than both the tables and text. The types of Special Use Land Management Areas affected are

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		HO-161 states, "Noise levels of 65 dB DNL could affect areas underlying R-5107 (Yonder) and R-5107 (Mesa H/L), including Wilderness Study Areas, national monuments, a national wildlife refuge, and an experimental range". Explicitly listing these areas in the text would help the reader.	then summarized in the text. Table HO 3.10–6 lists the projected subsonic noise level for individual Special Use Land Management Areas located under each airspace for each scenario, including scenario H4.
LU-21	2136	The Draft EIS identifies that some visitors to National Park Service areas might be annoyed by low-level overflights, but does not reflect how these flights would alter the feeling, setting, and character of areas at places like Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument.	The EIS includes the following additional text in Section 3.8.2: According to National Park Service publication Report on Effects of Aircraft Overflights on the National Park System, Report to Congress (1994), natural quiet is an important part of visitor experiences and a reason for visiting national parks and monuments for about 91 percent of persons surveyed. Increased airspace use over National Park Service units has the potential to impact visitor experience and the setting and feeling of the areas. Additionally, similar text has been added to the recreational assessment in Sections BO/HO/LU/TU 3.10.2.2.
LU-22	2136	The Draft EIS does not address the effect over overflights on Instrument Routes (i.e., IR 192/194 and IR 134/195) on National Park areas such as Carlsbad Caverns National Park and Guadalupe Mountains National Park. Flights in these areas could impact visitors to these areas.	Tables HO 3.10–6, HO 3.10–9, and HO 3.10–10 in the EIS include the noise levels and frequency of overflights for these Military Training Routes. Carlsbad Caverns National Park does not underlie either of these instrument routes, but is adjacent to IR-134/195. The far western portions of Carlsbad Caverns National Park may experience some noise from operations on the route due to its proximity, but the average noise levels would be lower than those reported in Tables 3.10–6 since none of the park is directly under the route. Frequency of operations on this route would not increase. About 6 acres of Guadalupe Mountains National Park underlies IR-192/194, over a small neck of land for the access road. None of the park's visitor facilities or the more natural portions of the park underlie this route. The proposed action does not include any changes to airspace or avoidance areas. The Air Force would continue to follow existing agreements with the National Park Service.
LU-23	2136	Salinas Pueblo National Monument has a working understanding with the Holloman AFB, that while the three units of the National Monument are under Holloman airspace, these areas are "removed" from the airspace (no flyovers). If Holloman is selected for the F-35s, Salinas Pueblo would like to retain this agreement.	Avoidance areas for military users are located in the vicinity of each of the three units of the Salinas Pueblo Mission National Monument. F-35A training flights would be subject to official route data and restrictions applicable to other military users. The Holloman AFB Alternative does not propose any changes to these avoidance areas.

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
LU-24	2136	Impacts in the land use and recreation sections are underestimated because analysis does not include National Park Service land/acreage that falls under airspace of the four installations.	National Park Service land/acreage under the airspace has been included in the EIS. Increased airspace use over National Park Service units has the potential to impact visitor experience and the setting and feeling of the areas. Additionally, similar text has been added to the recreational assessment in Sections BO/HO/LU/TU 3.10.2.2.
LU-25	2136	For Land Use and Recreation tables (e.g., in "Comparative Summary of Environmental Consequences" on Page 2-51), it should be noted that Special Use Land Management Areas potentially affected include National Park Service units. Increased airspace use in these areas has the potential to impact visitor experience and the setting and feeling of the areas. National Park Service units should be identified in this table.	In the Table 2–12 of the EIS, a bullet has been added under each location that indicates that Special Use Land Management Areas potentially affected include National Park Service units. Increased airspace use in these areas has the potential to impact visitor experience and the setting and feeling of the areas. The specific parks and monuments are not listed in the summary table since no specific Special Use Land Management Areas are listed in the summary. The reader can find the names of specific Special Use Land Management Areas (including State and National Parks and Monuments, Preserves, Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, Recreation Areas, and Wild and Scenic Rivers in the tables in Sections BO/HO/LU/TU 3.10.2.1.
LU-26	2136	In the section listing mitigation measures (Page 2-64), an additional bullet point should be added indicating avoidance of low altitude flights over National Park Service units where the mission is to protect significant cultural and natural resources and visitor use and experience is critical to the experience of the park unit.	Mitigations are discussed in Section 2.8. The proposed action does not include any changes to airspace or avoidance areas. The Air Force would continue to follow existing agreements with the National Park Service.
LU-27	A1037, 2126, 2166, 2167	Noise effects on recreation weren't addressed in the Draft EIS, specifically in places like the Owyhees, Weed, Saguaro National Park West, Tucson Mountain Park, and in the area surrounding the Boise foothills. The EIS should discuss the impact to recreation and what it will do to mitigate the community losses.	General noise effects on recreation that are common to all the EIS locations are discussed in Sections 3.8.2 and specifically in BO/HO/LU/TU 3.10.1.2 and 3.10.2.2. The proposed F-35 operations at Boise AGS would not fly over the Boise foothills, on the north side of the city. The foothills are located about 4 miles from the airport. The sound of F-35 aircraft landing and taking off may be audible in the foothills, but the sound levels would not be high enough to interfere with speech. Noise levels affecting the Owyhee Mountains, which are located mostly underneath Owyhee North MOA/ATCAA are reported in Tables BO 3.10–5 through BO 3.10–8. An increase of up to 2 dB DNL_{mr} is projected for underlying areas. This increase may be noticeable to some persons who are very familiar with the soundscape of the area, which is already affected by use of the Owyhee North MOA/ATCAA for military training. This area has 12 wilderness study areas and supports diverse outdoor recreation. Under all Tucson AGS scenarios, Tucson Mountain Park, well to the west of the airfield, is not affected by noise levels of 65 dB DNL or above. Similarly, Saguaro National Park, located in 2 parcels on the west and east side of the city of Tucson, is not affected by average noise levels of 65 dB or above. These areas could be overflown by F-35A aircraft transiting to and from Tucson AGS, but overflights would be infrequent.

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
LU-28	1994	The recent Joint Land Use Study (Davis-Monthan AFB), Military Community Compatibility Committee (MC3), and Air Force-convened Military Community Relations Committee (MCRC) all indicate there are ongoing unresolved problems with urban military overflights.	The Tucson AGS Alternative would only include up to 108 operations per year to Davis Monthan AFB, which constitutes less than six-tenths of one percent of total airfield operations at Davis- Monthan AFB and therefore would not have a measurable effect on noise levels or land use.
LU-29	2136	Can specific impacts (e.g., increases in sound levels) be provided for lands managed by other federal agencies (Wilderness Areas, National Park Service units, etc.)? The text notes that F-35 associated changes may affect wilderness for fed agencies, impacts are not clarified and can't be adequately addressed.	Specific increases or changes in noise levels are listed in Tables LU 3.10–6, 3.10–7 and 3.10–8 of the EIS for subsonic, supersonic and boom noise for each individual Special Use Land Management Area (e.g., National Park Service units and wilderness areas, by name) under the airspace for the different beddown scenarios. Wilderness areas are primarily addressed in the Recreation sections of the EIS; however, text has been added to Section LU 3.10.2.2 to clarify wilderness area and Wilderness Study Area characteristics further, similar to LU-13.
LU-30	2136	Can impacts to Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument be explained/clarified? Additional detail is needed to evaluate whether impacts are acceptable or not.	For the Luke option, LU Table 3.10–5 in the EIS shows that Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (98 percent under Sells MOA/ATCAA) would experience an increase in noise from <45 up to 52 dB DNL_{mr} under Scenario 6 in the Sells MOA/ATCAA. The portion of the monument under VR-244 (12 percent) would increase from <45 to 48 dB DNL_{mr} under Scenario 6 (maximum increase). Supersonic noise would decrease in Sells MOA from 54 to 52 CDNL under Scenario 6 with a decrease in booms per day (Table LU 3.10-7). Under the Tucson option, the monument would experience a slight increase in noise from 45 up to 47 dB DNL_{mr}, and supersonic noise would decrease from 54 CDNL to 49 CDNL (see Tables TU 3.10–5 and TU 3.10–6).
LU-31	2136	Please include the National Park Service publication Report on Effects of Aircraft Overflights on the National Park System, Report to Congress, 1994 (Table 6.1) to consider and describe impact of increased aircraft noise on visitors to national parks.	The following information has been included in the EIS, Section 3.8.2: “According to National Park Service publication Report on Effects of Aircraft Overflights on the National Park System, Report to Congress (1994), natural quiet is an important part of visitor experiences and a reason for visiting national parks and monuments for about 91 percent of persons surveyed. Increased airspace use over National Park Service units has the potential to impact visitor experience and the setting and feeling of the areas.” Specifically, information in Table 6–1 relates that natural quiet is an important reason for visiting National Parks and Monuments for about 91 percent of persons surveyed. Consideration of the potential to diminish visitors' experience of natural soundscapes in national park units is included in Section BO/HO/LU/TU 3.10.2.2.

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
LU-32	2111	Page 2-51: Table 2–12 (Comparative Summary of Environmental Consequences), - Question the statement "Noise levels in the vicinity of Mountain Home AFB would increase under all scenarios, potentially increasing incompatible land use." Elmore Co. has zoned a 2-mile buffer around the base planning for increased noise levels. Therefore, the only thing that might be incompatible and decrease the value is a base closure. Recommend deleting reference or refer to Elmore County's zoning that's in place to support greater noise at MHAFB.	The text cited in Table 2–12 regarding use of Mountain Home AFB as an auxiliary airfield for the F-35A beddown at Boise AGS has been revised to indicate that while the acreage in the area exposed to 65 dB DNL or greater would increase, the number of homes and persons affected would be negligible. This is already described in the EIS in Section BO 3.10.2.2 in the section called Auxiliary Airfield.
LU-33	2111	Page BO-114 The discussion of the Owyhee Wilderness needs to include a discussion of Public Law 111-11(March 30, 2009) that established The Owyhee Wilderness Areas but included protections for military training in the law found in Adjacent Management and Military Overflights, paragraphs in Section 1503, Wilderness Areas.	Owyhee Wilderness is not specifically cited on Page BO–114 but is evaluated in Tables BO3.10–5 through BO 3.10–9 relative to overflights and noise impacts on land use and recreation. In addition, see the response to comment LU-34.
LU-34	2111	On Page BO-117, paragraph 2, line 3, the text states "Wilderness Management Goals could be negatively affected by increase noise and disturbance associated with military overflight." Consider changing text to include reference to Public Law 111-11. For example: "Normal Wilderness Goals could be negatively affected by increase noise but since the Owyhee Wilderness was established by Public Law 111-11 knowing that military training and the associated noise would be allowed and therefore the impact is not a consideration."	Text has been revised in Section BO 3.10.2.2 to indicate that in some instances, where provisions of a specific statute apply, such as to the establishment of the Owyhee Wilderness Area in 2009, military overflights and training are acknowledged as an existing activity in the area.
LU-35	2174	What impact will the proposed F-35 placement have on the aesthetic resources in the areas near the Community of Weed, New Mexico?	None of the proposals involves physical changes to the landscape underlying training airspace. For some persons, both soundscape and visual environment are elements of the aesthetic environment. F-35 operations on low-level Military Training Routes near the community of Weed would be similar to existing operations. For Holloman Scenarios 3, 4, and 5, the F-35 operations may slightly

LU=Land Use			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			increase the frequency of operations on from 2 to 3 per day on IR-192/194 that present a temporary visual and auditory intrusion similar to current conditions for underlying areas. Overall, projected F-35 operations would result in minimal change to aesthetic resources at this location.
LU-36	A1142	Air Force implies that noise levels at Mission Manner Park as long as people stay away from the northeast corner-implies that 65 dB DNL may be noisy but 64.9 dB DNL is suitable for outdoor recreation.	The Air Force's noise compatibility criteria as adopted from FICON 1992 allows for outdoor recreation of all kinds in areas experiencing outdoor noise level between 65 and 70 dB DNL. These levels have been used to guide suitable land uses in urban contexts. The increase reported in the EIS (TU Table 3.10–4) represents a moderate increase in noise for Mission Manor Park and could reduce the quality and enjoyment of outdoor activities for some persons.
LU-37	3263	Have homes and businesses that are currently not in the airport influence area been built to the standards that are required for homes and businesses currently in the airport influence area?	The Air Force does not have information on individual homes and businesses. The construction standards and noise insulation standards to which individual homes and businesses have been built depends on the age, construction materials, renovations, and improvements for the particular structures. Therefore, a generalization cannot be made.
LU-38	Comment code not used.	Comment code not used.	Comment code not used.
LU-39	2189, 2190	Will the expansion of the 65 dB DNL contours at Tucson AGS result in the closure of schools, as was the case with Julia Keen Elementary School?	The Julia Keen School closed because of its location within an Accident Potential Zone associated with Davis-Monthan AFB, rather than an expansion in noise contours. An expansion in noise contours alone would not precipitate a change in land use or introduce new land use controls. Noise effects on representative school locations are addressed in Noise Section TU 3.2.1.2 and associated Table TU 3.2–3, and in Environmental Justice and Protection of Children Section TU 3.12.1.2 and associated Table 3.12–3.

NA=Native American			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NA-1	2004	The Draft EIS seems acceptable	Thank you for your review of the Draft EIS.
NA-2	2004	Defers to the Tohono O'odham Nation as lead in the consultation process.	**AIR FORCE TO REVIEW.** Thank you for your review of the Draft EIS. The Air Force will continue to consult with the Tohono O'Odham Nation as part of Government-to-Government consultations.
NA-3	2008	Defers further consultation to the SHPO and other interested parties.	**AIR FORCE TO REVIEW.** Thank you for your review of the Draft EIS. The Air Force will continue to consult with the state SHPO and Tohono O'Odham Nation as part of Government-to-Government consultations.

NA-4	2209	After reviewing your consultation documents, the Historic Preservation Department-Traditional Culture Program (HPD-TCP) has concluded the proposed undertaking project area will not impact Navajo traditional cultural resources. The HPD-TCP, on behalf of the Navajo Nation has no concerns at this time. However, the determination made by the HPD-TCP does not necessarily mean that the Navajo Nation has no interest or concerns with the proposed project. If the proposed project inadvertently discovers habitation sites, plant gathering areas, human remains, and objects of cultural patrimony, the HPD-TCP request that we be notified respectively in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).	Thank you for your review of the Draft EIS. If in the course of construction or other ground-disturbing activities associated with the basing of the F-35A any habitation sites, plant-gathering areas, objects of cultural patrimony or human remains are discovered, the Air Force will notify the appropriate tribe in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

NO=Noise			
Code	***Letter Number***	***Description***	***Response***
NO-1	1001, 1004, 1007, 1009, 1025, 1085, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1104, 1111, 1112, 1120, 1123, 1131, 1142, 1149, 1151, 1152, 1168, 1176, 1188, 1192, 1195, 1202, 1204, 1214 1275, 1278, 1284, 1300, 1301, 1303, 1306, 1412, 1422, 1424, 1430, 1440, 1442, 1444, 1452, 1454, 1466, 1469, 1472, 1475, 1477, 1482, 1488, 1516, 1520, 1536, 1557, 1561, 1564, 1573, 1582, 1583, 1587, 1593, 1640, 1659, 1660, 1661, 1663, 1672, 1693, 1697, 1699, 1702, 1714, 1730, 1737, 1746, 1756, 1759, 1767, 1774, 1776, 1783, 1784, 1787, 1795, 1801, 1809, 1814, 1821, 1822, 1823, 1825, 1833, 1864, 1865, 1875, 1878, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1889, 1893, 1900, 1904, 1909, 1911, 1915, 1918, 1925, 1931, 1934, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1946, 1949, 1953, 1954, 1956, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1971, 1972, 1975, 1978, 1979, 1984, 1986, 1987, 1989, 1995, A1001, A1005, A1025, A1027, A1028, A1029, A1038, A1043, A1045, A1048, A1054, A1055, A1063, A1073, A1078, A1083, A1084, A1085, A1088, A1092, A1095, A1098, A1108, A1109, A1110, A1112, A1120, A1121, A1126, A1130, A1132, A1136, A1137, A1151, A1155, A1156, A1157, A1158, A1195, A1197, A1198, A1199, A1202, A1206, A1211, A1213,	F-35A is a loud aircraft and louder than F-16s and other airframes and would increase noise around the airport/airfield. Noise would be worse than current aircraft noise.	The EIS uses cumulative and single-event noise metrics to communicate expected changes in noise under beddown scenarios. It should be noted that no F-35A flights have taken place at any of the locations being considered for beddown in this EIS.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1214, A1217, A1218, A1223, A1224, A1230, A1235, A1236, A1255, A1257, A1262, 2044, 2066, 2068, 2071, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2083, 2093, 2096, 2100, 2105, 2107, 2110, 2115, 2121, 2123, 2125, 2126, 2128, 2130, 2139, 2144, 2147, 2151, 2164, 2176, 2179, 2182, 2184, 2189, 2190, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2202, 2205, 2207, 3002, 3017, 3114, 3134, 3141, 3164, 3169, 3188, 3195, 3203, 3231, 3239, 3246, 3248, 3252, 3253, 3265, 3278, 3280		
NO-2	1001, 1503, 1736, 1773, 1807, 1995, A1055, A1071, A1093, 2066, 2067, 2105, 2107, 2188, 2200, 3017, 3224	Draft EIS understates the noise problem/ the number of people affected by aircraft noise.	The EIS uses standard Air Force methodology to calculate noise levels under beddown scenarios. As stated in the EIS, the number of residents affected by noise levels in each noise contour interval was calculated based on pro-rating area in each census block affected. This method is subject to error, as is any method of estimating population, but is not expected to include any bias. Methodology used to estimate the risk of potential hearing loss is described in Section 3.2.
NO-3	1001, 1004, 1172, 1194, 1407, 1469, 1542, 1576, 1583, 1593, 1643, 1647, 1699, 1719, 1743, 1753, 1756, 1773, 1784, 1794, 1799, 1865, 1909, 1919, 1945, 1949, 1977, 1980, 1983, 1995, A1027, A1042, A1045, A1051, A1060, A1076, A1077, A1092, A1093, A1121, A1125, A1175, A1179, A1180, A1195, A1211, A1214, A1230, 2035, 2068, 2107, 2120, 2164, 2188, 2207, 3010, 3073, 3110, 3211, 3229, 3230, 3244	F-35A noise would disrupt conversations and disrupt sleep. Sleep disruptions can negatively impact health and quality of life. Analysis needs to address impacts with windows open.	Section 3.2 of the EIS discusses possible negative effects of noise exposure. The EIS includes estimates of percents of persons awakened at least once per night under baseline conditions and the beddown scenarios at several representative noise sensitive locations in Section 3.2.1 of each base section. Numbers are provided for 'windows open' and 'windows closed' conditions. Sleep disturbance is acknowledged in the EIS as a concern and is quantified according to currently approved American National Standard Institute methods. As stated in the EIS, less than 6 percent of F-35A operations would be conducted between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., the time period during which sleep disturbance is expected to be of most concern. It is recognized in the EIS that structures in which windows are open provide less structural noise attenuation. A typical structure with windows open provides about 15 dB outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction while a structure with windows closed typically provides about 25 dB outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction. Outdoor-to-indoor noise-level reduction values are based on typical home construction methods. Residences built from very heavy materials such as bricks, or that use double- or triple-paned windows for improved heating and cooling efficiency may provide better outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction. Some residences, such as trailers, provide less outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction.
NO-4	1002, 1016, 1263, 1412, 1493, 1538,	Draft EIS noise analysis is insufficient	Noise analysis was conducted using standard Air Force methodology and

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	1543, 1551, 1552, 1562, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1628, 1699, 1785, 1900, 1904, 1912, 1921, 1925, 1942, 1945, 1985, 1995, A1037, A1046, A1093, A1100, A1142, A1152, A1190, A1193, A1202, A1211, A1234, A1235, A1236, A1255, A1261, 2035, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2101, 2136, 2172, 2176, 2187, 2189, 2190, 2195, 2200, 3002, 3016, 3017, 3217, 3218, 3232, 3248, 3249, 3252, 3256, 3271, 3285	and no technical details provided. Additional analysis needs to be done and published.	the most up-to-date noise modeling inputs available. Supplemental noise metrics (i.e., metrics used in addition to DNL) were selected in accordance with Air Force guidance on the subject. Data provided in the EIS are sufficient to allow the decision-maker to make an informed decision. Examples of the specific concerns expressed in public comments are addressed briefly below. Typical human perception of differing sound levels is discussed in Section 3.2.2 (see Table 3–1). In some instances in the EIS, to provide perspective expected changes in time-averaged noise levels are related to typical perceived difference in noise level if the noise levels were instantaneous. 65 dB DNL is the noise level above which not all land uses are considered to be compatible with noise according to DoD and FAA land use guidelines, and is the lowest DNL noise contour shown in the EIS. As shown in EIS Table 3–1, some persons will become annoyed at noise levels below 65 dB DNL. The process used to develop NOISEMAP operational parameter inputs is now described in Section 3.2.2. The NOISEMAP model calculates noise generated by aircraft as they fly along representative flight tracks, as reported by installation personnel. Calculated noise levels include all operations including afterburner takeoffs. The NOISEMAP model has been checked for accuracy by comparing NOISEMAP results against noise level measurements and found to be accurate within 1.5 dB with a 90 percent statistical confidence (Lee 1982). Impacts to quality of life can be assessed using the percent of the population expected to be highly annoyed as predicted using the DNL metric and by other specific noise impacts as predicted using supplemental noise metrics. Impacts associated with specific noise levels are described in Section 3.2.2 and Appendix B. The noise-sensitive locations listed in the EIS are representative as stated in Section 3.2. The locations listed are not intended to include all facilities that could be considered noise sensitive, but can be used as indicators of noise levels in nearby areas.
NO-5	1002, 1485, 1486, 1551, 1552, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583,	Noise from the F-35 will lead to hearing loss. Noise levels need to be	It is not feasible for all locations to be added to the maps so representative noise-sensitive locations are included in the EIS, with the

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1785, 1900, 1985, A1021, A1046, A1051, A1063, A1067, A1069, A1155, A1156, A1157, A1158, A1190, A1234, 2035, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2119, 2164, 2166, 2167, 2188, 2200, 2207, 3143, 3148, 3218, 3248, 3249, 3253	considered at all sensitive locations and identified on the EIS maps. Only one location was analyzed for afterburner operations and it is not the closest to the actual flight path.	locations of each identified on the DNL contour maps. Agency decisionmaking can be adequately supported through using a representative sampling of sensitive noise receptors. As stated in Section 3.1.2.1, Table TU3.2–2 lists noise levels associated with F-16C and F-35A overflights at a single point on the ground for purposes of comparison. The table accomplishes its intended purpose of providing a comparison between the aircraft at configurations and altitudes typically used at Tucson International Airport. Table 3.2–3 provides supplemental noise metrics (i.e., metrics other than DNL) data for several additional noise sensitive locations near Tucson International Airport.
NO-6	1002, 1089, 1091, 1146, 1251, 1305, 1407, 1412, 1414, 1424, 1440, 1449, 1450, 1466, 1469, 1495, 1536, 1538, 1543, 1544, 1548, 1551, 1552, 1562, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1578, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1593, 1639, 1643, 1644, 1661, 1685, 1698, 1699, 1703, 1719, 1724, 1730, 1737, 1743, 1747, 1755, 1756, 1758, 1759, 1760, 1767, 1784, 1785, 1790, 1799, 1810, 1822, 1853, 1889, 1893, 1900, 1903, 1906, 1913, 1918, 1919, 1924, 1931, 1934, 1945, 1954, 1977, 1980, 1983, 1984, 1987, A1022, A1031, A1043, A1046, A1055, A1076, A1083, A1087, A1093, A1094, A1119, A1121, A1135, A1137, A1162, A1163, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1175, A1180, A1190, A1196, A1198, A1204, A1207, A1211, A1212, A1214, A1218, A1227, A1229, A1232, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, A1255, 2067, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2107, 2115, 2120, 2128, 2151, 2175, 2177, 2179, 2189, 2190, 2200, 2202, 2205, 3016, 3055, 3148,	Noise can cause health and mental problems. What mitigations will be used to avoid the health and mental impacts of noise?	Section 2.8 includes discussion of operational modifications to reduce noise that were considered and either carried forward for analysis or rejected because they were found to be not operationally feasible, to be unsafe, or to provide no meaningful reduction in noise impacts. At locations other than Boise AGS, no mitigations were carried forward for analysis that would address impacts to physical and mental health resulting from increased noise levels. As described in Appendix Section B.2.5, studies conducted on the effects of individual overflights on Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) in adults and children have yielded conflicting results. It is possible that individual noise events exceeding 115 dB could result in temporary hearing threshold shift, although studies reviewed conflict as to whether temporary threshold shifts are always towards less hearing sensitivity. Without repeated exposures to high noise levels, such as would typically occur in a workplace environment, temporary hearing threshold shifts normally disappear and hearing returns to normal. Information has been added to the EIS quantifying the frequency of events exceeding 115 dB, which were found to occur less than once per month on any MTR under any beddown scenario. Noise levels of 120 dB or greater would occur less frequently. Appendix Section B.2.1 describes non-auditory health effects (i.e., mental health, hypertension, etc) of elevated noise levels. Studies reviewed provide conflicting findings on these two categories of noise impacts including the lower threshold at which impacts occur. It is generally thought that non-auditory health effects do not occur at noise levels below thresholds protective against noise-induced hearing loss. In order to assess health cost associated with potential auditory and non-auditory

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	3179, 3195, 3218, 3229, 3237, 3256, 3262, 3285,		health impacts of noise, other health factors would need to be controlled for requiring an extensive study, which is outside of the scope of this EIS.
NO-7	1002, 1378, 1467, 1469, 1551, 1552, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1785, 1814, 1864, 1913, 1942, 1945, 1987, 1994, A1014, A1125, A1152, A1153, A1190, A1212, A1234, A1235, A1236, 2066, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2120, 2121, 2124, 2151, 2184, 2187, 2195, 2202, 3073, 3182	The Air Force should bring several F-35A aircraft and measure the loudness at the location for typical flights. The noise analysis in the EIS should be based on this measurement. Also should include the F-16 presently flying. Indicating that public flyovers of the F-35 cannot occur due to a shortage of aircraft is neither appropriate nor reasonable.	The EIS makes use of standard DoD noise impacts prediction methodology. The standard methodology involves measurement of aircraft overflight noise levels under carefully controlled conditions followed by application of the recorded noise levels to predict aircraft noise levels in locations where the aircraft would operate. F-35A noise level measurements used in this EIS are the most accurate data available for the aircraft. Flight profiles expected to be used by the F-35A were derived by repeated flight simulator tests, and were applied to local flying conditions at the beddown installation. Individual overflight noise levels are compared in the Base and Airspace Noise Environmental consequences sections for each base. Field checks have been conducted which indicated good agreement between levels predicted by NOISEMAP and actual noise levels.
NO-8	1004, 1007, 1009, 1026, 1085, 1089, 1101, 1104, 1107, 1120, 1126, 1131, 1136, 1141, 1163, 1172, 1175, 1188, 1190, 1198, 1199, 1202, 1263, 1275, 1300, 1306, 1348, 1375, 1417, 1430, 1448, 1449, 1453, 1456, 1469, 1470, 1477, 1480, 1482, 1495, 1511, 1517, 1536, 1542, 1548, 1559, 1576, 1577, 1628, 1647, 1659, 1661, 1663, 1685, 1698, 1700, 1703, 1714, 1719, 1730, 1737, 1757, 1770, 1775, 1779, 1783, 1784, 1787, 1791, 1813, 1814, 1822, 1823, 1825, 1833, 1834, 1853, 1863, 1864, 1876, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1889, 1891, 1893, 1895, 1897, 1910, 1914, 1923, 1925, 1934, 1942, 1943, 1946, 1947, 1961, 1967, 1971, 1975, 1980, A1012, A1037, A1041, A1043, A1045, A1056, A1073, A1078, A1083, A1084, A1090, A1092, A1093, A1098, A1107, A1122, A1126, A1128, A1136, A1151, A1155, A1156, A1157, A1158, A1162, A1175, A1196, A1198, A1201, A1217, A1224, A1230, A1263, A1267, 2035, 2045, 2065, 2081, 2083, 2096, 2103, 2119, 2123, 2126, 2128, 2130, 2147,	Current noise levels are loud and disruptive. Aircraft noise can be heard inside the house and outside. No amount of window enhancement will be able to buffer flight paths directly overhead caused by these fighter plans.	Public and agency comments as well as analytical results will be included in information made available to the decision-maker prior to a decision being made on this action. The EIS uses Air Force standard noise analysis methodology to estimate expected annoyance levels under baseline conditions and beddown scenarios. Section 3.2 explains how annoyance is calculated and the degree to which structures provide noise level reductions as compared to outdoor noise. Section 3.2.1.1 of each base section includes supplemental noise metrics, which provide a more detailed picture of noise levels and potential noise impacts. It should be noted that no F-35A flights have taken place at any of the locations being considered for beddown in this EIS.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	2164, 2179, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2200, 2205, 2207, 3016, 3148, 3160, 3163, 3164, 3175, 3203, 3211,3227, 3228, 3245, 3262, 3268		
NO-9	1005, 1235, 1371, 1436, 1535, 1683, 1728, 1761, 2034, 2058, 2060, 3025, 3026, 3033, 3036, 3054, 3062, 3071, 3085, 3090, 3099, 3116, 3121, 3126, 3132, 3146, 3192, 3220, 3276, 3282	Noise was originally the only concern but studies have shown that the increased noise levels will scarcely be anymore than current F-16 mission at Luke/Tucson and barely discernible to the bare ear. Do not believe that F-35 noise will be worse than current aircraft or other common sounds.	As noted in the EIS, based on the measurements that are currently available, the proposed F-35 mission is expected to be louder than the current F-16 mission.
NO-10	1005, 1319, 1495, 3026, 3090	The F-35A noise contour lines are well within those established by the state of Arizona.	As shown in Figures 3.2–2 through 3.2–7 of the EIS, there are a few places where the current and proposed operational noise contours will go out of the JLUS contour line.
NO-11	1010, 1100, 1115, 1146, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1517, 1534, 1540, 1551, 1552, 1557, 1562, 1563, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1578, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1706, 1724, 1743, 1747, 1748, 1767, 1769, 1781, 1785, 1794, 1795, 1799, 1822, 1865, 1903, 1909, 1914, 1924, 1945, 1952, 1953, 1983, A1004, A1007, A1029, A1031, A1040, A1042, A1046, A1050, A1062, A1065, A1066, A1070, A1076, A1082, A1087, A1090, A1180 A1190, A1192, A1214, A1217, A1232, A1234, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2115, 2164, 2172, 2176, 2200, 2204, 2207, 3001, 3134, 3137, 3197, 3232, 3242, 3246, 3248, 3263, 3264	Large numbers of residents will be affected.	As stated in the EIS, more people will be affected by the noise under the proposed beddown of F-35A than under current conditions in Boise. Table BO 3.2–4 shows the number of people who may be exposed to noise levels that have the potential to cause noise-induced permanent threshold shift. Noise-induced permanent threshold shift indicates partial loss of hearing. For example, individuals with an average response to noise exposed to noise levels between 82 and 83 dB DNL outdoors for 8 hours a day every day for 40 years may experience as much as a 4 dB noise-induced permanent threshold shift in hearing. If the individual were to spend a percentage of their time indoors, expected noise-induced permanent threshold shift would be less.
NO-12	1063, 1091, 1106, 1110, 1153, 1251, 1412, 1440, 1469, 1477, 1485, 1486, 1540, 1561, 1583, 1758, 1759, 1760, 1767, 1790, 1793, 1900, 1938, 1954, 1977, 1985, A1023, A1056, A1060, A1067, A1069, A1093, A1163, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1237, A1239, A1242,	I expect damage (or more damage) to my home and other structures from sonic booms, severe noise, vibrations, and shock from the F-35. Current aircraft activities already cause my home to shake and/or suffer damage.	As stated in Section 3.2.2, the probability of damage to structures resulting from subsonic noise is extremely low. Text has been added to the EIS stating that even in afterburner power setting, the F-35A does not exceed 130 dB in any 1/3 octave frequency band for distances of greater than 250 feet. As stated in Section B 2.8, only sounds lasting more than 1 second above 130 dB are generally potentially damaging for structures. Noise-induced structural vibration may cause annoyance, but would not normally result in structural damage. Vibrations generated by aircraft with

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1249, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, A1255, 2096, 2105, 2166, 2167, 2174, 2175, 2189, 2190, 2200, 3055, 3166, 3188, 3214, 3238		similar noise level to the F-35A at low altitude (i.e., A-6 at 200 feet AGL) were measured at ancient Anasazi ruins, and found to be substantially below damage threshold peak velocities (Battis 1988). Vibrations caused by subsonic aircraft noise are similar in intensity to natural sources of vibration such as thunder and high winds (Sutherland 1989). Building and equipment constructed to withstand natural force loads (e.g., wind, minor seismic activity) should not be negatively affected by subsonic F-35A overflights. The F-35A is expected to conduct supersonic maneuvers using similar tactics to those used currently by fourth-generation aircraft such as the F-16, and the number of sonic booms generated per F-35A training sortie is expected to be similar to the number generated by F-16 aircraft. Sonic booms generated by the F-35 are expected to be similar in intensity to sonic booms generated by fourth generation fighter aircraft such as the F-16 and F-15. Unlike the F-22, the F-35A does not have the ability to exceed the speed of sound without using afterburner.
NO-13	1016, 1945, 1984, 1987, A1094, A1100, A1212, A1269, 2195, 2200, 3017, 3218	EIS should include L_{max} in noise analysis for all scenarios. For L_{max}, the analysis should present best case (comparison to a relevant known standard) and worst case (Max payload, max fuel load, cool damp morning, short takeoff length) scenarios. Can the EIS include what the normal training syllabus scenario would call for under various conditions and time of day?	Section 2.4.3.2 describes the F-35A training syllabus, which was used in the noise modeling. Noise levels were calculated for representative operating conditions at each location. The SEL metric accounts for all noise energy generated by an individual overflight by normalizing to 1 second. Under normal flying conditions, the SEL dB level is higher than the L_{max} level (see Appendix B, Tables B–1 and B–2). The SEL is a useful metric for assessing several types of noise impacts, and was selected for use in this EIS in most instances. The L_{max} metric is used to quantify number of events per unit time exceeding a noise level that could interfere with speech at sensitive location near the airfields.
NO-14	1016, 2200	How many people would be moderately annoyed and is this level of annoyance important to the Air Force.	The Air Force recognizes that there will be impacts to the population and that the impacts are higher under some alternatives than under others. Percent of people expected to be highly annoyed at levels below 65 dB DNL are listed in Table 3–1 and some persons will become highly annoyed by any aircraft noise level. As stated in Appendix B, noise is a subjective experience. The noise level 65 dB DNL was selected as the lowest noise level to be shown as a noise contour since it is the lowest noise level at which not all land uses are considered to be compatible with noise and because it is a noise level at which a substantial percentage of the population (approximately 12 percent) can be expected to be highly annoyed by noise.
NO-15	1064, 1072, 1106, 1414, 1689, 1793, A1159, 2103	Against sonic booms-cause shaking of walls and scare animals and humans.	Supersonic flight is critical to success in certain types of air combat and must be practiced to maintain pilot skills. Sonic booms are an

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			unfortunate side effect of supersonic flight. As stated in the EIS, if an individual feels that their property has been damaged by sonic booms, they should contact the local installation Public Affairs Office to initiate a claim.
NO-16	1073, 1091, 1104, A1055, A1159, 2013, 2164, 2207, 3004, 3195, 3211, 3242, 3253, 3278	Noise from low altitude and sonic booms will disrupt peace and quiet, destroying quality of life.	The Air Force recognizes that there would be impacts to the population and that some persons may feel that they have experienced a reduction in quality of life under beddown scenarios. Quality of life is not possible to quantify because it is based on a set of subjective experiences that are highly variable among individuals and unpredictable. However, the EIS provides several indicators of noise level, which can be used to predict quality of life. Estimates of the percentage of the population that would be highly annoyed by noise, for example, are one indicator of a decreased quality of life. F-35A training at active-duty Air Force locations would not be expected to take place on the weekend (i.e., Saturday or Sunday). However, mission requirements would dictate the flying schedule. Other weekend flying and ANG weekend training is expected to continue at its current rate.
NO-17	1110, 1414, 1440, 1469, A1052, A1093, 2193, 3179	Who will fix or pay for damages to home or property from noise or sonic booms? I am requesting specific physical attenuation measures for my residence to mitigate noise.	Any claims from Air Force-related damage would begin by contacting the base Public Affairs Office with details of the claim. The Air Force would then establish the exact nature and extent of the damage. The Air Force is not authorized to distribute funds for provision of additional structural noise attenuation in areas affected by increased noise levels.
NO-18	1125, 1168, 1199, 1440, 1442, 1469, 1560, 1566, 1678, 1738, 1779, 1814, 1865, 1909, 1912, 1944, A1056, A1093, A1098, A1196, A1203, A1212, A1227, 2013, 2035, 2074, 2115, 2125, 2126, 2128, 2129, 2164, 2179, 2184, 2189, 2190, 2199, 2204, 2205, 2207, 3012, 3115, 3253, 3263	Noise and sonic booms would be disruptive to outdoor activities and harmful to physical and mental health of those conducting outdoor activities, particularly hiking, and camping, bird watching, and photography.	As stated in the EIS, overflight noise may be disruptive and annoying. This is particularly true for persons who are outdoors, such as campers. Appendix Section B.2.1 discusses possible health effects of elevated noise exposure. The EIS states numbers of events exceeding 50 dB L_{max} at several noise sensitive locations assuming a person is indoors with windows open or indoors with windows closed. As stated in the EIS, indoor noise levels are calculated based on a typical structural attenuation of 15 dB with windows open and 25 dB with windows closed. Persons that are out-of-doors would experience noise events exceeding 65 dB L_{max} and 75 dB L_{max} at the same average frequency (i.e., number of events per hour) that is shown for events exceeding 50 dB L_{max} indoors. Original individual aircraft overflight noise levels published in the EIS for operations in the installation vicinity did not reflected the most up-to date engine power settings and flight profiles. Therefore, an errata document was published that does reflect the most accurate flight profile information. All noise contours shown in the EIS reflect the most up-to-

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			date F-35A flight profile information.
NO-19	1579, A1093, 2015, 3166, 3179	Noise numbers for an F-35A low approach at 500 feet, touch and go, and at 1,000 feet from initial to final should be included in Final EIS. Comparisons to aircraft community can relate should be included.	Individual overflight noise levels for the F-35A and currently based aircraft are shown in Tables B–1 and B–2 for the aircraft in typical approach and departure configurations at several distances. Noise levels for the F-35A aircraft reflecting specific flight parameters used at the at the beddown installation are shown in Table BO/HO/LU/TU 3.2. Noise levels shown at the beddown installation are for the loudest flight profile of that category (i.e., approach, departure, or second approach) at the location specified.
NO-20	1085, 1142, 1196, 1251, 1263, 1284, 1306, 1424, 1468, 1555, 1576, 1784, 1807, 1900, 1945, 1970, A1013, A1022, A1093, A1163, A1196, A1198, A1234, 2038, 2044, 2065, 2094, 2105, 2128, 2136, 2172, 2184, 2199, 2200, 3005, 3055, 3097, 3115, 3215	Had trouble finding information on noise mitigations. What mitigations will be implemented to make sure noise is not a problem? Could you vary the take-off and landing patterns to give temporary reprieves? Can the F-35A be modified to make it less noisy?	Mitigations considered are described in Section 2.8. Certain mitigations that are effective for other types of noise (such as highway sound walls) are not effective for aircraft noise once the aircraft are airborne. Extensive test flights in the F-35A flight simulator have been used to determine realistic engine power profiles and data currently available indicate that reductions in engine power are not possible without reducing safety of flight. Fighter aircraft manufacturers and users are always looking for ways to reduce noise generated by fighter aircraft. Similar efforts have been very successful when applied to commercial and cargo aircraft. However, achieving maximum performance in training and operations is critically important to the success and survivability of fighter aircraft. No measures have been discovered which would substantially reduce fighter aircraft noise without also reducing performance. The Air Force continues to look for ways to reduce noise without compromising the mission.
NO-21	1173, 1467, 1900, 1913, 1985, A1062, A1139, A1235, A1236, 2166, 2167, 3140, 3141, 3182	Are you certain you have the F-35 noise data correct? It looks like it is in error. The original published data stated that the decibel level for the F-35A was 22 dB louder than the F-16C upon landing and without explanation, it was later stated that the decibel level was only 9 dB not 22 dB louder than the F-16C – what was done to reduce the decibel level? Why the noise data was changed or what methodology used that this data was altered so significantly and abruptly isn't explained in the EIS	Original noise levels published in the EIS reflected engine power settings and flight profiles that were not the most up-to-date. Noise levels published in the errata and EIS reflect the most accurate flight profile information available for the F-35A.
NO-22	1142, 3003	The newspaper said the noise from the F-35s would be "slightly elevated"	The term "slightly elevated" is not specific and represents an individual's perspective. The EIS makes specific statements about F-35A noise

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		from an F-16. What does slightly elevated mean? The EIS says the F-35A is slightly noisier than the aircraft it is replacing, that is not factually correct.	levels as compared to noise levels generated by other aircraft types that are accurate based on the best data currently available about F-35A noise levels and expected flight profiles. Comparative information between the F-35A and other aircraft is presented in Tables 3–1 and 3–2 of the EIS.
NO-23	1205, 1263, 2065	I support F-35 training [at Luke]; as long as noise profile is no greater than current, levels/I oppose F-35 training if the noise is greater than current levels.	A majority of the proposed F-35A noise contour lines are within the 1988 JLUS noise contour lines. Figures 3.2–2 through 3.2–7 compare the baseline (current) noise contours to the proposed noise contours. Some scenarios have a smaller area within the ≥65 dB contour line, while others have a larger area affected.
NO-24	1403, 1412, 1778, A1037, A1094, A1100, A1141, A1161, A1162, A1163, 1984, 3005, 3008, 3072, 3074, 3240, 3246, 3253, 3257	Noise analysis, particularly of Military Training Routes or airfields where operations are only conducted at certain times of year, is insufficient because it only includes one average metric. Should use Department of Defense guidelines of three noise-measuring techniques including single event, maximum level, and cumulative activity.	Each base section includes multiple noise metrics to describe noise from F-35A as well as other aircraft for comparison including the use of single event, maximum level, and cumulative noise metrics. It is acknowledged in Section 3.2 of the EIS that the DNL metric does not communicate all information about every noise level experienced near an airfield. The DNL metric is useful though as an indicator of noise levels that can be used for land use planning and prediction of community annoyance. Use of DNL as a general predictor of the percent of a community expected to be highly annoyed by noise is consistent with the current policy of DoD and several other federal agencies. Page 10 of DoD's *Community Annoyance Caused By Noise From Military Aircraft Operations* (2009) states "DNWG (DoD Noise Working Group) is not aware of any research to suggest that there is a better metric than DNL to relate to annoyance" and "DNWG, like FICAN, regards the updated Schultz Curve as the best available source of empirical dosage effect information to predict community response to transportation noise without any segregation by transportation source for the foreseeable future". As stated in EIS text, Table 3–1 summarizes results of studies published on noise and annoyance, and the table states that numbers listed are "average percentage highly annoyed" rather than a fixed known percentage. However, text in Section 3.2 and in Appendix B has been edited in recognition of the fact that there is substantial spread in individual percent highly annoyed data points as relates to DNL. The DNL metric was calculated for an average operational day at the installation. Focus booms affect relatively small areas, with the amount of area depending on the exact nature of the aircraft maneuver creating the boom and atmospheric conditions. Discussion has been added to the EIS about the potential for focus booms and the overall frequency booms of various overpressure levels. The average number of sonic booms per day is stated in the EIS.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NO-25	1412, 1778, A1163, 2136, 2200, 3001, 3003, 3005, 3016	Draft EIS fails to characterize the effects of sonic booms and focused sonic booms. Effects are understated. "Average" noise and "average" sonic boom pressures, "average" number of booms per month, do not accurately represent the impact to residents under the training area.	As stated in Section 3.2.2, the probability of damage to structures resulting from subsonic noise is extremely low. Text has been added to the EIS stating that even in afterburner power setting, the F-35A does not exceed 130 dB in any 1/3 octave frequency band for distances of greater than 250 feet. Training sortie-operations conducted after 10:00 p.m. would have an increased likelihood of disrupting sleep. As stated in Section 3.2.2.2, approximately 7 percent of total sortie-operations would be conducted completely or partially after 10:00 p.m. under Scenario H5, and smaller percentages would be conducted after 10:00 p.m. under the other beddown scenarios.
NO-26	1412, 1778, A1094, A1141, A1143, A1163	Draft EIS is using outdated methodology and noise modeling techniques to develop modeled estimates. Aircraft have been updated significantly in last 30 years and noise modeling should be updated as well. Additional research is also available pertaining to low altitude flights and noise.	This EIS uses the most up-to-date versions of currently approved DoD noise models. However, the Air Force is in the process of certifying the use of future noise models that better account for nonlinear propagation and lateral attenuation. Existing noise impacts studies do not include information on effects of the F-35 specifically because the F-35 is currently engaged in test flights and is not yet flying on a regular schedule. Tests on the effects of noise generated by other aircraft are used as indicators of expected effects of the F-35A. A1141 - The findings of the studies referenced in the Noise Appendix have not been discredited and, therefore, the studies are not out-of-date. The SEL metric was used at several locations in the document including Table TU 3.2–2, as input to sleep disturbance probabilities, and Appendix B Table B–2. F-35A overflight SEL levels have been added to Table B–2 in the EIS.
NO-27	1207	Request for data on specific operations and noise levels associated with F-35 and F-16 over El Mirage.	If one defines the term "overflight" broadly to include any flight in the general area, then approximately half of the operations listed in Table LU2.1–1 could be said to overfly El Mirage. Airfield operations can be generally categorized as being either approaches to or departures from the runway. In the case of a closed pattern operation (i.e., a second approach to the runway), a departure operations is followed immediately by an arrival operation. All departure operations towards the north would fly near El Mirage and all arrival operations towards the south would fly over El Mirage. The noise level experienced in El Mirage during the operation would depend on the type of operation and flight track on which it is being conducted. Supplemental noise metrics such as the number of events that exceed 50 dB indoors are used to provide an indication of changes in noise level at representative noise-sensitive locations. The total number of annual operations conducted at Luke AFB would

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			decrease under all beddown scenarios except L6, and total operations under that scenario would increase by approximately 10 percent. The relative loudness of F-35A operations as compared to F-16 operations is described in Table **3.**2–2.
NO-28	1182, 2128, 2166, 2167, 2200, 3017	What is the criterion for determining that the acceptable level of noise for residential areas is less than 65 dB DNL in the vicinity of airfields and less than 55 dB DNL under airspace?	Several federal agencies, including the Air Force have identified DNL of 65 dB as a criterion which protects against most noise impacts, and which can often be achieved on a practical basis (FICON 1992). Depending on local environmental conditions, aircraft noise may be audible for several miles. However, distant, low-intensity, or infrequent aircraft noise is not generally considered to warrant any recommended restrictions on land use. As described in Appendix B, 65 dB DNL noise contour has been selected as the noise level above which all land uses are not considered compatible, based on input from several federal agencies. Depiction of noise contours down to 65 dB DNL is in keeping with standard Air Force practice. The 65 dB DNL line does not imply that aircraft noise would never be audible outside of the line.
NO-29	1362, 1367, 1715, 1757, 1761, 1779, 1792, 1824, 1861, 1954, A1048, A1049, A1088, A1093, A1125, 2034, 2060	In order to reduce noise, please consider changing flight activities (e.g., landing patterns, no fly zones, altitudes, power settings, etc)	The NEPA process requires bases to identify possible noise mitigations measures. Recommended mitigation measures have been considered and included in the EIS, Section 2.8. Impacts of mitigation alternatives are in environmental consequences, as applicable. Profiles used in noise modeling were designed based on repeated flight simulator test flights. Use of lower power settings that those used in noise modeling reduces rate of climb on departure, while use of lower power settings during approach and straight and level cruise would result in aircraft not maintaining desired speed for optimal safety. Several mitigation measures were considered including hold down (i.e., trading lower power setting for longer time at low altitude). At installations where operational mitigation measures were found to be infeasible, future mitigation measures may be possible once local flight profiles are known with 100% confidence. Mitigation measures would be re-considered during the follow-on AICUZ report at the base selected for F-35A beddown. Several mitigation measures are designed into the proposal including lowest possible late-night flights while still supporting required training, flight tracks and avoidance areas defined over several years to reduce noise, no or rare weekend flights, use of afterburner as infrequently as possible while supporting required takeoff load safely, conducting a large percentage of practice approaches to auxiliary airfields.
NO-30	1412	Several documents have been released about the F-35 with	Noise levels stated in the F-35A Training Basing EIS reflect the most up-to-date information on F-35A noise levels and operational parameters.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		conflicting noise numbers. Why are these numbers different? Are they estimates or have they been massaged to placate the public? Air Force should use the real numbers.	F-35A operational parameters have been updated subsequent to publication of certain prior NEPA documentation. The method used to calculate high-speed low-altitude F-35A flight noise levels has been refined since publication of prior NEPA documents.
NO-31	1412, 3003	Noise analysis does not accurately reflect impacts from low-frequency noise and falsely assumes that the F-35 does not produce the low frequency noise, which inflicts structural damage.	Text has been added to the EIS stating that even in afterburner power setting, the F-35A does not exceed 130 dB in any 1/3 octave frequency band for distances of greater than 250 feet. As stated in Section B 2.8, only sounds lasting more than 1 second above 130 dB are potentially damaging for structures. Noise-induced structural vibration may cause annoyance, but would not normally result in structural damage. Vibrations generated by aircraft with similar noise level to the F-35A at low altitude (i.e., A-6 at 200 feet AGL) were measured at ancient Anasazi ruins, and found to be substantially below damage threshold peak velocities (Battis 1988). Vibrations caused by subsonic aircraft noise are similar in intensity to natural sources of vibration such as thunder and high winds (Sutherland 1989). Building and equipment constructed to withstand natural force loads should not be negatively affected by subsonic F-35A overflights.
NO-32	1298, 1468, 2068, 2069	A more fair comparison for noise contours would be the F-4 (and/or older airframes). I think you'll find those aircraft were much noisier than the F-35 will be.	Data has been added to Appendix B Tables B–1 and B–2 allowing comparison between the noise levels generated by F-4 aircraft, F-35A aircraft, and other types in typical takeoff and approach configurations.
NO-33	1412	Why is the pain metric information missing from the Military Training Route/Special Use Airspace analysis? How do these compare across the alternatives?	Information has been added to the EIS regarding the average frequency at which overflights exceeding 115 dB SEL would be experienced beneath the centerline of MTRs to be used by the F-35A. It was found that such events would occur less than once per month under any of the MTRs under any beddown scenario. The average frequency of noise levels exceeding 120 dB, the lower threshold for ear discomfort, would be substantially less.
NO-34	1302, 1515, 1913	It is very uncertain how noisy these aircraft are compared to the F-16. What are the noise levels and areas that will be impacted from the F-35?	The F-35A is expected to be louder than the F-16 in all configurations, based on all available measurement data. The Base and Airspace Environmental Consequences sections for each base compare the F-35A to other aircraft. As shown in the Draft EIS, the F-35A would be loudest during departure. The distance, which an aircraft can be heard depends on a several factors including but not limited to background noise levels, atmospheric conditions, intervening terrain, aircraft configuration and orientation, and the sensitivity of the hearing of the person listening for the aircraft. Under the right conditions, the F-35A and other loud jet

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			aircraft are audible at quite a distance.
NO-35	1473, 1814	Concerned about the noise from aircraft transiting to other locations to load munitions.	The F-35A would be expected to use the same procedures currently used by the F-16 to fly to Davis-Monthan prior to conducting munitions training with live munitions. Davis-Monthan AFB currently supports several thousand operations per year, including transient aircraft operations by aircraft such as the F-18E/F that generate noise levels similar to the F-35A. Because F-35A transiting to Davis-Monthan AFB would be relatively rare, occurring up to 108 times per year, noise levels generated by the F-35A at and near Davis-Monthan AFB would not add to overall time-averaged noise levels at the installation.
NO-36	1449, 1466, 1469, 1485, 1486, 1488, 1516, 1536, 1538, 1540, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1559, 1561, 1569, 1570, 1573, 1583, 1590, 1650, 1655, 1656, 1660, 1661, 1674, 1681, 1699, 1736, 1751, 1758, 1770, 1781, 1783, 1787, 1790, 1799, 1810, 1815, 1816, 1822, 1831, 1841, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1861, 1864, 1885, 1886, 1897, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1908, 1911, 1915, 1918, 1920, 1923, 1929, 1934, 1938, 1948, 1949, 1952, 1961, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1976, 1980, 1984, 1987, 1999, A1000, A1004, A1006, A1007, A1037, A1040, A1041, A1042, A1050, A1053, A1054, A1060, A1064, A1067, A1069, A1070, A1073, A1076, A1077, A1082, A1084, A1088, A1090, A1098, A1104, A1108, A1119, A1120, A1122, A1136, A1137, A1162, A1163, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1175, A1179, A1180, A1182, A1183, A1187, A1191, A1196, A1202, A1210, A1213, A1229, A1230, A1234, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, A1262, A1266, 2044, 2066, 2067, 2083, 2100, 2105, 2115, 2123, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2139, 2144, 2163, 2164, 2166, 2167,	Noise impacts will diminish my quality of life	The Air Force recognizes that there would be impacts to the population and that some persons may feel that they have experienced a reduction in quality of life under beddown scenarios. Quality of life is not possible to quantify because it is based on a set of subjective experiences that are highly variable among individuals and unpredictable. However, the EIS provides several indicators of noise level, which can be used to predict quality of life. Estimates of the percentage of the population that would be highly annoyed by noise, for example, are one indicator of a decreased quality of life. As noted in the EIS, activity interference, upsetting of pets, and other effects of noise could result in annoyance.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	2174, 2177, 2179, 2188, 2198, 2200, 2203, 2204, 2207, 3059, 3142, 3145, 3155, 3156, 3163, 3168, 3191, 3184, 3185, 3187, 3191, 3193, 3243, 3268, 3279		
NO-37	1521, 1538, 1543, 1551, 1552, 1560, 1563, 1568, 1569, 1582, 1599, 1664, 1725, 1747, 1824, 1833, 1852, 1853, 1865, 1884, 1887, 1891, 1900, 1909, 1913, 1929, 1946, 1954, 1967, 1970, 1976, 1980, 1984, 1987, 1992, 1995, A1044, A1083, A1088, A1090, A1093, A1095, A1112, A1183, A1196, A1203, A1211, A1224, 2123, 2172, 2200, 3218, 3219, 3140, 3160, 3179, 3188, 3195, 3243, 3253, 3256, 3257, 3262, 3266, 3285	Noise of F-35s will be excessive/unacceptable even for an urban environment and is not compatible with residential restrictions.	The purpose of the EIS is to present to the decision-maker information about environmental impacts so that an informed decision can be made. Impacts quantified in the EIS, such as the number of off-base residents affected by noise greater than 65 dB DNL, will be a part of that decision-making process. The EIS recognizes that the F-35A is a loud aircraft and may cause annoyance in the affected population. Speech interference, which is particularly annoying, is discussed in the Base and Airspace Environmental Consequences sections as well as in Appendix B, Section B.2.3. The EIS uses cumulative (i.e., DNL and $L_{eq(SD)}$ as well as single-event (i.e., SEL) noise metrics to communicate expected changes in noise under beddown scenarios. As stated in Section 3.2.2, schools were assumed to provide 25 dB outdoor-to-indoor noise reductions. Under this assumption the highest exterior Leq(sd) recommended by ANSI S12.60-2009 is 64 dB. Actual Outdoor-to-indoor noise level attenuation varies not only between schools, but also between locations in individual schools. Estimated 25 dB outdoor-to-indoor reduction is expected to provide a good representation of typical school building structural attenuation.
NO-38	1407, 1819, 1912, 1949, 1977, A1062, A1152, A1162, A1190, A1212, 2166, 2167, 2184, 3001, 3002, 3010, 3148, 3164, 3218, 3248	Noise analysis needs to consider terrain, particular mountainous terrain, in noise modeling. Other factors that should be included are weather conditions and afterburner use.	The current DoD-approved training airspace noise model, MR_NMAP, uses typical altitude band distributions for each aircraft type (see EIS Table 2–9) which are based on pilot input. At altitudes below 5,000 feet AGL, pilots typically fly at a specified distance from the ground (feet AGL). As aircraft transit areas with varied terrain, the altitude in feet AGL will change, but this variability has been accounted for in estimations of altitude band usage. NOISEMAP calculations in this EIS use a topographic effects model that accounts for terrain effects on noise propagation. Terrain effects include the degree to which different ground types absorb sound (bare rock does not absorb sound energy well) and ground elevation (closeness of ground-to-aircraft and acoustic blocking due to terrain). The effects of atmospheric conditions such as temperature and relative humidity on sound propagation are accounted for by using average conditions from the month with the median acoustic atmospheric attenuation value. NOISEMAP propagation algorithms do not explicitly include the effects of wind on sound propagation, but propagation in all directions is calculated as if the sound were propagating downwind (which is favorable for propagation and hence

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			provides estimates of noise levels that are slightly biased towards being higher than actual). Calculated noise levels include all varieties of F-35A operations (including afterburner takeoffs) as well as all varieties of operations conducted by their aircraft that operate at the airfield.
NO-39	1440, 1900, 1913, 1977, 1985, 1987, 2121, 2166, 2167, 3002, 3201, 3221	Planes often come into town in formation and their noise is amplified/multiplied. Did the Draft EIS noise analysis take this into consideration? Does the Draft EIS take into consideration compounded noise impacts of trainees flying with an accompanying instructor?	The EIS takes into account all training sorties including those flown by a training instructor, and this noise is incorporated into calculated time-averaged noise levels. When two aircraft fly together as during formation flight, noise energy is doubled, which equates to an increase in overall individual overflight noise level of 3 dB (see Appendix B, Section B.1.1). In most cases, jets fly such that the noise of two aircraft flying together on a low-level route do not reach maximum level at exactly the same. As a result, the additive noise level of two overflights is generally less than 3 dB greater than the level generated by a single aircraft. Formations including overflight of more than two aircraft together result in longer duration noise events, with the duration depending on the specific sequencing of the aircraft. Text has been added the EIS describing the noise generated by multiple aircraft flying together. Low-altitude training would not typically involve more than two aircraft flying together.
NO-40	1440, 1450, 1987, A1047, A1153, A1256, 2195, 3179, 3270	Noise methodologies and/or analyses are inadequate because they do not accurately reflect actual conditions (e.g., aircraft in my area fly at lower elevations than those analyzed in the Draft EIS) or sudden surges of sound (e.g., F-35 Flyovers).	The EIS for beddown of F-35 aircraft at Eglin AFB and Nellis AFB used the same general NOISEMAP noise modeling process as the AETC EIS (i.e., noise levels measured, recorded into NOISEFILE database, and then used by NOISEMAP to estimate local noise levels). F-35A flight parameters have undergone further study since the previous F-35 beddown documents were published, and the updated parameters and modeling techniques are reflected in the current EIS. Noise modeling was conducted using information specific to the local flying environment where applicable. For example, each installation designates a 'pattern altitude' at which the level flight portions of runway approach operations are conducted. Noise modeling included operations on several flight tracks, which mirror flight tracks used by currently based aircraft. Aircraft vary from standard or typical flight tracks because of winds, ATC de-conflictions with other air traffic, and other factors. NOISEMAP calculations in this EIS use a topographic effects model that accounts for terrain effects on noise propagation. Terrain effects include the degree to which different ground types absorb sound (bare rock does not absorb sound energy well) and ground elevation (closeness of ground to the aircraft and acoustic blocking due to terrain). The effects of

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			atmospheric conditions such as temperature and relative humidity on sound propagation are accounted for by using average conditions from the month with the median acoustic atmospheric attenuation value. NOISEMAP propagation algorithms do not explicitly include the effects of wind on sound propagation, but propagation in all directions is calculated as if the sound were propagating downwind (which is favorable for propagation and hence provides estimates of noise levels that are slightly biased towards being higher than actual). Outside of the base vicinity, noise modeling is conducted using the noise model MR_NMAP, which accounts for the increased variability and unpredictability of training flights in special use airspace.
NO-41	1715	Is an engine trim still required after an engine change or a serious engine problem and was this and the required engine run-ups included in the noise analysis?	All maintenance work involving engine runs at higher than idle power would be conducted off-site. No trim pad would be required.
NO- 42	1697, 1778, 1814, 1900, A1037, A1092, A1093, A1094, A1161, 2195, 3140, 3218	How accurate is the computer model that generated the decibel levels? Why were "modeled" F-35A data used for the environmental analysis when data specific to the F-35 A exists regarding the environmental impact the F-35A has on communities and the environment (e.g., Eglin AFB). The computer modeled dbs should be should be compared to the actual decibel levels that were measured that were reported in this Table E–2 of the EIS for Eglin AFB.	At the time of writing of this letter, the F-35A aircraft is not yet flying regularly at Eglin AFB. Operations parameters used in the F-35A Training Basing EIS were based on multiple simulator test flights. Description of the profile development process has been added to Section 3.2. F-35A noise levels have been measured for flight configurations used near the airfield. High speed flight noise has been estimated based on a composite of measured noise levels for several aircraft types flying at low altitudes and high airspeeds. The EIS for beddown of F-35 aircraft at Eglin AFB and Nellis AFB used the same NOISEMAP noise modeling process as the AETC EIS (i.e., noise levels measured, recorded into NOISEFILE database, and then used by NOISEMAP to estimate local noise levels). F-35A flight parameters have undergone further study since the original Eglin F-35 EIS was published, and the updated operational parameters are reflected in the current EIS.
NO-43	1778, A1094	Why was SEL data from Eglin EIS not used or cited in the F-35A Training Basing Draft EIS especially since communities and humans and animal populations living under Military Training Routes will be subject to	As stated in Table 2–9 of the EIS, F-35A training under the current proposed actions is only required down to 500 feet AGL. Other EIS documents have considered the impacts of F-35A MTR operations at altitudes lower than 500 feet AGL. Noise levels associated with high-speed flight at 500 feet AGL have been added to Table 3.2–6 of each base section. The method used to estimate high speed F-35A and typical

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		more than 133 dB	flying parameters have been refined slightly since the Eglin AFB EIS was published, although the noise levels presented for overflight in the two documents are similar at 1,000 feet AGL.
NO-44	1450, 1560, 1985, A1093, A1191, 2202, 3243, 3263	Are there OSHA standards that would apply and/or considered for teachers, store attendants, or other workers in areas identified as greater than 65 dB DNL or for short-duration sonic events of over 120 dB? What will be the effects on the workers at the airports?	Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) standard requires that a hearing conservation program be implemented at a workplace if the eight-hour time-weighted average is at 90 dB or above. Airport flightlines are an example of workplaces that have hearing conservation programs in place. Department of Defense policy states that populations exposed to noise levels at or greater than 80 dB DNL have the greatest risk of potential hearing loss. Most jobs, including teachers and store attendants, involve spending a substantial portion of the workday indoors, where aircraft noise levels are typically reduced relative to outdoor noise levels by 15 to 25 dB. Aircraft noise levels indoors would not be expected to be high enough to cause any risk of noise-induced permanent threshold shift.
NO-45	A1037, 2103, 2200	Sonic booms do not occur over cities and larger towns in the area since pilots avoid those areas. This is unfair to people in rural areas who deal with the negative consequences of training flights. Analysis should include the maximum noise levels, account for focused sonic booms while using rural noise levels as a basis. It must include how the Air Force will mitigate these issues.	The majority of F-35A training sortie-operations would be conducted in the White Sands Missile Range and McGregor Range (see EIS Tables HO 2.2–1 and HO 2.2–2). These ranges are very large and provide excellent training opportunities, but also must accommodate a large and growing number of training and test missions. The distributions of operations among existing and accessible airspace units shown in EIS Tables HO2.2–1 and HO 2.2–2 is expected to maximize use of large range areas near Holloman AFB given competing user requirements.
NO-46	2105	The F-35 will have 10 times the energy of the F-16C when cruising, and 100 times the energy on landing. The human auditory system compresses those differences into twice and four times respectively	The human ear is able to comfortably detect noise energy ranging in intensity 0.00002 Newton's per square meter to 60 Newton's per square meter (a factor of 3 million). As stated in Appendix B, noise energy levels are generally expressed as decibels for ease of notation. Noise levels generated by the F-35A and F-16 are stated at various places in the EIS and the perceived relative difference between decibel values is presented in several locations. In general, a 3 dB increase is perceived as noticeably louder, a 10 dB increase is perceived as about twice as loud, and a 20-decibel increase is perceived as being four times as loud.
NO-47	A1073, A1087, 2105	The disturbing sound level and the general "roar" are not confined to the impact area. The sound carries for tens of miles and lasts minutes on end. The F-16 has 23,000 pounds of	The F-35A is equipped with an engine that is more powerful than engines used by F-16 aircraft. As is recognized in the EIS in base specific Sections 3.2, measured noise levels indicate that the F-35A is also louder than the F-16.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		thrust while the F-35 had 40,000. So the noise and pollution generated by those jets taking off in the morning will be much louder and extend much further into the city neighborhoods.	
NO-48	1900, 1985, A1093, A1100, A1256, 2105	The Eglin AFB F-35 EIS recorded the F-35 while landing at 500 miles per hour at 500 feet at 122 decibels. Translated in health terms, that means that permanent hearing damage occurs with only a 4 second cumulative exposure over a 24 hour period.	Noise-induced permanent hearing threshold shift risk in the installation vicinity is assessed according to DoD policy at noise levels exceeding 80 dB DNL. Persons working in known high-noise areas on the installation/airport are subject to Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. OSHA standards require that a hearing conservation program be implemented at a workplace if the eight-hour time-weighted average is at 90 dB or above. Information has been added to the EIS regarding the average frequency at which overflights exceeding 115 dB SEL would be experienced at a location on the ground beneath the centerline of MTRs to be used by the F-35A. It was found that such noise events would occur less than once per month under any of the MTRs under any beddown scenario and there is a lower expectation of people being under the MTR at the same time. Noise-induced permanent threshold shift would not be expected to occur in an environment with such infrequent intense noise events.
NO-49	A1093, A1139, A1152, 2105, 3005	Explain the noise model validity and results. Specific questions include whether NOISEMAP is accurate predicting SEL at 40% engine power setting and is it possible the SEL is identical for with and without afterburner with 107 feet slant distance.	NOISEMAP has been field tested and found to be accurate at estimating noise levels. It was found that noise levels were estimated to within 1.5 dB of actual measured level with a 90% statistical confidence (Lee 1982). F-35A standard flight profiles (i.e., altitude, engine power setting, and airspeed at points along the flight track) have been developed based on repeated flight simulator runs. In these test flights, detailed records were kept on power settings change during the flight. The engine power settings and noise levels presented in the revised Table 3.2–2 reflect the most up-to-date understanding of F-35A flight profiles based on repeated tests. Use of 40 percent ETR provides appropriate power to safely accomplish segments of the runway approach and closed pattern (i.e., second approach). This power setting is the loudest aircraft configuration typically being used during overflight at the location analyzed and is used for the level portions of closed pattern flight profiles. NOISEMAP calculations are based on noise levels measurements for the F-35A at high power settings and also at lower power settings such as 40 percent. The results of NOISEMAP are accurate in this power setting range. F-35A pilots would de-select afterburner very early in the flight profile and the remainder of the flight profile is very similar to military power departure profile. For this reason, noise levels generated by the two

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			profiles are similar in areas not immediately adjacent to the runway. As described in Section 3.2.2, subsonic F-35A noise levels are stated in A-weighted decibels. A-weighting reflects human hearing by emphasizing sound energy in mid-frequencies, where human hearing is best, and de-emphasizing sound energy in high and low frequencies. Concentration of F-35A noise in middle frequencies is reflected by higher sound levels reported in the EIS.
NO-50	1424, 1685, 1766, 1861, 1864, 1865, 1913, 1925, 1977, 1980, 1985, 1987, A1093, A1094, A1142, A1147, A1151, A1180, A1182, A1212, A1224, A1227, A1235, A1236, 2101, 2121, 2203	The 24-hour DNL measurement in the EIS does not consider short-term events or the actual noise levels experienced during an overflight. Additionally Draft EIS tries to make comparisons between DNL and instantaneous sound levels, which are two different metrics. We question the metrics used.	Supplemental noise metrics including SEL and L_{max} have been employed to provide a more complete description of noise levels than is provided by the 24-hour DNL measurement alone. DNL is a cumulative metric averaging noise over a 24-hour time period and sound levels generated by individual overflights cannot be known based on DNL alone. Supplemental noise metrics, including events exceeding a threshold level, are employed, as presented in base-specific section Tables 3.2–3, in accordance with DoD guidance on the subject. It is recognized in the EIS that aircraft overflights would be louder than ambient noise levels, and would be expected to cause annoyance in affected persons. Noise generated by overflights at speeds used in the airfield environment does not rise from ambient levels at a rate that would trigger application of 'onset rate adjustment'. While operating in training airspace at low altitudes, aircraft often fly at 475 knots and noise onset rate is much more sudden. The onset-rate adjusted SEL noise metric is used to estimate negative effects of potential surprise or startle effects during such low altitude overflights in training airspace. Typical human perception of differing sound levels is discussed in Section 3.2.2 (see Table 3–1). In some instances in the EIS, to provide perspective expected changes in time-averaged noise levels are related to typical perceived difference in noise level if the noise levels were instantaneous. Impacts of noise to schools can be assessed using the Leq(sd) metric and the number of events exceeding 50 dB maximum noise level which are both published in the EIS. As stated in the EIS, events exceeding 50 dB have potential to interfere with speech, which is of critical importance to teaching. As stated in Section 3.2, the EIS uses A-weighted sound levels to predict impacts of subsonic aircraft noise, while C-weighted noise levels are used

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			to predict impacts associated with impulsive noises such as sonic booms and ordnance detonation. Use of these frequency-weighting scales is common practice and part of standard DoD noise assessment methodology.
NO-51	1795	Maps contained in the Noise Section contain incorrect or outdated imagery. By using outdated imagery presents a less than current picture of the effects of the noise contour lines.	Aerial photography is used primarily to provide a feel for the types of areas affected by elevated noise levels. Use of newer aerial photography would not yield different analytical results. Analysis was conducted using the most up-to-date data available. For example, calculation of estimated off-installation residents exposed to noise levels exceeding 65 dB DNL was made based on the 2010 U.S. census data.
NO-52	1450, A1093, A1143	Several tables in Appendix B do not specifically address or call out the F-35	The F-35A has been added to Tables B–1 and B–2 in Appendix B.
NO-53	1538, 1543, 3256, 3285	EIS shows the contour largely in line with the air strips and is incomplete in its disclosure, as it does not show the noise impact zone for the military landing pattern for an eastward approach.	The contours in the EIS depict the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) down to 65 dB. Occasional or high-altitude aircraft operations occur in areas outside of the 65 dB DNL noise contour, but do not generate time-averaged noise levels at or exceeding 65 dB DNL.
NO-54	1538, 1543, 3172, 3179, 3285	Real life decibels need to be measured in all take off and landing patterns for existing and proposed runways, and measured by a neutral contractor agreed upon by the Air Force and the affected residents and businesses. The results need to be combined with a door to door census and survey of affected residents and businesses.	Taking F-35 noise measurements in the vicinity of potential beddown installations is not feasible. Only a small number of F-35A aircraft exist currently and those aircraft are not available for demo flight because they are being used for flight testing. Use of NOISEMAP to model aircraft noise is in compliance with DoD standard methods for aircraft noise modeling. Conducting F-35A training at potential beddown locations and then carrying out a door-to-door survey of the effect of those training operations on the nearby population would be enormously expensive to the government and results would be subject to error if conditions during the tests were non-standard. Analysis of aircraft beddown environmental impacts requires substantial resources. While the idea of the analysis being conducted by a disinterested third party is logical, it would not be expected that a truly disinterested third party would choose to invest the substantial time and effort required to produce a coordinated environmental document.
NO-55	1576	If public objections cannot force the use of Boise air space only, then the City of Meridian should also be compensated.	The Air Force does not have any plans at this time to compensate any individuals or municipal governments for potential impacts resulting from aircraft noise that may occur if the F-35A were to beddown at Boise AGS.
NO-56	1578, 3232	The EIS says if too noisy outside go inside. If too noisy inside on one side	As stated in the EIS, noise levels would increase substantially under certain F-35A beddown scenarios. The EIS makes no recommendations

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		of house move to the other side of the house.	to the public about where to go to avoid noise. Its purpose is to identify and describe noise impacts on indoor and outdoor environments.
NO-57	1579, 2195, 2200, 3017	The use of averages in this EIS should include the greatest decibel level to arrive at the average decibel level. The Air Force dilutes and minimizes the most damaging F-35 noise impacts by averaging them on a 24-hour day.	Aircraft operations are highly variable by nature, and an analysis claiming to capture the highest level that would ever occur at a particular location would always to be subject to error. Supplemental noise metrics are used to quantify the number of loud noise events under baseline conditions and beddown scenarios.
NO-58	1775, 1973, A1163, A1180, A1227, 2166, 2167, 3235	People with noise sensitivities, such as autism or Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), won't be able to tolerate the noise.	Section 3.2 and Appendix B of the EIS acknowledge that certain citizens, such as those with autism, are more sensitive than others are. Text has been added to Section 3.2 regarding sensitivity of citizens with PTSD to noise. Persons that feel that they have incurred damages resulting from sonic booms should contact the local installation Public Affairs Office to initiate a claim.
NO-59	1900, 1912, 1942, 1980, A1062, A1093, A1151, A1235, A1236, 2120, 2124, 2166, 2167, 2185, 2187, 2195, 3191	The noise analysis for the Tucson International Airport ANG alternative is incomplete because no analysis is provided for F-35 (arming) flights in and out of Davis-Monthan AFB (DMAFB).	Text has been added to the EIS in Section TU 3.2.1.2 discussing the frequency, intensity, and expected noise impacts of F-35A flights to load live munitions at DMAFB. Flights to DMAFB would occur up to 108 times per year (under Scenario T3). Individual F-35A overflights could result in noise that could be annoying, but the flights would be infrequent enough that time-averaged noise levels near the AFB would not be expected to be affected.
NO-60	2112	Table LU 3.2–1 does not include data associated with the 1988 (65 dB DNL) Joint Land Use Study lines.	A new table (Table LU 3.2–2) and appropriate text has been added providing the JLUS 1988 noise contour information for comparison.
NO-61	1912, 1984, A1037, A1047, A1076, A1199, 2166, 2167, 3250	EIS should investigate the impact of the F-35A on use of sensitive scientific research equipment where experiments or protocols may be spoiled by F-35A vibrations. Investigation should be based on thorough research with high-level officials.	Potential effects of noise and vibration were considered in development of land use compatibility criteria. Table B–4 may be consulted to determine noise compatibility a particular land use type at DNL under beddown scenarios. Noise-induced structural vibration may cause annoyance, but would not normally result in structural damage. Vibrations generated by aircraft with similar noise level to the F-35A at low altitude (i.e., A-6 at 200 feet above ground level) were measured at ancient Anasazi ruins, and found to be substantially below damage threshold peak velocities (Battis 1988). Vibrations caused by subsonic aircraft noise are similar in intensity to natural sources of vibration such as thunder and high winds (Sutherland 1989). Building and equipment constructed to withstand natural force loads (e.g., wind, minor seismic activity) should not be negatively affected by subsonic F-35A overflights.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NO-62	1913, A1151, A1235, A1236, 2120, 2166, 2167, 2187, 2195, 3056, 3164, 3166, 3175	The Draft EIS fails to address noise impacts if F-35s are directed by Air Traffic Control to fly outside Tucson International Airport's designated flight paths, as the F-16s of the 162 FW currently are.	Under baseline conditions and under the F-35A beddown scenarios, aircraft do and would sometimes continue to vary from flight paths typically used to avoid air traffic conflicts and for other reasons. F-35A aircraft would use flight paths similar those used by the F-16 aircraft based at Tucson AGS currently. NOISEMAP accounts for flights along several representative flight paths. DNL noise contours shown in the EIS represent areas where overflights are relatively frequent and relatively loud such that time-averaged noise levels would be high enough to result in substantial annoyance. The contours do not delimit the only areas, which aircraft fly, but rather the areas in which overflights are loud enough and frequent enough to result in elevated time-averaged noise levels.
NO-63	2120, 2175, 3204	The Draft EIS ignores many studies that demonstrate a wide range of adverse health effects that result from elevated noise levels. Other studies, which the Draft EIS also ignore, conclude that children are even more sensitive than adults are to the health effects of noise.	Appendix Section B.2.1 describes possible adverse health effects from elevated noise levels. As described in Appendix Section B.2.5, studies conducted on the effects of individual overflights on Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) in adults and children have yielded conflicting results.
NO-64	2125	Tables indicating that 1,181 people would be affected under the 65 dB DNL contour for Scenario L3 at Luke AFB are incorrect because the Pueblo El Mirage, an active adult community 3 miles north of Luke AFB with approximately 3,000 residents, lies under this contour.	As stated in the EIS, estimated off-installation population affected by noise levels at or greater than 65 dB DNL was calculated using 2010 U.S. Census data, which is the most accurate and up-to-date source of information on population in the affected areas available. All persons living permanently in the affected area are counted using this method. Text has been added to the EIS acknowledging that temporary residents are not counted using this method.
NO-65	A1013, A1093	Annoyance represents the most common noise impact	As stated in Section 3.2, annoyance represents the most common noise impact. The metric DNL is the best available predictor of the percentage of the affected population that can be expected to be highly annoyed by noise.
NO-66	A1013	I am confident at least 12.3% of the local population (Tucson) will be highly annoyed by the F-35's noise.	As depicted in Figure B–2, there is a positive correlation between noise level and the percentage of the population that is highly annoyed. Based on this relationship, it would be expected that approximately 12 percent of people exposed to noise at 65 dB DNL would be highly annoyed by the noise while people at higher noise levels would be more likely to be highly annoyed by the noise.
NO-67	2136	Why do the contour maps not take sonic booms into account? Why were	Supersonic flight is not conducted in the installation vicinity, and sonic booms would not normally be experienced in this area. Therefore,

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		maps showing only sonic boom contours not included in the Draft EIS? This would likely increase the intensity of the dB and the extent of the noise contour lines.	supersonic noise energy is not included in calculated noise levels near the installation. Supersonic noise levels are calculated for areas beneath military special use airspace units in which supersonic training is proposed to be conducted. The results of these calculations are presented in the Airspace Environmental Consequences section.
NO-68	3006	Is the Air Force going to conduct hearing examinations for people and be responsible for the loss of hearing as a result of the F-35A?	The Air Force does not plan at this time to conduct hearing examinations for people that are not DoD employees. Individuals living within the 80 dB DNL contour would be handled on a case-by-case basis (see Response NO-6).
NO-69	1913, 2184, 3221, 3263	At public meetings, people reported severe noise impacts from current flights far outside the acknowledged noise contours (e.g., Tucson Mountains area). The Draft EIS needs to address these complaints.	The EIS acknowledges that aircraft noise is heard outside of the depicted noise contours. For example, noise levels at representative noise sensitive locations are not zero for those locations outside of the 65 dB DNL contour line; however, text has been added explicitly stating that noise would be experienced outside of the 65 dB DNL contour line. As noted in EIS Table 3–1, some persons will become highly annoyed due to noise at less than 65 dB DNL. As also noted in the EIS, the reaction of individuals to aircraft noise is impossible to predict and depends heavily on several factors specific to the individual. Individual aircraft overflights in areas outside of the 65 dB DNL contour line may be loud, but do not occur at a frequency and or sound level such that time-averaged noise levels exceed 65 dB DNL. 65 dB DNL is a widely accepted threshold above which an increasingly large percentage of the population would be expected to become highly annoyed.
NO-70	1914	The Boise Airport noise study conducted several years ago does not reflect current conditions and not even the airport information was used in the modeling. Model relied on older data and was not "ground truthed".	The Boise Airport noise study (i.e., FAA Part 150 Study) was conducted using standard FAA noise modeling methodology. The commenter is correct in noting that "ground-truthing" in the sense of measuring noise levels near the airport was not conducted as part of this study, nor is such measurement part of standard FAA Part 150 noise study procedures.
NO-71	1915	Does the pilot experience sonic booms? How do they affect his/her hearing?	As depicted in Section B.3.2 of Appendix B, sonic booms create a cone of pressure behind the aircraft. While the pilots may feel some turbulence as they transition to supersonic speeds, they do not normally experience sonic booms generated by the aircraft.
NO-72	1921	No Department of Defense study exists that demonstrates the scientific integrity of NOISEMAP and its ability to provide accurate DNL contours. A federal policy was signed on 17 Dec 2010 by Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy	As described in the EIS, methods used to assess noise levels and noise impacts reflect the most up-to-date Air Force methods and noise models currently approved for use. The process used to develop NOISEMAP operational parameter inputs is now described in Section 3.2.2 and additional text has been included in Appendix B describing noise modeling methods. The NOISEMAP model has been checked for accuracy by comparing NOISEMAP results against noise level

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		requiring that the public be given more substantially more information on NOISEMAP methodology. This EIS provides little information on how inputs were developed so there is little reason to accept the accuracy of the DNL contours. Methodology discussion in Appendix B should be improved.	measurements and found to be accurate within 1.5 dB with a 90 percent statistical confidence (Lee 1982).
NO-73	1921	Public can enforce the EIS model of flight profiles by collecting flight operations information from photographic altimetry of actual flights and limiting those flights to those represented by the BaseOps model of flight operations used in NOISEMAP.	There is a degree of variability inherent to flying, which can be caused by factors such as winds, pilot technique, and air traffic control routings of aircraft to de-conflict with other aircraft. Flight tracks and altitude profiles used in noise modeling are representative of flight operations. Text has been added to Section 3.2 explicitly acknowledging that aircraft sometimes vary from typical flight paths and altitudes due to special circumstances. Members of the public are welcome to keep records of aircraft overflights in any way they see fit.
NO-74	1942, A1062, 2187	EIS fails to present issues related to noise pollution and refers to a $25 million contribution by Pima County to address noise pollution issues, a sum that is not designated or authorized for this purpose. The offer was made at the urging of local business groups, not impacted residents who would prefer fewer and less noisy flight. The proposed funding would come from a bond election that has little possibility of passing in these economic times. Also, there is question of the Pima County bonding process: http://www.yourwestvalley.com/valleyand state/article_7ecal10be-693c-11e1-9ffc-001871e3ce6c.html	No mention is made of these funds in the EIS and no decision has been made on allocation of these funds. The EIS uses standard methods to assess and describe noise levels under baseline conditions and the beddown scenarios.
NO-75	1945	Boise airport completed a noise study a few years ago. Why wasn't this data presented in this study? It would be nice to see how their information compares to your model.	As stated in the EIS, the Boise Airport FAA Part 150 noise study noise contours were adopted as representative baseline noise conditions.
NO-76	1948, 3197	Noise contours on the maps are a	It is fully acknowledged in the EIS that the DNL noise metric does not, by

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		deceptive generality. The contours should be analogous to topographic lines and should correlate to the Bell Curve for the intensity and frequency of sound. Contour lines don't prevent noise from entering the air on the other side and are therefore illusionary.	itself, communicate a complete set of information about all overflights at a particular location, but rather provides an indication of the loudness of the area, which can be used for land use planning and assessment of environmental impacts. The intensity of aircraft noise at a given location varies not only as a result of atmospheric conditions, but also as a result of where the aircraft is flying (i.e., ground track), altitude, engine power setting, airspeed, type of aircraft, and flight configuration. Noise levels presented in the EIS reflect the noise generated by several types of aircraft conducting several types of operations. As the commenter suggests, the resulting noise levels, if viewed in cross section would look approximately like a Bell curve with the peak at the runway. Supplemental noise metrics, such as number of events exceeding a certain level are used to provide more information about noise levels than is provided by DNL alone. Noise is noticeable outside of the 65 dB DNL line and, as noted in Table 3–1 some persons will be highly annoyed by noise levels below 65 dB DNL.
NO-77	3005	Noise figures omit the fact that in the mountains we're used to very minimal ambient noise and peaceful tranquility.	F-35A operations would occur in areas that are currently used for training by currently-based aircraft. Changes in noise level would be incremental increases relative to a baseline aircraft noise level. Ambient noise levels in training airspace are discussed in the Airspace Affected Environment section.
NO-78	2136	Are historic tribal lands (where religious ceremonies might occur) included in the discussion/definition of places of worship in relation to being sensitive receptors under 65 dB DNL conditions?	As stated in the base-specific Sections 3.2.1.2, the noise sensitive locations for which specific noise data are presented are a representative sample of locations that may be affected by noise in the areas surrounding the base. These types of building are easily recognized by the public and can be used to infer possible noise effects in nearby areas. Tribal concerns regarding potential noise impacts to historic tribal lands are established through the government to government consultation process between the Air Force and tribes whose lands are beneath the airspace. The consultation process is described in EIS base-specific Section 3.9 and documented in Appendix C. Section 2.8 explains that overflights would avoid, to the extent practicable, identified seasonally sensitive Native American ceremonies or other seasonal activities.
NO-79	3002	Ramp-ups are more harmful on the body than ramp-downs in noise and that needs to be looked at very closely because the effects are significant.	People may be more likely to notice the F-35A as the beddown process is under way. During the aircraft beddown process, jets transition to the beddown location over a period. The number of flights conducted by the jets bedding down typically increase over the course of months until all units are at full-strength and operating at full capacity.
NO-80	3001	Request information/clarification regarding the special study that has to	Additional studies could be conducted to examine specific noise impacts, if it were determined that such studies would be beneficial. However, no

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		be done if the noise level is at a certain decibel.	studies, above and beyond the EIS and its associated documentation, would be required in order to comply with applicable regulations and policy regarding the proposed beddown of the F-35A.
NO-81	2200, 3111, 3147, 3179, 3240	Do not see in the study that damage to hearing is caused by peaks in sound level, not the average. Do not see where the threshold of permanent hearing loss is specified.	The risk of experiencing noise-induced permanent threshold shifts increases with repeated or prolonged continuous elevated sound level exposure. Current DoD policy accounts for this by recommending use of a time-averaged noise metric, which account for both frequency and duration of loud events (DNL) to predict the extent of any potential noise-induced permanent threshold shift. It is possible that individual noise events exceeding 115 dB could result in temporary hearing threshold shift; however, without repeated exposures to high noise levels, such as would typically occur in a workplace environment, temporary hearing threshold shifts normally disappear and hearing returns to normal.
NO-82	2126	The Draft EIS doesn't take into account a noise study from the early 2000s conducted by Mountain Home AFB for measuring noise levels of sonic booms and F-16 engine noise flying at different altitudes in the Owyhees. This study could help define local impacts and be combined with the rest of the noise analysis.	The EIS establishes representative baseline operational conditions based on ongoing levels of operations in military training airspace. This data is compared against expected noise levels under beddown scenarios to estimate noise impacts. It may be that the commenter is referring to the Enhanced Training in Idaho (ETI) EIS, which was released in January 1998. The ETI EIS document does not bear directly on findings of the current EIS.
NO-83	2158	All of the Draft EIS's airfield exhibits seem to show the 11L landing threshold at TW-A1; the landing threshold is generally located at TW-A4. The location of the threshold is generally located at TW-A4. The location of the threshold has obvious bearing on your technical (i.e., project costs) and environmental (i.e., sound exposure) analysis and conclusions.	The location of the landing threshold on Runway 11L is the same used in the Tucson IAP FAA Part 150 study and aligns with aerial photography. There is no problem with the modeled runway threshold location.
NO-84	2136	Community land use guidelines for the vicinity of an airport do not adequately address the effects of noise on the expectations and purpose of people visiting areas within a national park or a national wildlife refuge where ambient noise is very low and a quiet setting is a generally recognized	Noise levels generated by the F-35A and other aircraft operating in special use airspace units are calculated and presented in the EIS using standard DoD methods and sound metrics. Certain metrics, such as time above a threshold level and percent of time in which aircraft noise is audible cannot be calculated using modeling software currently approved for use in modeling DoD aircraft. All existing avoidance procedures would continue to be under F-35A beddown scenarios.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		purpose and attribute (FAA 1050.1E, 6.2). Although this section is in reference to 4(f) evaluations that are not required to be conducted by the Air Force, the concept is applicable in that the National Park Service does not use DNL or the 65 DNL standards in evaluating impacts of noise to park resources and visitor experience.	
NO-85	2111	In Table 2–12 (Comparative Summary of Environmental Consequences) on pg 28, 2nd bullet from top, it indicates that sleep disturbance would increase 33%, 17%. Ad 31% under scenarios B1, B2, and B3, respectively. Recommend checking these numbers - how would more aircraft result in sleep disturbance decreasing? This is the case with the other installations as well.	The decrease in percent awakened results from the relocation of A-10 aircraft from Boise AGS under Scenarios B2 and B3. A-10 aircraft currently conduct late-night sorties, which would be expected to result in awakenings under baseline conditions and Scenario B1.
NO-86	2111	In Table 2–12 (Comparative Summary of Environmental Consequences) on pg 28, 3rd bullet from top - is Boise the only area that has people at risk for potential hearing loss in areas > 80 dB DNL?	Boise is the only beddown installation at which off-base residents in the area affected by noise levels greater than 80 dB DNL.
NO-87	2111	In Table 2–12 (Comparative Summary of Environmental Consequences) on Page 31, the first bullet indicates that 10-11 off-installation residents would be affected by the 65 dB DNL contour. This figure should be ground truthed; in reality there are only 2 people residing under the noise contour shown in figure BO 3.2–5. Once ground truthing the numbers, all tables and charts should be updated to reflect the accurate impact of noise to residents. In this case, there would be no impact.	The EIS uses a standard method for estimating residents impacted at all locations analyzed. As noted in the EIS, the pro-rated area method used to estimate population is subject to error, and particularly in sparsely populated areas. Even if structures that could be assumed to be residences are counted, it is difficult and time-consuming to accurately assess number of residents in those structures, and results would be expected to deviate from results of the pro-rated area method only slightly. Using a standardized population estimation method also has the benefit of being applied consistently across all locations analyzed for comparable results. Text has been added to discussion of noise impacts at Mountain Home AFB explicitly stating that there is increased potential for error in population estimates in sparsely populated areas.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NO-88	2111	When comparing the various noise footprint charts Figure BO 3.2–6 (MHAFB) appears to have a larger footprint than basing options with more F-35s, i.e., Luke Scenario 6 (Figure LU 3.10–7)	Mountain Home AFB is a busy airfield under baseline conditions, and areas near the installation are currently exposed to elevated noise levels
NO-89	3279	Do not understand how it is that the noise level changes with regard to the number of aircraft if every aircraft takes off with the same noise level and goes up to the same corridor.	Time-averaged metrics, such as DNL, take into account both the frequency and intensity of noise events so that the level of noise in an area can be generally described. Metrics such as DNL reflect increases in the frequency of events and also allow all types of events (i.e., different aircraft types or different type of operations by the same aircraft type) to be communicated with a single number.
NO-90	2147	When military jets (F-16s), often in pairs, are on approach near Tucson International Airport, they emit a very loud burst of noise from a thrust maneuver. No one has been able to clarify why this thrust maneuver is necessary or whether or not the F-35 would use similar maneuver. The EIS would be incomplete if noise caused by these descent-related thrusts are not addressed. If these maneuvers will happen, acoustic modeling should be done for this EIS, similar to those done for takeoff/landing sites and noise from these maneuvers should be quantified.	Pilots of all aircraft types (e.g., F-35A, F-16, commercial aircraft) may adjust power to remain within an optimal altitude and airspeed envelope, and these power adjustments may result in temporarily increased or reduced noise levels. Approach profiles are represented using an engine power setting chosen such that actual power setting used sometimes exceeds or is less than the representative power setting. Short-term variations from typical or representative engine power profiles during approach is dependent on pilot flying style, environmental variables, and other factors that cannot be predicted. Representative flight profiles provide a good approximation of typical flying procedures.
NO-91	2174	F-35 training will result in more frequent and more intense/louder sonic booms.	As stated in EIS Table HO3.2–6, F-35A sonic booms are less intense than booms generated by F-22 aircraft under standard supersonic flight configuration, but are slightly more intense than sonic booms generated by F-16 aircraft. The average number of sonic booms experienced per day would increase slightly under certain beddown scenarios relative to baseline conditions due to beddown of additional supersonic-capable aircraft at Holloman AFB, but would decrease under other scenarios in which fewer aircraft are beddown (see EIS Table HO3.2–4). The F-22, which has a unique ability to fly at supersonic airspeeds without using the fuel-intensive afterburner, is scheduled to depart Holloman AFB. As a result of its ability to fly at supersonic speed without afterburner, during air combat the F-22 is able to maneuver at supersonic speeds for extended periods of time without running out of fuel while other aircraft, such as the

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			F-35A and F-16 only have the ability to make short supersonic "dashes". Longer duration supersonic flight segments result in "carpet booms" which affect a swath of land over which the aircraft is flying. More description of supersonic flight and resulting sonic booms can be found in Appendix B, Section B.3. Additional information has been added to the EIS at Section HO3.2 about the differences between supersonic training with the F-22 and with other aircraft.
NO-92	2176	The bases for claiming a particular noise level in relation to the F-16 are not explained. Yet a range of actual tests (e.g., Lockheed) and computer models in prior EIS evaluations (e.g., for Eglin and Nellis AFBs), the average difference in loudness is at least 10 decibels above the louder F-16, at various power levels. Furthermore, currently in Tucson only about 20 percent F-16 sorties are with the louder version, so the average increase in noise will be more than stated.	Individual overflight noise levels comparisons at Tucson are for the F-16 equipped with the PW-220 engine, as appropriate for the aircraft based at Tucson AGS. The PW-220 engine is slightly quieter than the PW-229 engine with which some of the aircraft based at Luke AFB are equipped. Individual overflight noise levels are dependent on a number of variables as described in Section TU3.2. Table TU3.2–2 presents noise levels as they are expected to be experienced in Tucson, at the representative location selected.
NO-93	A1093, 2176	The method to estimate the loudness in the Draft EIS would not be accepted either by either OSHA or NIOSH, which both set standards for accumulated exposure to noise, not a 24-hour average. F-35s will create ear damage through accumulated noise in an 8-hour period, according to either organization, for a substantial number of citizens. IF NIOSH standards used for military operations were applied, only a few sorties per day would be allowed, at most.	OSHA and NIOSH standards are applicable to noise in the workplace, and as such, are not directly applicable to military training noise as it affects persons not working for the DoD. Analysis of potential hearing loss risk in the EIS follows DoD policy for such analyses
NO-94	A1037	What specific F-35A data has been collected, disseminated, and evaluated as evidence in the damages (including health) caused by rapid-onset noise (sonic booms) from over flights?	No specific F-35A data has been collected, disseminated, and evaluated as evidence in the damages. The F-35A aircraft has conducted several flight tests so far, but is not conducting regular training operations. No instances of damage have occurred so far as a result of F-35A noise.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NO-95	A1046, A1081, A1148	Noise analysis (including Appendix B) is insufficient in addressing impacts to children, students, and learning.	The flying schedule of the F-35A is not known at this time. Therefore, the Leq(sd) metric was provided as an indicator of noise levels during the school day. Noise models currently approved for use are not capable of calculating time-above a given noise level threshold, which would be the ideal metric for assessing compliance with ANSI recommended noise levels in schools. Text has been added to the EIS stating that if frequency of operations during a particular hour were to be double the average, then the Leq during that hour would be 3 dB greater than the Leq(sd). The EIS explains that outdoor-to-indoor attenuation of a typical school building reduces noise by about 25 dB, although this value varies from school to school and between locations within a school. Conducting structural attenuation surveys of all schools affected by the proposed F-35A beddown is outside the scope of this EIS, and typical structural attenuation values are a reasonable for use in estimating noise effects. Modifications have been added to Appendix B to reflect that test scores have improved, but are not equal to the control group (Hygge 2002).
NO-96	A1149	Noise analysis is insufficient in analysis of noise impacts on physical and mental health. Appendix B cites outdated studies or are inconsistent with each other.	The findings of the studies referenced in Appendix B have not been discredited and, therefore, the studies are not out-of-date. As described in Appendix B, studies have provided conflicting findings regarding non-auditory health effects such as hypertension and mental health issues.
NO-97	A1154	Draft EIS uses two different models to determine noise impacts: the Federal Aviation Administration's model and NOISEMAP. Therefore, these noise levels cannot be compared to each other and the analysis is flawed.	Integrated Noise Model (INM) and NOISEMAP are similar to one another in that they both use time-integrated noise level calculations to generate DNL maps. A key difference between the two models is that the current INM noise database does not support the most accurate calculation of F-35A currently available while NOISEMAP does. Baseline noise conditions at Tucson IAP reflect data being used in the Part 150 study, which has been thoroughly reviewed for accuracy. At Tucson, it was decided that the most accurate noise picture could be provided by using both models. Combination of results generated by the two models has been used in past studies in cases where each of the models provides better or more accurate results for a particular category of aircraft operations. Such combinations are not flawed and represent the best methodology available for accurately predicting noise levels in certain situations.
NO-98	3032	Recent flight paths over my house registered 82-90 dB, with 2 planes reaching 94 dB…how is this new flight path of only 65 dB going to work?	The EIS includes two types of noise metrics. Time-averaged noise metrics, such as the DNL average sound levels over a period to provide an indication of the general level of noise in an area. Such an indication is useful for assessing environmental impacts and land use planning. The other type of noise metric, single event noise levels describes the noise level of a single event, and several numbers are provided in the EIS

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			regarding single event overflight noise levels. Individual overflights currently exceed 65 dB on a regular basis and would continue to exceed 65 db on a regular basis.
NO-99	2203, 3182	Twenty-four-hour DNL averaging is not appropriate for determining the noise impacts on schools and other facilities that are occupied only for part of each day. The CHPPM Operational Noise Manual (2005) states that "contour maps of DNL, by themselves, cannot be used to determine whether a particular classroom is suitable for learning." The Manual notes, "For school children, the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) has recommended a... limit of 35 dBA."	The equivalent sound level during the school day (Leq(sd)) is published in the EIS and provides an average sound level during the school day. In addition, the number of events exceeding 50 dB L_{max} indoors has been calculated for several noise-sensitive locations, and is published in the EIS.
NO-100	2166, 2167	A robust, peer-reviewed noise analysis was anticipated. However, early in the Draft EIS the Air Force only offers a follow-up to the analysis in the EIS once pilots are actually training at the base. Thus led to understand that the noise analysis in the EIS as it relates to F-35A basing is being postponed until a decision regarding basing has been made and the final development of the design and operations use of the F-35A is complete.	Peer-reviewed noise analysis was used in the EIS. The EIS has used flight simulator data that has been extensively reviewed within the Air Force to predict how the aircraft will fly at particular installations. As noted in Section 2.8, a follow-up study would be conducted to confirm or adjust flight parameter data once the F-35A is beddown.
NO-101	3166	Military.com says the F-35 has a 9-mile sound wave, which is not addressed in the EIS.	Quick search of the military.com website did not yield references to a "nine mile sound wave" in particular. As acknowledged in the EIS, the F-35A is louder than the F-16 and A-10. As such, it could be audible at long distances under the right conditions.
NO-102	3017	Noise analysis and averages do not take into consideration the time between midnight and 3:00 a.m., when there is no noise at all.	The DNL metric, which averages over a 24-hour period, includes in the average time between midnight and 3:00 a.m. when aircraft operations are infrequent. However, when aircraft operations do occur during the period between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., the noise event is weighted by addition of 10 dB to account for additional annoyance generated in the community. The equivalent noise level during the school day, or Leq(sd), is provided for several noise-sensitive locations and describes the average noise level only during the part of the day in which the majority of

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			operations occur. In certain locations under certain scenarios, Leq(sd) is higher than DNL because it averages only within the busier part of the day. In other locations where night flights are more frequent, the Leq(sd) is lower than the DNL as a result of the 10 dB penalty applied to late-night operations.
NO-103	A1062	The possibility of any type of acceptable mitigation for homes and schools near the Tucson AGS is questionable. The Davis-Monthan Air Force Base/Tucson/Pima County Joint Land Use Study of February 2004 states on Page 5-8 "Noise attenuation may mitigate the effects of the average noise exposure (as expressed in Ldn), on these uses; however, it is important to note that single-event noise levels at significantly higher decibels would not be fully mitigated."	A discussion of mitigations considered as part of the EIS can be found at Section 2.8. In general, economically feasible and aesthetically acceptable structural attenuation measures can be expected to yield up to 35 dB outdoor-to-indoor noise levels reduction.
NO-104	2195	On January 30, 2012, the Air Force admitted that the noise estimates in the Draft EIS are not even accurate and changed some of them. Which one of these noise estimates is the most accurate and exactly why, no one really knows. We anticipate the Air force will continue making changes after our right to comment has expired.	Changes made in the errata document were to reflect the most up-to-date information of F-35A flying procedures available.
NO-105	A1093	Do not understand the statement "Supersonic Noise: CDNL would decrease beneath all primary training Special Use Airspaces in which supersonic training is allowed. Average number of sonic booms per day would decrease beneath all primary training SUAs." How many sonic booms occur per day currently?	The average number of sonic booms per day experienced at a location near the center of the airspace unit is listed in base-specific Section 3.2.2.2 in the EIS. As described in several locations in the EIS, supersonic flight would be conducted in training areas currently approved for supersonic flight. Supersonic flight operations would not be conducted in the vicinity of the installation.
NO-106	A1093	Unsure if subsonic means "Very Low Frequency or infrasonic" and supersonic is the same as ultrasonic	The term "subsonic" refers to aircraft moving at less than the speed of sound and the term "supersonic" refers to aircraft moving at greater than the speed of sound. The term "infrasonic" refers to sound that is at

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		or very high frequency, if so, please address whether statements from Karl Kryter's "The Effects of Noise on Man" [see original comment] would be a concern.	frequencies (i.e., Hertz or cycles per second) too low to be heard by the human ear. Kryter was referenced in Appendix B of the EIS.
NO-107	A1093	This statement is vague, please expand: However, impacts that cannot be mitigated could occur. Some of these impacts could be considered adverse or annoying to potentially affected individuals.	This is a true statement. Potential noise impacts are described in the EIS, and this statement clarifies that in some cases the impacts are not avoidable under the beddown scenario being discussed.
NO-108	2200	The United States Air Force and NASA have conducted studies on noise and sonic booms, why is that information not part of this document? Few resources were listed in this EIS for the purpose of compiling information relating to the realities of dangerous noise effects. You can type "sonic boom noise" in any internet search engine and find more current information about sonic booms and the effects in fifteen minutes than what is contained in this EIS.	Appendix B contains extensive information of the potential effects of sonic booms, the physics of sonic booms and the modeling of sonic booms. The information in the Appendix has not been disproven, and is therefore, still relevant to the discussion.
NO-109	2200	To include DNL or CDNL with an explanation is fine, but what is missing is real data. Identify the parameters of the test. What was the altitude of the aircraft MSL or AGL, ambient temperature and humidity, how was the aircraft configured, was the aircraft maneuvering (focused boom), the linear distance from the collection point. Then multiple test flights should be conducted with aircraft being operated at the minimum altitude and at the maximum altitude at various distances from the collection point. Put an end to the garbage of noise levels that don't exceed 62 dB CDNL, "distant thunder."	As stated in base-specific Section 3.2, within MOAs, ATCAAs, and Restricted Areas, training flights are typically widely dispersed and random. Training flights differ from test flights in that they attempt to reproduce a combat environment, in which a predictable pilot is at increased risk of being shot down. Noise modeling in training airspace must account for the unpredictability inherent to air combat training. The approximate percentage of total training time spent in various altitude bands is shown in EIS Table 2–9. Representative aircraft SEL noise levels are given in Table HO 3.2–5 at several altitudes.

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NO-110	2200	The 65 dB DNL is a garbage number and has no meaning. Residents are not being exposed to 65 dB. The maximum decibel exposure of a sonic boom is real number that is controlled by a number of factors. Size of the aircraft, flight profile, temperature, humidity, linear distance from the aircraft and is the person indoors or outdoors. Common sense would tell you that no matter how many hours of silence you try to factor in THE MAXIMUM decibel EXPOSURE IS WHAT IT IS and it is not 65 dB unless the aircraft is at FL60 on the other side of the county.	The 65 dB DNL is a commonly accepted threshold used in planning and impacts assessment in the vicinity of airfields. As recommended by FICON, the CDNL metric was used to evaluate sonic booms. Due to public comments, additional information on the frequency of occurrence of sonic booms of varying intensities has been added to the EIS. However, as air combat training is inherently variable, it is not possible to calculate exact numbers and extents of sonic booms that will impact the ground. Furthermore, variable atmospheric conditions affect the way sonic boom wavefronts move. Data provided in the EIS regarding average sonic boom frequency make use of sonic boom measurements taken during air combat maneuvers.
NO-111	2200	Did the Draft EIS consider the 1971 study by Maj. Richard Roberds, "Sonic Boom and the Supersonic Transport" in its assessment of the effects of sonic boom or the Environmental Impact Statement for the Supersonic Operating Area at Fallon, Nevada, which indicated an extensive list of potential health effects from sonic and focused booms?.	Maj. Roberds' study was reviewed during the development of the EIS; however, more recent information was used in the analysis. The EIS bases findings on a set of scientific papers that provide a comprehensive picture of noise impacts.
NO-112	A1094	What is the maximum decibel level and maximum rate of increase in decibels/sec that won't affect public health and welfare? What is the minimal altitude AGL the F-35A must fly to meet these levels?	The USEPA recommends 55 dB DNL as the noise level, which protects the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety (USEPA 1974). However, most people are regularly exposed to time-averaged noise levels exceeding 55 dB. The noise level 65 dB DNL has been selected as a threshold level above which the risk of substantial noise impacts increases.
NO-113	2200	I question any EIS that would claim habituation to sonic booms over time occurs. The majority of those compiling information for a research project on noise or sonic booms have not been through any sonic booms.	The EIS states that people, domestic animals, and wildlife may habituate to noise. All individuals are different, so some humans and animals may habituate more easily than others may to disturbances. In general, more frequent noise exposure increases habituation, although some species do not habituate as well as others (see Section B.2.4 and Section B.2.6).
NO-114	A1094	What is the maximum level of dB required to make land under the	The DoD does not make land use recommendations for areas beneath MTR and Special Use Airspace (SUA). The percentage of the affected

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		Military Training Routes (MTRs) suitable for residential use? What is the minimal altitude AGL the F-35A must fly to meet this level?	population that is highly annoyed would be expected to increase with increasing noise levels as measured using the metric DNL_{mr}. Noise levels stated in the EIS are for a location beneath the centerline of the MTR and for a segment of the MTR with the narrowest corridor width (i.e., the highest concentration of overflights). Furthermore, MTRs are flown in segments between set specified points. Since pilots flying on MTRs often enter and exit at points other than the beginning and end of the MTR, locations on the ground would be overflown somewhat less frequently than indicated in tables of MTR operations frequencies found in the EIS.
NO-115	A1094	What studies have been done showing the psychological impacts of low-level flights of the F-35A over humans at various low-level altitudes and on rural residents whose noise environment is significantly lower than the noise environments urban or suburban populations? If studies cannot be sited, then are these populations being exposed to harmful, unsafe situations without their informed consent? Is this legal?	Several studies relating to low-altitude overflight effects on people are cited as stated in Appendix B, Section B.1.2.5. As stated in the EIS in base-specific Sections 2.2.1, all proposed F-35A training operations would be conducted in airspace units that are approved for and currently used for the types of operations that would be conducted by the F-35A. For example, supersonic operations would be conducted only in airspace units and at altitudes currently approved for supersonic flight.
NO-116	2200	The Holloman section states that operations must be conducted 24 hours per day, including the "environmental night" (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) that includes the 10 point decibel penalty. This noise at hours when people and animals are usually sleeping or resting will affect tens of thousands of residents and their environments negatively. The section for Tucson doesn't allow for flights during the "environmental night" - Why is it required if it is placed in New Mexico?	The F-35A training syllabus, which would be followed consistently at all bases, requires that certain training flights be conducted after dark. Being able to conduct operations effectively at night, whether using night vision capability or not, is critically important to success and survivability in combat. Night training sorties are completed prior to 10:00 p.m. whenever possible. However, the available amount of night between sunset and 10:00 p.m. varies by installation due to time of year (sun angle), geographic latitude, longitude location within a time zone, and daylight savings time shifts. Typically, during the summer months, when nightfall occurs later, the night mission sorties take off later. These situations result in some sorties that may return to the installation after 10:00 p.m. Some operational squadrons shift their night training to the winter months as much as possible in order to avoid or minimize night operations past 10:00 p.m. Since training squadrons need to schedule multiple classes throughout the year, they do not have the flexibility to likewise shift night flying away from the summer months. Therefore, we find not only varying numbers of night sorties past 10;00 p.m. among the training installations, but also potential for more landings after 10;00 p.m. than would be conducted by an operational unit. In the case of Tucson AGS and Holloman AFB, the biggest factor explaining the difference in

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			number of landings after 10:00 p.m. is the absence of Daylight Savings Time in Arizona. This absence effectively gives Tucson an additional hour of darkness during summer months that is not available at Holloman AFB.
NO-117	A1093	Concern that military aircraft noise is not Federally regulated when noise has been used as a weapon.	The statement that military aircraft noise is not federally regulated is a true statement. However, DoD equipment noise levels are reduced whenever methods used to reduce noise do not impinge on combat capabilities.
NO-118	A1093	In the 1972 Noise Control Act, which did not include military weapons systems as equipment, what entity decided the definition of equipment, and when was this definition created?	The Noise Control Act of 1972 states that the term "'product' means any manufactured article of goods or components thereof; except that such term does not include-- (A) any aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, or appliance as synch terms are defined in Section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; or (B)(i) any military weapons or equipment, which are designed for combat use..." The law was passed by the United States Congress in 1972.
NO-119	A1093	On pg 137, the statement "The Air Force has voluntarily agreed…", the Air Force has agreed with whom?	Text has been clarified in the EIS regarding the decision by the Air Force to use aircraft generating less noise whenever doing so would not interfere with combat capabilities.
NO-120	A1093	Statement that community annoyance in response to aircraft noise is predicted reliably using DNL does not seem to be a true statement according to Kryter, 1985 The Effects of Noise on Man."	Statements quoted from Kryter 1985 about the percent of the population annoyed by noise increasing sharply at above a certain noise level correspond well to the relationship between DNL and percentage of the population expected to be highly annoyed by noise presented in Table 3–1 and described in more detail in Appendix B. Community reaction to noise is predicted with enough reliability using the DNL metric that several federal agencies have, for several decades, used the DNL metric to make recommendations regarding land use. It is possible that people may be more annoyed at certain points in the beddown process and less annoyed at other points. Results presented in the EIS are predicted values once all flying units are at full-strength and operating at full capacity.
NO-121	A1093	Define "typical residential construction" when discussing the noise attenuation with windows and windows closed conditions (pg 141).	Typical residential construction can be interpreted to mean construction methods used in a vast majority of American homes. Certain structures, such as those sheathed in brick or incorporating energy-efficient building components provide greater outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction, while certain other structures, such as mobile home provide less outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction. Text has been added to the EIS.
NO-122	A1093	Department of Defense policy assesses hearing loss using the EPA's methodology, which does not consider impulsive noise (Kryter 1985). Also,	Impulsive noise sources, including gunfire, and explosives detonation, are not a major concern near the installations discussed in the F-35A Training Basing EIS. Impulse noises are most often defined as noises with duration of less than one second, and do not include subsonic aircraft

NO=Noise			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		hearing protections discussed on Page 143 apply to workplace conditions meaning 8 hours a day, which leaves 16 hours at home affected by noise.	overflights. The DoD policy regarding potential hearing loss focuses on non-impulsive noise sources and recommends use of the DNL metric to predict long-term risk of Noise-Induced Permanent Threshold shift (NIPTS). Use of DNL to predict NIPTS was originally proposed by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1982 in a document titled "Guidelines for Noise Impact Analysis"
NO-123	A1093	Identify the research studies stating that non-auditory health effects of aircraft noise are ambiguous.	Results of studies reviewed conflict as to the certain aspects of non-auditory health impacts, and ambiguity remains as to the lower threshold at which noise is a factor in certain non-auditory health conditions.
NO-124	A1093	What does it mean that aviation and typical community noise levels near airports are not comparable to the occupational or recreational noise exposures associated with hearing loss?	The statement about the difference between hearing loss in a workplace environment and in a non-workplace environment points out that there are several key differences between noises experienced in the two environments. One key factor is that, at work, a person is typically required to stand near the noise source and is not able to move further from the noise source while still accomplishing their job. In a non-work environment, people have the option to go indoors. Persons that spend some percentage of their day indoors, whether with windows open or closed, would experience reduced aircraft noise levels. As shown in EIS Table 3–2, persons spending the national average percent of their day indoors (87%) and with an average response to noise, would not be expected to experience a noticeable (3 dB) permanent threshold shift unless they were exposed to noise levels of 87 dB DNL or greater.

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NP-1	1002, 1551, 1552, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1785, A1046, A1093, A1190, A1234, 2070, 2071, 2072, 3218, 3227, 3273	What are the next steps in the EIS and the next steps in the beddown after the Final EIS? Who is going to make the final judgment?	Section 1.6 describes the next steps, which consist of finalizing the EIS, incorporating comments from agencies and the public, publishing the release of the Final EIS, and preparing a Record Of Decision.
NP-2	1009, 1424, 1469, 1755, 1767, 1792, A1100, 2066, 2165, 3006	The Air Force will not consider or ignore my comment. The Air Force will do what it wants to, regardless of public input or opposition.	The EIS public scoping, release of the Draft EIS for review, and public hearings demonstrate that the Air Force is receiving comments and the effort to respond to those comments demonstrates that the Air Force is considering all public and agency inputs. That input all becomes part of the public record for decision makers to consider along with other factors, prior to making any decision regarding basing

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			of F-35A training aircraft.
NP-3	1016, 1793, 1945, A1037, A1094, A1100, A1161, A1162, A1163, A1255, 2097, 2147, 2159, 2191, 2200, 2201, 3001, 3006, 3218, 3249	Comments provided during scoping were not addressed in the Draft EIS. Concerns identified in base Sections 2.2.3 have no replies or answers identified. Where are the answers to the questions and the explanations for the comments from the public and agency scoping meetings? Public involvement and addressing our concerns are requirements of the NEPA process.	Section 2.2.3 for each basing alternative summarized the public and agency concerns expressed during the scoping process. Environmental concerns from scoping are addressed in the Draft EIS for the alternative location where such concerns were raised.
NP-4	1069, 1457, 1576, 1591, A1062, 2200	Issue with public meeting location or question as to why public meeting was not held in additional/alternative/more relevant location.	Public hearings were held in off-base locations as specified in 32 CFR 989.19(c)(2) and in accord with the process outlined in Pt. 989 Appendix C. The locations selected for hearings are at public locations, which can provide space and facilities to support anticipated participants. The location may be selected based upon public participation during scoping meetings. Public hearing locations selected for the F-35A Training Basing Draft EIS were well publicized and well attended, with many participants and comments. Comments on the Draft EIS at the hearings and postmarked by March 14, 2012 were used in preparation of the Final EIS.
NP-5	1184, 1497, 1578, 1767, A1204, 2199, 2200, 3032	Displeased with speaker and/or information provided during public hearing.	The Draft EIS public hearing format is outlined in 32 CFR 989 Appendix C (A3.7). That format includes an explanation of the Proposed Action, alternatives, potential environmental consequences, and the environmental process A3.7.3). Questions can be asked and the Air Force EIS preparation team may elect to reply in writing at a future date. Persons attending are given the chance to present oral and written statements, which are recorded along with the name and address of the person presenting statements. Every detail of 32 CFR 989 was followed in the information provided during the public hearings.
NP-6	1165, 1412, 1800, 1859, A1161, A1163	Did not receive full/part of EIS as requested.	We apologize that you did not receive all portions of the Draft EIS. Hardcopies of the documents have been mailed, as requested.
NP-7	1212, 1233, 1412, 1576, 1778, 1793, 1946, A1037, A1094, A1163, A1196, A1233, A1255, 2168, 2189, 2190	Request to receive copy of Draft EIS or Final EIS.	Hardcopies of the Draft EIS and/or an Executive Summary with a searchable electronic file have been mailed, as requested. You have also been added to the mailing list to receive a copy of the Final EIS.
NP-8	1403, 1412, 1576, 1660, 1778, 1793, 1795, 1910, 1947,	My comments should be included in the Final EIS and should be answered in full. I would like my comments/communications incorporated into the	Public and agency comments on the Draft EIS are considered in the EIS. In some cases, comments have resulted in updating to Final EIS text. In other cases, similar comments have been grouped and a response is provided for the comment. The

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	1966, A1037, A1094, A1135, A1161, A1162, A1163, A1234, A1255, A1272, 2104, 2159, 2165, 2168, 2175, 2191	administrative record.	comment responses are explained in Appendix D of the Final EIS.
NP-9	1388, 1494, 1770	Involving the public in Air Force changes is a fine occurrence. This is one of the venues left for citizens to be informed and express their concerns.	The Air Force strictly adheres to the requirements of NEPA and the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (CFR Part 989). Senior Air Force representatives from each alternative location were present and paid close attention to the public statements during the hearings. The Air Force appreciates the comment, which recognizes the extent to which the Air Force provides information and listens to public concerns through the EIS process.
NP-10	1403	The EIS should fully outline the challenges associated with Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 in one section of the Final EIS so that decision makers have a better grasp of the impacts associated with this airfield. Currently Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 information is incomplete and sprinkled throughout the EIS making it difficult to get a handle on Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 related issues.	Any complex document must establish a structure and adhere to that structure to provide information for reviewers. Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 project definition information is contained in Section LU 2.2.1. Baseline (No Action) information is contained for each environmental resource in Section LU 3.x.2.1 (where x is the number of the environmental resource as 1 for airspace, 2 for noise, etc.) `and environmental consequences are presented immediately following in Section LU 3.x.2.2. This is the procedure used for all alternatives and all auxiliary airfields. The information is complete for potentially affected environmental resources at Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1, for example, acres and population affected by varying noise contours are presented for Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 under Section LU 3.2.2.2, and use consequences are presented in Section LU 3.10.2.2, and so forth. The environmental baseline conditions (No action) and consequences by environmental resource are consistently applied for all basing alternatives.
NP-11	1344, 3204	Procedural issue with a public meeting (e.g., no water available, no pledge of allegiance at start of meeting, facility not adequate for meeting, 3 minute time limit, etc.)	The procedures for holding public hearings on a Draft EIS are detailed in 32 CFR 989 Appendix C. The procedures are designed to promote public participation and do not include beginning a hearing with a flag salute. Public hearings were held in off-base locations as specified in 32 CFR 989.19(c)(2) and in accord with the process outlined in Pt. 989 Appendix C. The schedule and location selected for hearings are at public locations, which can provide space and facilities to support anticipated participants. The location may be selected based upon public participation during scoping meetings. The time limit placed on speakers facilitates full participation of attendees and allows the maximum number of speakers the same opportunity.
NP-12	1445, 1457, 1792, 1859, A1030, A1037, A1062, A1094, A1235,	Comment period is too short. Requests for extension to the comment period.	The Air Force follows the guidelines for timing of agency action and allows no less than 45-days for comments on draft environmental impact statements, as prescribed in 40 CFR §1506.10(c).

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1236, 2063, 2064, 2098, 2101, 2108, 2124, 2159, 2179, 2195, 2199, 2200, 3008, 3111, 3141, 3144		
NP-13	1445, 1448, 1538, 1543, 1551, 1552, 1562, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1621, 1778, 1785, 1792, 1814, 1900, 1912, 1915, 1931, 1942, 1977, 1985, 1994, A1046, A1061, A1062, A1081, A1082, A1093, A1094, A1100, A1128, A1130, A1141, A1163, A1190, A1193, A1197, A1198, A1199, A1201, A1210, A1235, A1236, A1255, A1261, A1262, 2035, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2124, 2128, 2164, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2175, 2184, 2187, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2195, 2200, 2201, 2207, 3001, 3002, 3003, 3016, 3140, 3141, 3143, 3149, 3155, 3159, 3179, 3182, 3184, 3194, 3203, 3218,	The Draft EIS is premature and/or significant information is simply missing, unavailable or estimated. In addition, how does this Draft EIS meet NEPA requirements if the F-35 is still going through design changes and these changes have not been fully tested. The Air Force admits in the Draft EIS that this analysis of aircraft types of number is not currently ripe for decision making. The NEPA process should be stopped/postponed until such deficiencies are addressed.	NEPA requires an EIS be prepared to provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and to provide decision makers and the public with reasonable alternatives (40 CFR 1502.2). The F-35A has been flying as part of a test program since December 2006, and emission, noise, personnel, facility, infrastructure, weapons, and other characteristics of the aircraft and its operations are available and have been included in the EIS. Military (and commercial) aircraft continue to undergo evaluation throughout their service life, and the F-35A will continue to undergo refinements throughout its projected 50-year service life. The EIS makes clear that other on-going actions are occurring on the active military installations under consideration for basing the F-35A training mission. Actions under consideration, such as the eventual location of F-16 training squadrons, the actual number, and the configuration of F-35A training aircraft potentially based at any time in the future, and the eventual numbers of F-35A aircraft in a squadron, have been addressed in the EIS by presenting multiple alternatives and aircraft scenarios. As stated in the EIS, the actual number and configuration of aircraft potentially based at any time in the future will be determined by national security factors existing at the time of delivery and specification of aircraft final numbers. The EIS includes four alternative locations, with a total of 20 aircraft scenarios, and the No Action (baseline) Alternative for decision makers to evaluate the environmental consequences of alternatives prior to making F-35A training basing decisions. The EIS appropriately facilitates decision making with respect to F-35A basing and provides for comprehensive National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) planning. The number of aircraft assigned and bases used in support of the F-35A mission could change in light of national strategic considerations and F-35A production and availability (EIS Sections 2.4 and HO 1.0). However, this document supports a known requirement that is ripe for decision.

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	3248, 3253, 3256, 3258, 3271, 3285		
NP-14	1540, 1663, 1709, 1736, 1743, 1784, 1792, 1854, A1037, A1234, 2087, 2096, 2168, 2199, 3204, 3280	Meeting and availability of information has been poorly presented. People have been minimally informed.	Section 1.6 explains the Draft EIS public hearing notifications and participation. The response to NP-5 explains the strict adherence to the process outlined for public hearings on a Draft EIS in 32 CFR 989 Appendix C.
NP-15	1766, 1778, A1094, A1163, A1255, 2200	Where are the environmental reviews and consultations found regarding the environmental impacts that will be made specifically by the F-35A? What Independent third parties (other than NEPA) will evaluate all data, assessments, assertions, methodologies, literature cited, citations, etc. and the application of data and literature etc. to insure that the Final EIS will be a valid and reliable document. Will this information be found in the Final EIS; if not, why?	The Air Force has also been conducting consultations with State Historic Preservation Offices, Native American tribes, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Details on these consultations are provided in Appendix C of the EIS. Forty-six pages of references identify multiple papers, peer reviewed articles, government publications, and other literature used in the development of this EIS. Some of the references are specific to the alternative and some are applicable to all alternatives. To facilitate review, references used for one base alternative may be repeated for another base alternative. The EIS is a valid and reliable document for use by agencies, the public, and decision makers.
NP-16	1778, A1094, A1163, A1255	In the Final EIS, I expect that a "conflict of Interest" disclosures be made by all parties and persons associated with this EIS. Where are they in the Draft EIS; if not included, why?	The conflict of interest statement has been added to the List of Preparers section of the EIS.
NP-17	2099	Requests that specific details (attendance, organization, CODEL attendance, etc.) of a scoping or other public meeting be included in the Final EIS.	A publicized hearing on the Draft EIS was held in Weed NM on February 7, 2012. Hearings on the Draft EIS are required to be conducted as specified in 40 CFR 989 Appendix C and include a verbatim transcript. As explained in the public hearing, speakers who submit oral or written statements are identified by their name and address. As explained on the first page of the Draft EIS, the provision for private address information to be submitted with a comment is voluntary. Private address information will be used in the creation of a mailing list of interested parties, but private addresses will not be released for any other purpose unless required by law.
NP-18	2102	There is no mention of consultation taking place or opportunities to comment by state or local governments, either in regard to the potential for economic development, or for those government entities to voice their concerns.	The EIS, Appendix A, describes the public involvement and communication with federal, state, and local parties as well as communications with cooperating agencies. Appendix C lists the cultural and natural consultations. Such consultations, including government-to-government consultations are ongoing.
NP-19	1814, A1235, A1236	ANG does not have a track record of abiding by NEPA, as evidenced by Operation Snowbird and thus it should not be regarded as having credibility in claiming its fidelity to operating the F-35 within the dictates of the law, along any flight	The 162 FW has a clear record following FAA, Air Force, EPA, and DoD rules and regulations as evidenced by its history of performance in inspections and exercises and its safety record. The current Operation Snowbird Environment Assessment is currently in progress to assess the implementation of National Guard Training Plan 60-1, which includes allied nations and sister services. The OSB EA does not

NP=NEPA			
Code	***Letter Number***	***Description***	***Response***
		paths and consistent with the Draft EIS.	reflect a track record of non-compliance by the 162nd FW or the Air National Guard at large.
NP-20	1588, 1900, A1185, 3242, 3280	Each home and business that is impacted by this should receive a notice in the mail and be able to respond.	Public notification requirements for the EIS process are outlined in 32 CFR 989.24 and the public involvement program is explained in EIS Section 1.6. Requirements for public notification have been carefully followed throughout the EIS process.
NP-21	2092	The Federal Aviation Administration has requested to be a cooperating agency on this project.	As stated in EIS Section 1.7, the Federal Aviation Administration and the U.S. Marine Corps are cooperating agencies on this EIS.
NP-22	1663, A1071, 3227	Suspect that EIS is lying about the effects we will have after the beddown is completed and that we can't influence what happens to our community.	The EIS presents data and analysis to identify projected environmental impacts. Many of the concerns expressed by participants in the public hearings and submitted as part of the EIS process identify as the source of their concerns the information on potential impacts presented in the EIS. The public distribution of the Draft EIS hearings was avenues for the public to influence the Air Force. The Air Force is receiving, reviewing, and responding to comments so that all oral and written statements will be part of the public and agency inputs. That input all becomes part of the public record for decision makers to consider, along with other factors, prior to making any decision regarding basing of F-35A training aircraft.
NP-23	1806	Request ESRI Shape Files for the Boise Noise Contours	The shape files will be included in an administrative record.
NP-24	1576, A1094, 2175	Requests notification of future hearings and any other correspondence to the public regarding the EIS.	EIS Section 1.6 describes the public involvement in the EIS. No future hearings are scheduled.
NP-25	2128	Several references were made regarding the use of Libby Army Airfield at Fort Huachuca in some of the training flights. Has the Sierra Vista community held Draft EIS hearings on the possible use of their airfield for F-35 training?	A public hearing on the Draft EIS was held in Sierra Vista, Arizona on February 21, 2012.
NP-26	2117	EPA believes that the draft EIS provides an adequate discussion of the potential environmental impacts and we have not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes. EPA has rated the EIS as LO - "Lack of Objections".	The Air Force appreciates EPA's review of the F-35A Training Basing Draft EIS.
NP-27	1807, A1093, A1094	Draft EIS notes where there would be impacts (such as reducing recreation enjoyment, creating dB that exceed acceptable levels for health, safety, and environment; or impacts on low-income communities). This must be contrary to NEPA regulations.	The EIS correctly identifies potential environmental impacts in order to inform the decisionmaker. NEPA is the cornerstone of our Nation's environmental laws and was enacted to ensure that information on the environmental impacts of any federal, or federally funded, action is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken (40 CFR 1501.1).

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NP-28	1900, 1912, A1197, 2166, 2167, 3011 3204	Why were meeting held on evenings that are in conflict with religious festivals and holy ceremonies, i.e., Ash Wednesday and beginning of Rodeo holidays? Many people are Catholic and were observing Ash Wednesday.	Public hearings were held in off-base locations as specified in 32 CFR 989.19(c)(2) and in accord with the process outlined in Pt. 989 Appendix C. The schedule and location selected for hearings are at public locations, which can provide space and facilities to support anticipated participants. The location may be selected based upon public participation during scoping meetings. Public hearing locations selected for the F-35A Training Basing Draft EIS were well publicized and well attended, with many participants and comments. As publicized, statements on the Draft EIS could be submitted in writing or by e-mail through March 14, 2012. Comments on the Draft EIS at the public hearings and postmarked by that date were all used in preparation of the Final EIS.
NP-29	1942, 1977, 1987, A1014, A1037, A1047, A1074, A1094, A1100, A1146, A1150, A1162, 2120, 2168, 3003	Concerned about the inadequacies of the EIS. EIS's poor analysis due to lack of and faulty information doesn't allow for an informed decision or a comparison between alternatives. Numerous sources (literature and research data) regarding the F-35A are available; why have no literature or research findings been cited specifically and why have no F-35A studies and data from other countries been used in the Draft EIS?	NEPA requires the EIS be prepared to provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and to provide decision makers and the public with reasonable alternatives. The EIS process is also to identify actions, which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. Detailed studies are cited on all environmental resources and listed in the Reference sections. Where available, F-35A specific information was used. In particular, analysis of noise impacts and air quality emissions were conducted using F-35A specific data. Cumulative projects are described and the environmental consequences of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions by the government and others are described for each alternative location.
NP-30	A1007	I would like to see the Air Force give serious consideration to the noise pollution that will result from bringing the F-35A Training Program to Gowen Field when they develop the environmental impact statement.	The Air Force recognizes that noise is a serious concern of members of the public. NEPA requires the EIS provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and to provide decision makers and the public with reasonable alternatives. The EIS process is also to identify actions, which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. Detailed studies are cited on all environmental resources. For details on mitigation measures, see Response NP-33.
NP-31	2168, 3005	DoD self-citations cannot be considered independent references; cannot track down some of the references in the document because they are in-house Air Force publications and have run into barriers that the Air Force has erected for these documents.	The EIS contains forty-six pages of references, which identify multiple papers, peer reviewed articles, government publications, and other literature used in the development of this EIS. Every effort is made to list and make references available. Some references have been published by private organizations who charge for them. In many cases, DoD is the sole source of the information needed to analyze this proposed action adequately. The EIS is a valid and reliable document for use by agencies, the public, and decision makers.
NP-32	1985, 2200, 3250, 3257	A new EIS must be done by a new subcontractor with a record of true independence (lack of bias for the Air Force), use of appropriate tools and methods, transparency and clarity of explanations, comprehensive coverage of all issues required by NEPA.	The EIS contains forty-six pages of references, which identify multiple papers, peer reviewed articles, government publications, and other literature used in the development of this EIS. Some of the references are specific to the alternative and some are applicable to all alternatives. To facilitate review, references used for one base alternative may be repeated for another base alternative. The EIS is a valid and reliable document for use by agencies, the public, and decision makers.

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NP-33	1987, A1094, A1130, A1210, A1235, A1236, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2195, 2199, 2200	Draft EIS makes no mention of efforts to mitigate impacts. Believe this is a Federal requirement for a Draft EIS. Discussion should include explicit information on the type of mitigation, how well it will work, and what penalties will be levied against the Air Force if the mitigations are not followed or fail. How will this be enforced? If the impact is an unavoidable adverse impact, the Air Force has the responsibility to identify those impacts that cannot be mitigated to acceptable levels. Waiting until the FEIS and Record of Decision for this identification is unacceptable.	EIS Section 2.8 explains mitigation measures and Section 2.8.1 identifies mitigations and management actions incorporated into the project alternative actions to reduce the potential for environmental impacts (40 CFR 1502.14 (f)). Section 2.8 also explains that certain F-35A beddown activities are projected to result in disturbance and/or noise within areas not previously or recently subject to these effects. To the extent practicable, mitigation measures would be applied to reduce potential effects to acceptable levels. However, impacts that cannot be mitigated could occur. Some of these impacts could be considered adverse or annoying to potentially affected individuals. Unavoidable, adverse impacts are impacts identified during the public and agency review of the Draft EIS that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level. Such unavoidable, adverse impacts are identified for decision makers in Section 2.8 of the EIS and Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD will state whether all practicable mitigation measures have been adopted, and if not, why not (Section 1505.2(c)). The ROD will identify the mitigation measures and monitoring and enforcement programs selected and will indicate mitigations adopted as part of the agency's decision. The ROD will delineate the mitigation and monitoring measures in sufficient detail to constitute an enforceable commitment, or incorporate by reference the portions of the EIS that do so (see CEQ 40 Facts, response 34c.).
NP-34	1953, 1987	After the Draft EIS has been corrected and adequately prepared, request that communities and leaders be given an opportunity to review and comment again for a final Draft EIS is created.	See Response NP-13. The public review of the Draft EIS was begun with the publishing of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on January 20, 2012, and the comment period ended on March 14, 2012, a period of 54 days. This is consistent with the directions that the public review of a Draft EIS be at least 45 days (32 CFR 989.19(c)(1). The public is given an opportunity to review the Final EIS. A Notice of Availability will be published in the Federal Register marking the beginning of a 30-day wait period. During that time, the public may review and submit additional comments for the Air Force's consideration. After the 30-day wait period is over, the Air Force will make a decision either to re-address aspects of the EIS or to sign the Record of Decision.
NP-35	A1235, A1236, 2191, 2195, 2200, 3016, 3201	EIS should be completed using appropriate tools and include transparency and clarity of explanations regarding procedures and tools.	The EIS contains forty-six pages of references, which identify multiple papers, peer reviewed articles, government publications, and other literature used in the development of this EIS. Some of the references are specific to the alternative and some are applicable to all alternatives. T o facilitate review, references used for one base alternative may be repeated for another base alternative. The EIS is a valid and reliable document for use by agencies, the public, and decision makers.
NP-36	3201	New EIS must be completed to include comprehensive coverage of all issues required by NEPA, including cumulative impact.	See Response NP-13.
NP-37	2166, 2167	Premature publication of the Draft EIS appears unnecessary for the attenuated schedule for	NEPA requires the EIS be prepared as soon as possible to provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and to provide decision makers and

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		decision making since several trade publications indicate there is no known date when the F-35A will be cleared for safe flight to train pilots (references provided to two articles).	the public with reasonable alternatives. The EIS process is also used to identify actions, which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. As a result of the rigorous testing outlined above, on February 28 2012 officials at the US Air Force Aeronautical Systems Center issued a Military Flight Release (MFR or Air Force Airworthiness Certification) that allows the F-35A Lightning II fighter to begin initial operations at the joint training center at Eglin AFB, FL. Air Force Airworthiness Certification (AFPD 62-6) establishes the requirements for airworthiness certification of Air Force aircraft and it applies to all U.S. Air Force owned and operated aircraft including those of the Air National Guard and U.S. Air Force Reserve. The Airworthiness certification verifies that the aircraft can be safely maintained and operated within its established operational parameters by pilots and maintainers (Air Force 2012).
NP-38	2159, 2168	Our initial request for an extension in the comment period was denied due to "lack of a compelling reason".	In accordance with NEPA, an EIS must be available for public review for a minimum of 45 days. The Draft EIS was made available for a 54-day period of public review. The document was structured so that an individual near a specific base could easily review the information on that base and airspace. Public review was conducted and the Air Force received multiple inputs from close to 11,000 commenters during the comment period.
NP-39	2159	Based upon our previous experience with Holloman AFB (including the F-22), we believe that our communities will not receive a fair and objective assessment regarding the environmental impacts of the F-35.	Many of the concerns expressed by participants in the public hearings and submitted as part of the EIS process identify as the source of their concerns the information on potential impacts presented in the EIS. The public distribution of the Draft EIS hearings was an avenue for the public to influence the Air Force. The Air Force is receiving , reviewing, and responding to comments so that all oral and written statements will be part of the public and agency inputs. That input all becomes part of the public record for decision makers to consider, along with other factors, prior to making any decision regarding basing of F-35A training aircraft.
NP-40	A1043, A1087	Is there a way to fill out and submit the comment form online? Original comment letter was submitted by e-mail to the address provided, but it was not accepted.	During the review period of the Draft EIS, there was no way to submit the comment form online. Other than email, comments were also accepted by mail, fax, submitted during public hearings, or by oral comment recorded by a court reporter at the public hearings. Addresses and the fax number were provided on the Draft EIS, the Executive Summary, materials provided during the public hearings, or on the F-35A Training Basing EIS website.
NP-41	2168, 2200	Dissemination of the Draft EIS to the public was minimal. Some but not all of the libraries and post offices in the area were provided a single copy. The Draft EIS was not available in a timely manner either online or at a public library.	The Draft EIS was provided to all members of the public who specifically requested a copy during the scoping period. Copies were also provided to public libraries in affected areas and online at the F-35A Training Basing EIS website. Distribution of the EIS to the public and libraries began a week prior to the opening of the public comment period to ensure that the EIS would be received in a timely manner. The Draft EIS and Executive Summary were also posted on the website on January 20, 2012 the first day of the public comment period.
NP-42	2168	The Air Force per 40 CFR Section 1502.24 and	The data collected and addressed in the EIS are current and applicable to the

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		Section 1500.1(b) should insure the professional integrity and scientific integrity of their EISs and information/scientific analysis must be of high quality. The Air Force failed to review and collect sufficient scientific data and much of it is old and unrelated to the specific project.	proposed action and alternatives. The Draft EIS includes the most recent information about training flight profiles as well as the results of the 2010 census (see base Sections 3.2, 3.11. and 3.12). References and noise, air quality, and economic models used to document potential environmental consequences are from established sources, which have been peer-reviewed and applied to analyses throughout the nation. The methodology applied to the analyses is summarized in EIS Section 3.0. The EIS has been prepared with professional and scientific integrity.
NP-43	3016	This project, and other Air Force projects in our area, have lacked transparency and full public disclosure, and violate NEPA as well as the constitutional law.	The EIS presents data and analysis to identify projected environmental impacts. Many of the concerns expressed by participants in the public hearings and submitted as part of the EIS process identify as the source of their concerns the information on potential impacts presented in the EIS. The public distribution of the Draft EIS hearings was an avenue for the public to influence The Air Force. The Air Force is receiving, reviewing, and responding to comments so that all oral and written statements will be part of the public and agency inputs. That input all becomes part of the public record for decision makers to consider, along with other factors, prior to making any decision regarding basing of F-35A training aircraft. The EIS contains forty-six pages of references, which identify multiple papers, peer reviewed articles, government publications, and other literature used in the development of this EIS. Some of the references are specific to the alternative and some are applicable to all alternatives. To facilitate review, references used for one base alternative may be repeated for another base alternative. The EIS is a valid and reliable document for use by agencies, the public, and decision makers.
NP-44	A1074	The assessment paper from Dr. Kevin E. Cahill, PhD, found at http://www.saveourvalleynow.org/, pointed out flaws in the Air Force EIS draft, which merit scrutiny.	Dr. Cahill's report was submitted to the Air Force as part of the public comment period and his comments addressed by the Air Force in these comment responses.
NP-45	A1074	Testimony at the United States Air Force public hearing on Tuesday, February 28, 2011 highlighted that the Air Force presented only beneficial aspects of an F-35A training base at Gowen, which biased decisions in support of the proposal.	The EIS provides a full evaluation of both positive and negative impacts as a result of the proposed F-35A basing to provide decision makers and members of the public information on the environmental consequences of all of the alternatives under consideration.
NP-46	2200	I find no comments from the airfields, communities, airlines, or civic leaders potentially affected. Were any of these groups briefed on this plan and requested to comment?	Section 2.2.3 of the EIS for each basing alternative summarized the public and agency concerns, including concerns of local airfields, locally elected officials, and other agencies, expressed during the scoping process. Environmental concerns from scoping are addressed in the Draft EIS for the alternative location where such concerns were raised. Concerns provided expressed by these same parties during the public review of the Draft EIS are included in the Final EIS and addressed in these comment responses.

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
NP-47	2200	The Air Force is contracting with the same company which has produced similar documents for other Air Force projects in this area of New Mexico and is accepting this type of work that fails to provide the true picture of significant negative and adverse effects in many areas and which provides limited information that should have been included in This EIS.	The EIS contains forty-six pages of references, which identify multiple papers, peer reviewed articles, government publications, and other literature used in the development of this EIS. Some of the references are specific to the alternative and some are applicable to all alternatives. To facilitate review, references used for one base alternative may be repeated for another base alternative. The EIS is a valid and reliable document for use by agencies, the public, and decision makers.
NP-48	2200	The program manager for this F-35 project was also the manager for the F-22 project that came into our area when it shouldn't have. He is well aware of affects such projects are having in our communities. He was present at the F-35 scoping meeting in this area.	The EIS provides a list of preparers of the document which contains their qualifications and years of experience (40 CFR 1502.17)
NP-49	2200	New Mexico residents at the Alamogordo, New Mexico public hearing were not given the opportunity to speak orally and address the group present on February 9, 2012. At no time was the public informed that they had to sign in order to speak publically. Those who chose to comment orally had to do so "on the record" at the table with the Air Force Colonel from Washington and the court reporter. Why was this done in Alamogordo when other cities that had comment meeting were able to speak orally? Many spoke in Arizona, and Idaho, and Weed, New Mexico. Comments of some residents were quoted in the media as to concerns that had been expressed at the comment meeting in their area.	Public Hearing attendees were asked to sign in at every hearing and advised of the opportunity to speak. They were requested to fill out a card identifying themselves for use by the Colonel presiding over the hearing. The Air Force presiding officer noted in his opening comments at every hearing that attendees had the opportunity to address the public and did so at the hearing in Alamogordo on February 9, 2012. After the short presentation by the Air Force the presiding officer noted that no one had signed up to speak and the Air Force presiding officer placed the hearing into recess and the Air Force representatives remained available until 8:00 p.m. to discuss the project with hearing attendees. In order to accommodate this person's comments the Air Force presiding officer reopened the hearing and gave the individual the opportunity to enter their comments into the record with the court reporter transcribing the comments. This commenter accepted this process and provided comment as is represented by the transcript of the public hearing.
NP-50	A1094	Would not it be in the best interest of everyone and more cost effective to avoid the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action (Mitigation Measure #1 on Page 2-63 of Draft EIS)?	Section 2.8 explains mitigation measures and management actions incorporated into the project alternative actions to reduce the potential for environmental impacts (40 CFR 1502.14 (f)). To the extent practicable, mitigation measures would be applied to avoid or reduce potential effects to acceptable levels.
NP-51	A1094	How will the assertions/assumptions/statements found in the Final EIS of "no impact and minimal impact" be tested, evaluated, and re-addressed should these statements prove false? What if the EIS is WRONG? Explain the recourse the citizens have.	The EIS identifies mitigations in Section 2.8, which can be applied to reduce consequences. As explained in Section 1.8, the Final EIS is released for a 30-day waiting period before a Record of Decision (ROD) can be signed. The ROD will include specific mitigations adopted and define those impacts, which are adverse and unavoidable if the action is taken. Within 90 days of the signing of the ROD, a mitigation plan will be prepared which specifies the mitigations, explains how any

NP=NEPA			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			mitigations will be implemented, identifies who is responsible for funding and implementing mitigations, specifying the proponent who will complete the mitigation (32 CFR 989.22 [d]).
NP-52	2200	There are approximately 15 counties that would be impacted by the Holloman basing option. There are also New Mexico counties that will be impacted if the F-35 is located in the Tucson area and those are listed in the Tucson section. All of the counties are in part of the proposed airspace that the F-35 will potentially use. With that in mind, residents in these counties should have had appropriate public notice, and should have had the EIS available for at least 45 days within their community for the opportunity to review and comment on it. The majority of the public that have the potential to be affected were left out of the NEPA process.	The Draft EIS was provided to all members of the public who specifically requested a copy during the scoping period. Copies were also provided to public libraries in affected areas and online at the F-35A Training Basing EIS website. Distribution of the EIS to the public and libraries began a week prior to the opening of the public comment period to ensure that the EIS would be received in a timely manner. The Draft EIS and Executive Summary were also posted on the website on January 20, 2012 the first day of the public comment period. A list of the libraries, which were provided with copies of the Draft EIS are listed in the List of Repositories of the EIS. Public hearings were also held in areas under the airspace and near the auxiliary airfields.
NP-53	2200	Scoping meetings in 2010 also failed to encourage adequate citizen participation due to the lack of appropriate exposure and publicity of the project. As a result, there was low participation in New Mexico scoping meetings.	Section 1.6.1 of the EIS describes the scoping process that was held in 2010. Twenty-three scoping meetings were held and advertised in local daily and weekly newspapers. A total of 1,829 people attended these scoping meetings and 1,958 written comments were received.
NP-54	2200	Explain how F-35As flying at low-levels over ANY populated MTR, creating dB that exceed levels acceptable for human habitation, that are recognized as producing health and safety risks, and degrade to the environment is not ILLEGAL and does not VIOLATE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS?	The definition of a Military Training Route is given in Section 2.4.4. The purpose of an EIS is explained in the Preface of this EIS. The full disclosure of potential environmental consequences for the public, agencies, and the Air Force decision maker has been accomplished in this EIS.
NP-55	2199	At the Luke AFB public meetings, presentations were made, and the first half of the time allotted to "public comment" was granted to Politicians who repeated platitudes, and did not address the EIS. Several people left without voicing their views because they were afraid to speak up. This was not the time for political posturing, it should have been dedicated to the public.	Time was available for all participants to be able to speak. Public meeting were conducted in accordance with the procedures specified in 40 CFR 989 Appendix C. All individuals present were able to ask questions and discuss their concerns with the Air Force team prior to and after the public hearing comments. All individuals were invited to submit written comments, which were given equal weight with oral comments.

PN=Purpose and Need			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
PN-1	1010, 1412, 1793, A1100, A1161, 2066, 2071, 2115, 2139, 2164, 2182, 2207	Believe this proposal is moving forward for political reasons without consideration of how it would affect local communities.	Section 1.4 notes that in October 2001, the DoD announced its decision to move forward with the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program to replace the aging inventory of F-16s, A-10s, and other legacy aircraft. Since then, the Air Force has been determined to base the F-35A through a transparent and repeatable process. The EIS, including the public comment period, is being conducted in accordance with NEPA to inform the Air Force decision-makers of the potential impacts to local communities of the F-35A basing decision.
PN-2	2020	Will funding actually be given for this?	Funding has been requested for the F-35 program in the President's Budget. In 1996, the DoD awarded, and Congress approved, competitive contracts to develop Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) prototypes. In 2001, Lockheed-Martin won the competition and was awarded the contract to develop the JSF. The F-35A is the Air Force version of the JSF. Under Congressional and administrative direction, the DoD
PN-3	1210	Shouldn't the success of previous class action lawsuits against Navy deter Holloman from training F-35 pilots?	What is now Holloman AFB has been a location for training and operating a diverse variety of military aircraft since 1942. If selected as a location for F-35A training, the F-35A training mission and training flights within the regional airspace would represent a continuation of the 70-year history of Holloman AFB. Any decision regarding basing of the F-35A would be made after full evaluation of environmental and other factors. This EIS process is part of the established NEPA procedures, which have been applied to Air Force projects at Holloman AFB and throughout the nation.
PN-4	1163, 1539, 1640, 1646, 2032, 3111, 3265	Disagree with the need to train pilots from other countries.	Section 1.1 notes that the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program is a joint, multinational program with as many as eight international partners participating in F-35 training in the U.S. as part of the program agreements. The fielding of the F-35, JSF, will further our partnerships with more established allies. Developing mutually beneficial partnerships with militaries around the world is vital for the Air Force. Successful partnerships ensure interoperability, integration, and interdependence between Coalition forces while providing our partner nations the capability and capacity to resolve their own national security challenges. The Air Force and Air National Guard have a long history of training pilots from our allied countries. Holloman AFB, Luke AFB, and Tucson AGS have all had a long history of providing training resources to allied pilots.
PN-5	1163, 1286, 1529, 3169	Why does the Air Force need the F-35, aren't existing aircraft (drones, F-16s) enough and more affordable? The F-35A won't be helpful in the wars we're fighting now.	The existing F-16 and A-10 fleets are aging and a replacement aircraft was determined to be more cost effective than continuing to maintain legacy aircraft as noted in Section 1.5 of the EIS. Section 1.1 of the EIS notes that the F-35A is expected to replace the F-16 and A-10 aircraft and complement the F-22 over the projected 50-year service life. While Remotely Piloted Aircraft are capable of fulfilling some of the same missions as the F-35A there are some missions for which the F-35A is more suitable include Close Air Support, Tactical Intercepts, Suppression of Enemy Air Defense/Destruction of Enemy Air Defense as described in Section 2.4.3 of the EIS.
PN-6	1469, 1518, 1529, 2200	There's already existing pollution and health issues at the base. What is the Air Force's justification for damaging the environment and wreaking havoc on the residents? What expense will be involved?	The Air Force works to be a good steward of the environment and a good neighbor to nearby communities and strives to achieve its mission as determined by the President with a minimal amount of disturbance to residents. As part of these efforts, this EIS has been developed to evaluate and provide information on the environmental impacts of the F-35A basing decisions in order to inform the decision makers of the impacts and possible mitigations. Any decision regarding basing of the F-35A would be made after full evaluation of environmental and other factors. This EIS process is part of the established NEPA procedures, which have been applied to Air Force projects at Holloman AFB and throughout the nation.

SA=Safety			
Code	***Letter Number***	***Description***	***Response***
SA-1	1004, 1131, 1149, 1172, 1204, 1300, 1302, 1410, 1422, 1452, 1488, 1495, 1515, 1516, 1577, 1714, 1737, 1746, 1758, 1760, 1781, 1790, 1801, 1810, 1865, 1878, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1900, 1909, 1910, 1931, 1942, 1971, 1979, A1054, A1062, A1084, A1093, A1121, A1128, A1137, A1146, A1163, A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1183, A1212, A1257, 2066, 2182, 2189, 2190, 2199, 2200, 2205, 3010, 3016, 3134, 3169, 3195, 3205, 3221, 3227, 3231, 3243, 3281	F-35A would increase the potential for a crash, how safe are schools, businesses, and homes in the flight path? F-35A needs to be moved where it would not potentially crash into a school, business, or residential areas.	Section 3.4 of the EIS discussed the *probability* of a Class A accident with the F-35 and analysis of the potential for a crash within the airfield environment including the establishment of Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones that are based on historical aircraft accident locations.
SA-2	1004, 1424, 1814, 1942, 1985, 1994, A1045, A1062, A1085, A1093, A1121, A1212, 2101, 2184, 2187, 2200, 2205	Air Force planes have crashed in the past, resulting in the loss of civilian life. Why would the F-35A be any safer? The EIS does not provide data on crashes with new aircraft, only probabilities.	Section 3.4.2 contains historical data on crashes of Air Force fighter aircraft that are currently in service including the F-16 and F-22 (newest fighter aircraft in the inventory). As indicated in this section, the F-22 has not yet flown 100,000 flight hours to establish an official Class A mishap rate; therefore, an estimated rate based on the number of flight hours to date is presented. While we do not have data on the F-35A, review and analysis of historical averages and trends for legacy aircraft can be used to determine the *probability* of a Class A accident involving the F-35A. Probability analysis using the best available data is allowed with Section 1502 of the CEQ regulations governing NEPA analysis.
SA-3	1086, 1407, A1037, 2175	Concerned with Crashes, especially flying in mountains, causing fires.	Section 3.4.1.1 for each base-specific section discusses crash response in the airfield environment and airspace. In addition, this section has been modified to include additional discussion of criteria for flare release as determined by the National Fire Danger Rating System as follows: Section 3.4 also discusses the probability of a Class A accident. Air Force Instructions (AFIs) are issued for each base to establish restrictions on flare deployment. Typically, these AFIs designate airspace managers or range controllers with the responsibility to identify and publicize fire conditions and specify minimum altitudes for flare use. Fire category restrictions are established for the use of flares, and aircrews are responsible to know the fire code and associated restrictions. Aircrews are briefed on fire conditions prior to a mission, and, if in doubt, the AFIs specifically state an “aircrew will not dispense flares anywhere in the impact area or MOA without positive confirmation that flare use is authorized”. Airspace managers or range controllers apply a decision matrix

SA=Safety			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			that takes into consideration the fire danger assigned by the US Forest Service to the forests, such as high, very high or extreme, fuel load on the ranges, recent rainfall, humidity, winds, etc. Based on fire danger conditions, use of flares in specific airspaces can change on a daily basis. Flare use restrictions for specific airspaces in the arid west are typically 60-90 days a year, and sometimes for 5 months or more. These restrictions are for specific airspaces and reflect a fire danger season which typically starts in April and runs through mid-summer, but can start as early as mid-March and last until early fall. Since there are multiple different types of training events (see Section 2.4.3.1), flare restrictions applicable to specific airspaces can adjust the types of training event in those airspaces, but overall training is not detrimentally affected by application of the appropriate AFI and associated flare use restrictions.
SA-4	1016, 1091, 1163, 1303, 1453, 1484, 1485, 1486, 1518, 1534, 1563, 1593, 1915, A1056, A1064, A1067, A1069, A1163, A1177, A1255, 2028, 2051, 2093, 2168, 2174, 2200, 3005	Concerned with crashes , dropping bombs and flares	Section 3.4 of the document for all basing scenarios discuss loading, unloading, emergency response, and flying with ordnance. Flares are also discussed in this section. Also added to Section TU 3.4.1.2 "Aircraft carrying live munitions depart Davis Monthan utilize the southeast corridor, thus avoiding large population areas". Air Force Instructions (AFIs) are issued for each base to establish restrictions on flare deployment. Typically, these AFIs designate airspace managers or range controllers with the responsibility to identify and publicize fire conditions and specify minimum altitudes for flare use. Fire category restrictions are established for the use of flares, and aircrews are responsible to know the fire code and associated restrictions. Aircrews are briefed on fire conditions prior to a mission, and, if in doubt, the AFIs specifically state an “aircrew will not dispense flares anywhere in the impact area or MOA without positive confirmation that flare use is authorized”. Airspace managers or range controllers apply a decision matrix that takes into consideration the fire danger assigned by the USFS to the forests, such as high, very high or extreme, fuel load on the ranges, recent rainfall, humidity, winds, etc. Based on fire danger conditions, use of flares in specific airspaces can change on a daily basis. Flare use restrictions for specific airspaces in the arid west are typically 60-90 days a year, and sometimes for 5 months or more. These restrictions are for specific airspaces and reflect a fire danger season which typically starts in April and runs through mid-summer, but can start as early as mid-March and last until early fall. Since there are multiple different types of training events (see Section 2.4.3.1), flare restrictions applicable to specific airspaces can adjust the types of training event in those airspaces, but overall training is not detrimentally affected by application of the appropriate AFI and associated flare use restrictions.
SA-5	1016, A1093, 3002, 3005	Concern that dud flares could be ignited on the ground by controlled burns, by children	Flare use and residual materials are described in detail in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.5. Discussion has been added to this section concerning acceptance criteria dud rates and information from field observations of dud flares in a training

SA=Safety			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		playing, or by electrostatic sensitivity.	range environment. Flare safety information has been added to this section as follows: Flares are tested to ensure they meet performance requirements in terms of ejection, ignition, and effective radiant intensity. If the number of failures exceeds the upper control quality assurance acceptance level (approximately 99 percent must be judged reliable for ejection, ignition, and intensity), the flares are returned to the manufacturer. Flare failure would occur if the flare failed to eject, did not burn properly, or failed to ignite upon ejection. For training use within the airspace, a dud flare would be one that successfully ejected but failed to ignite. That probability is projected to be 0.01 percent based upon dud flares located during military range cleanup. On extremely rare occasions (estimated at approximately 0.01 percent of flares dispensed), a flare may not ignite and would fall to the earth as a dud flare. Although very few dud flares would be expected on the ground, and fewer would be expected to be found, any located dud flare should be treated as UXO. A dud flare would probably not ignite even in a campfire unless it was on a very hot bed of coals. If a dud flare were shot with a bullet or cut with a power saw, the friction could cause it to ignite. If a dud flare were struck by an ax, it is unlikely, but possible, that an ignition could occur. Should a flare be ignited, it would burn at a temperature of 2,000°F and could result in severe injury or death. The primary environmental message for anyone in the public finding a dud flare (an extremely unlikely event) is to mark its location, but to not touch it. The likelihood of finding a dud flare is extremely remote, and the likelihood of a dud flare igniting is even more remote, but because there would be dud flares on the ground under the airspace, someone has the potential to come upon one. The message is, do not touch it. Tell an authority about its location. Section HO 2.2.2 has been modified to indicate flares will be deployed at WSMR in R-5107 and 5111.
SA-6	2004	In the event of a crash, what kind of effects to cultural resources could occur as a result of recovery and would archaeological monitors be a part of the recovery operations.	Section 3.4.2 of each base scenario discusses crash response. Once that accident investigation board has cleared the site for recovery and clean-up. Should cultural resources be suspected at the crash site, the Air Force will have appropriate personnel with expertise in cultural resource preservation on-site to monitor the recovery/clean-up effort.
SA-7	1115, 1168, 1409, 1442, 1758, 1760, 1790, 1863, 1953, A1146, 2051, 2139, 2189, 2190, 2200, 3188, 3217, 3281	Concern with pilots with little or no experience flying over residential areas.	Section 1.4 has been modified to include a discussion of minimum qualification for pilots selected for F-35A training. Section 2.4.3.1 describes the various levels of training proposed for the F-35A during the training course.

SA=Safety			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
SA-8	1412, 2136, 2200, 3002, 3003	Draft EIS does not have correct or complete information on flares or other hazards. What is the life cycle for flares? Will they remain on the ground for many years, or are they biodegradable?	Flare use and residual materials described in detail in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.5 including an acknowledgment that once in the environment, the residual materials would degrade slowly as any plastic or nylon material would. Discussion has been added to Section 2.4.5 concerning acceptance criteria dud rates and information from field observations of dud flares in a training range environment.
SA-9	1151, 1578, 1664, 1759, 1799, 1885, 1886, 1900, 1915, 1985, A1068, A1076, A1077, A1163, A1197, A1204, A1265, 2028, 2168, 3032, 3145, 3232	Concern regarding fuel dumping and jet fuel pollution. What is the health impact and will residents be informed of the change of the risks to their safety and health?	JP-8 exposure levels have been established for the workplace. OSHA and the Air Force Office of Safety and Health (AFOSH) regulate levels of petroleum products in private sector workplaces and in Air Force workplaces, respectively. The maximum allowable amount of petroleum products in workroom air during an 8- hour workday, 40-hour workweek, is 400 milligrams per cubic meter (mg/m3). Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) has derived an intermediate duration inhalation minimal risk level (MRL) of 3 mg/m^3 for JP-5 and JP-8. An MRL is an estimate of daily human exposure to a substance over a specific period that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of adverse effects (noncarcinogenic). Most of the published hypothetical cancer risks associated with airports have been based on extrapolated probabilities to known carcinogens emitted (measured or estimated) from airplanes. Two studies investigated the cancer incidence of communities near airports. The Illinois Department of Public Health examined actual cancer incidence observed in communities near Chicago's O'Hare and Midway airports and the Washington State Department of Health (1999) similarly investigated Seattle's SeaTac airport. Both studies found no evidence to substantiate a clear and observable elevation of cancer cases among communities residing close to airports. Base Specific Sections 3.4.2.2 discusses the emergency dumping of fuel and the studies discussing the amount of fuel that is likely to reach the ground. Additional information has been included in these sections referencing EPA's determination of "no serious effect" from emergency fuel dumping. Section revised as follows: In 2001 the EPA National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory concluded ". Since fuel dumping is a rare event, and the fuel would likely be dispersed over a very large area, we believe its impact to the environment would not be serious". In 2001 the EPA National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory concluded ". Since fuel dumping is a rare event, and the fuel would likely be dispersed over a very large area, we believe its impact to the environment would not be serious (EPA 2001).
SA-10	1412	Flare failure rate is inconsistent with other studies and is not based on a real study.	See Response DO-7.
SA-11	1412	Draft EIS fails to discuss dangers from dud flares.	Section 2.4.5 has been modified to include a discussion of flare dangers and proper actions should one discover a dud flare as follows: Although very few dud flares would be expected on the ground, and fewer would be expected to be

SA=Safety			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			found, any located dud flare should be treated as UXO. A dud flare would probably not ignite even in a campfire unless it was on a very hot bed of coals. If a dud flare were shot with a bullet or cut with a power saw, the friction could cause it to ignite. If a dud flare were struck by an ax, it is unlikely, but possible, that an ignition could occur. Should a flare be ignited, it would burn at a temperature of 2,000°F and could result in severe injury or death. The primary environmental message for anyone in the public finding a dud flare (an extremely unlikely event) is to mark its location, but not touch it. The likelihood of finding a dud flare is extremely remote, and the likelihood of a dud flare igniting is even more remote, but because there would be dud flares on the ground under the airspace, someone has the potential to come upon one. The message is to not touch it and tell an authority about its location.
SA-12	1412, 1759, 1807, 1814, 1900, 1913, 1915, 1938, 1942, 1953, 1985, A1093, A1146, A1212, A1218, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, A1259, A1261, 2079, 2121, 2128, 2182, 2187, 2189, 2190, 2200, 3137, 3140, 3141, 3155, 3159, 3184, 3201, 3204	Aircraft safety information is not based on facts and should note that the F-35A is going through readiness testing and has had multiple problems during development. EIS should only be done after there is sufficient amount of time for the F-35 to actually have a track record to determine the safety risk.	As stated in Chapter 3.4.2 Safety information is based upon the most recent data from the Air Force Safety Center for Class A Accidents (the most severe) using statistical analysis that is accepted by both DOD and is similar to that used by the FAA. Air Force type fighter/attack aircraft are used in the analysis. The F-22 (the most recent Aircraft in the Air Force inventory is included in the analysis. Additionally Section 1.1 now includes a discussion of the airworthiness certification process, which included testing of the electrical and mechanical components as part of this certification.
SA-13	1424, 1536, 1912, 1913, 1938, A1121, A1235, A1236, 2105, 2124, 2128, 2174, 2187	Concern about the safety of loading/flying F-35s with live ordnance at an installation near populated areas.	Section TU2.2 discusses the use of ordnance and the locations used. Section 3.4 discussed the storage and handling of ordnance. Departure routes are chosen to avoid populated areas while transiting to training ranges where the ordnance will be deployed. AFI 11-214, Section 5.1.1.2 states aircraft must avoid populated areas to the maximum extent possible when carrying externally loaded. Text has been added Section TU 3.2.1.2 and Section TU 3.4.1.2 to the EIS to address loading and flying with live ordnance.
SA-14	1403	Concern with the F-35A and inexperienced pilots using an auxiliary airfield without a functional runway such as Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1.	See response to SA-7 Also, specifically regarding Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1, Section LU3.4.2.1 indicates Luke AFB Auxiliary Airfield 1 does not have an active runway (aircraft do not actually land at or take off from the airfield).
SA-15	1557	Concern with BASH issues (Canadian geese populations w/in flight patterns)	Section 3.4 discusses the methods the Air Force and Department of Defense use to avoid bird strikes. In fiscal year 2011, there were no Air Force Class A mishaps as a result of bird strikes.
SA-16	1424, 1913, 1938, 1977, 1989,	Concern over the status of the F-	There have been other aircraft that have not had an on-board instructor to train

SA=Safety			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1164, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, 2051, 2124, 2128, 2200, 3016, 3188, 3265	35A is a single seat aircraft and/or that the lack of a training instructor on board the aircraft (as with F-16s) reduces overall safety of training.	their pilots, most recently the F-117 fighter. Training for this aircraft utilized a chase plane with a qualified instructor in the cockpit. Currently the Air Force plans use this process in the early syllabus training events.
SA-17	1977, A1211, A1237, A1238, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, 2051, 2128, 2189, 2190, 2200	Concern that some training pilots will speak English as their second language and difficulties in communication will reduce safety.	Text has been added to Section TU 3.1.2.1 of the Final EIS to include a discussion regarding adoption of English as the required language for air traffic control communications (http://www.icao.int/Meetings/anconf12/Documents/AN10_V2_cons%5B1%5Dpdf).
SA-18	2128, 2189, 2190, 3155	We have heard that the F-35A has mechanical components that would be endangered if the aircraft were to fly in or near lightning storms.	Shielding and surge suppressors built into the F-35A insure that electrical transients do not threaten the on board avionics. Additionally Section 1.1 now includes a discussion of the airworthiness certification process, which included testing of the electrical and mechanical components as part of this certification.
SA-19	1888	The F-35s could relay observations of forest fires to the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.	F-35A pilot training is an intense course, as described in Section 2.4.3, with specific requirements to be conducted on each flight. The trainee pilot is focused on flight training for combat. If an F-35A pilot observes a forest fire, the pilot will relay the location to air traffic control.
SA-20	1912, 1989, 3167	Air Force conceded in a 1980 letter that Tucson was too big of a risk for a single engine jet. Mission was changed to A-10s and C-130s while 162nd FW was moved to Tucson International Airport. What is Air Force's obligation to the 1980 letter and how can it be reconciled with basing the F-35A in Tucson?	The aircraft changes at Davis-Monthan AFB were the result of the phase-out of the A-7, which was being replaced by the A-10 and mission changes related to use of the C-130, which are outside the scope of this EIS. The 162 FW has been flying the F-16 since 1985 and has never had a Class A mishap. It should also be noted the 162 FW has historically flown single engine aircraft. The A-7 had a lifetime Class A Accident Rate of 5.71 during its 25-year Air Force service life. By contrast, the F-16, (which is currently based at Tucson International Airport) has a lifetime rate of 3.58 over a 36-year Air Force service history.
SA-21	1761, 2124	There is no mention of the current construction of the Pima Emergency Communications Center, which is partially in the Accident Potential Zone. Also, a racetrack is located in close proximity to Luke AFB and seems	The Pima Emergency Communications is eight miles away from Tucson International Airport, the location of the 162 FW, which is subject of the analysis in this EIS; and therefore, not within the runway protection zone established for Tucson International Airport. Arizona Motor Sports Park is located in an accident potential zone for Luke AFB. The park occupancy is limited to a maximum of 200 persons and most activities occur on the weekend, outside normal hours of operation at Luke AFB. It is a pre-existing facility and its use

SA=Safety			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		to be in a high risk crash area.	involves intermittent congregating of people, is not compatible with the land use guidelines established for accident potential zones. The Air Force is not proposing to acquire land or development rights to surrounding lands in this EIS; nor is the Air Force proposing rezoning of surrounding lands. The Air Force will continue to engage in cooperative planning with surrounding communities through the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) program. In addition, for communities with a close relationship with and proximity to military installations, a Joint Land Use Study can identify mechanisms for managing and controlling incompatible future development. The JLUS process involves local input and participation to find solutions to issues of mutual concern. Local jurisdictions may select strategies and implement to correct existing incompatible encroachment to meet short-term objectives and long-term goals.
SA-22	2136	Will flares be used over National Park Service units? If so, flares have the potential to fall on National Park Service lands, potentially impacting visitor safety and could be a detriment to resources.	As stated in Section 2.4.5, flares are used only in approved airspace at altitudes already designated for the airspace. Flares burn out in approximately 500 feet, so altitude restrictions in special use airspace are established to insure flare burnout before a flare reaches the ground or water surface under the training airspace. Section 2.4.5 has been modified to include a discussion of flare dangers and proper actions should one discover a dud flare as follows: Although very few dud flares would be expected on the ground, and fewer would be expected to be found, any located dud flare should be treated as unexploded ordnance (UXO). A dud flare would probably not ignite even in a campfire unless it was on a very hot bed of coals. If a dud flare were shot with a bullet or cut with a power saw, the friction could cause it to ignite. If a dud flare were struck by an ax, it is unlikely, but possible, that an ignition could occur. Should a flare be ignited, it would burn at a temperature of 2,000°F and could result in severe injury or death. The primary environmental message for anyone in the public finding a dud flare (an extremely unlikely event) is to mark its location and not touch it. The likelihood of finding a dud flare is extremely remote, and the likelihood of a dud flare igniting is even more remote, but because there would be dud flares on the ground under the airspace, someone has the potential to come upon one. The message is to not touch it and to tell an authority about its location.
SA-23	1977, A1122, A1163, 3137	There is no mention of the dangers to drivers, pedestrians, or outdoor workers who cannot hear audible warning signals such as sirens, crossing signals, heavy equipment, or approaching traffic.	As stated in Section 3.2 Overflights with sound levels exceeding 50 dB L_{max} have an increased likelihood of interrupting speech. However, this interruption would be of short duration. Warning horns, sirens and other safety warning devices emit higher/different frequency sounds that are distinguishable from background jet noise.
SA-24	A1037, A1162, A1163, A1177, A1207	What additional Air Force resources will be made available	As stated in Section HO 3.4.1.2, capability for fire response is located on base and in the impacted communities. The base Fire Department is party to mutual

SA=Safety			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		to mitigate the FIRE and EMERGENCY situations that will inevitably result? How quickly will the Air Force resources be made available in the Sacramento Mountains? What availability (time and resources) should there be? If the over flight could cause potential fire hazards then living on a ridge top with one way in and out is of serious concern to me.	aid support agreements with the nearby communities. These functions, including response times, would continue to occur as they have under current conditions.
SA-25	A1037, 2200	I understand that chaff, flares, lasers, and electronic countermeasures will be used over the Weed area. Where will the debris land? Will some areas be saturated with debris due to local wind/topography? An analysis of the likely impact from chaff and flares (based on altitude and winds) must be made and maps constructed for citizens impacted. The military has stated that the accuracy of data from flares and chaff is inaccurate in mountain local wind situation and that the stated minimum altitude for flare and chaff operations are not acceptable as the wind shears can down the ordinance rapidly.	As stated in Section 2.4.5, F 35A pilots are not planning to train with chaff. Flare use and residual materials described in detail in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.5. Discussion has been added to this section concerning acceptance criteria for dud rates and information from field observations of dud flares in a training range environment. As stated in Section HO 3.4.1, lasers are used on White Sands missile Range (WSMR) on targets and areas specifically approved for their use.
SA-26	A1037	Laser hazards must be addressed and made available to stakeholders.	As stated in Section HO 3.4.1.2 ordnance and laser training would use approved targets, including targets on White Sands Missile Range and associated ranges, and such training would be comparable to existing ordnance and laser training. Therefore, munitions handling, ordnance use, or laser training would not result in any greater safety risk, and no significant impact related to explosives or laser training safety would occur.
SA-27	2174	What specific precautions are being made to prevent damage to the homes, property, and people of the Community of Weed, New Mexico?	Flight Safety and Ground Safety are discussed in Section 3.4 and Individual Base Sections. The safety information for specific to Holloman and environs is contained in Section HO 3.4

SA=Safety			
Code	***Letter Number***	***Description***	***Response***
SA-28	A1062, A1139, A1146	The Errata sheet for the Draft EIS changed the engine power from 55% to 40% for the F-35A. Is the Air Force sure this power setting is safe and appropriate for inexperienced pilots flying over residential areas? Will this change affect pilots' training?	As stated in Section 3.2.2 power settings employed in calculating noise impacts, presented in this EIS are estimates. As the F 35A program continues to develop, information on how the aircraft operates will continue to improve. The estimates provided were derived from actual test flights and high fidelity simulation. Confirmation from test pilots and training pilots currently flying the F-35 at Eglin AFB has attested to the fidelity of the simulators currently available; therefore, our confidence in the parameters being used is very high. The power settings referenced are those currently necessary to maintain the flight profiles around the airfield. The power settings identified reflect the performance characteristics of the aircraft itself for a particular phase of operation and is independent of the experience level of the pilot..
SA-29	A1037, A1162	What impact will the addition of aircraft, personnel and armaments have on public safety? What Air Force safeguards will be in place?	Flight Safety and Ground Safety are discussed in Section 3.4 and Individual Base Sections. The safety information for Holloman and vicinity is contained in Section HO 3.4
SA-30	2200	Based on the current data for fifth generation aircraft (F-22), the concern should be that the F-35A would have a similar rate (6.35 per 100,000 hours). What makes this a major concern for this EIS is that the proposal is for the F-35A to accomplish the majority of its training directly over civilian populated areas. Fifth generation aircraft have a much greater potential for accidents than legacy aircraft, coupled with increased size and payload of this aircraft push the risk factor up. To ignore the risk with a statement that the F-35 does not have enough flight hours for an estimate, is pure negligence.	Section 3.4.2 contains historical data on crashes of Air Force fighter aircraft that are currently in service including the F-16 and F-22 (newest fighter aircraft in the inventory). As indicated in this section, the F-22 has not yet flown 100,000 flight hours to establish an official Class A mishap rate; therefore, an estimated rate based on the number of flight hours to date is presented. As stated in Section 3.4.2.1, the rate is expected to decrease as more flight hours are recorded. While we do not have data on the F-35A, review and analysis of historical averages and trends for legacy aircraft can be used to determine the *probability* of a Class A accident involving the F-35A. As stated in Section HO 2.1.1 the F-35A would employ similar departure, closed pattern, and landing procedures as currently used by Holloman AFB aircraft. F-35A operations would adhere to existing restrictions and avoidance procedures including avoidance of populated areas to the greatest extent practicable. Finally, since the Air Force variant of F-35 is designed to replace the F-16 and A-10 in the attack mission role, training for that mission will take place within special use airspace as well as restricted airspace and ranges controlled by DoD away from populated areas. As stated in Section HO 3.4.1.2 military aircraft have become safer over the years and the accident rates have become significantly lower. Although the F-35A is a relatively new type of aircraft, historical trends show that mishaps of all types decrease the longer an aircraft is operational as flight crews and maintenance personnel learn more about the aircraft's capabilities and limitations. As the F-35A becomes more operationally mature, the aircraft mishap rate is expected to become comparable with a similarly sized aircraft with a similar mission.
SA-31	A1092	Concerned that F-35's flying near or over I-84 (Boise) have the	As stated in Section BO 3.1.1.2 the F-35A operations could be accommodated within the Boise Air Terminal Airport (BAT) airspace, airfield environment, and

SA=Safety			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		potential to dramatically increase the heavy number of fatalities already had on I-84.	ATC system capabilities without adversely affecting the overall use and management of this airspace. No modifications would be required for this airspace structure or airport flight patterns and procedures to accommodate the F-35A aircraft operations. The addition of the F-35A is consistent with the Airport Master Plan and Noise Compatibility Study. It should also be noted that commercial air traffic into BAT is expected to increase in a much larger proportion than the F-35A projections. Introduction of the F-35A into BIA should not result in any more danger on I-84 than would be experienced as a result of commercial overflights.
SA-32	A1223	EIS does not address the footprint of the current safety and crash zones Airport Incompatible Use Zone (AICUZ). Many private homes and places of public assembly are within the area. It is a significant safety issue and the EIS should evaluate the cost and include construction of an adequate standard AICUZ (see attachment to letter)	Since Boise Air Terminal is a commercial airport, implementation of the Air Force Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) program is not required. If an Air Force unit is located on a non-Air Force-owned or -operated airfield, the air Force Major Command informs the airfield operators of the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone program and suggest the airfield operator prepare an AICUZ study or equivalent. As described in Section BO 3.4.1.1, Runway Protection Zones (RPA),Runway Safety Areas (RSA), Runway Object-Free Areas (OFA), and Runway Obstacle-Free Zones (OFZ) are established in accordance with relevant FAA regulations and design standards. These are discussed in detail in this section.

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
SO-1	1001, 1002, 1007, 1010, 1016, 1089, 1091, 1112, 1126, 1134, 1152, 1153, 1163, 1182, 1195, 1198, 1214, 1233, 1251, 1284, 1302, 1303, 1305, 1381, 1410, 1449, 1450, 1469, 1474, 1485, 1486, 1488, 1495, 1516, 1536, 1538, 1540, 1543, 1544, 1548, 1551, 1552, 1556, 1557, 1559, 1560, 1562, 1564, 1566, 1567, 1568, 1570, 1572, 1573, 1574, 1575, 1576, 1578, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1639, 1641, 1643, 1647, 1656, 1660, 1667, 1681, 1693, 1698, 1699, 1700, 1707, 1719, 1730, 1736, 1747, 1753, 1755, 1756, 1758, 1760, 1767, 1770, 1773, 1781, 1785, 1787, 1790, 1793, 1794, 1799, 1801, 1810, 1815, 1816, 1819, 1821, 1822, 1824, 1830, 1853, 1855, 1856, 1863, 1865, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1891, 1893, 1896, 1897, 1900, 1902, 1904, 1906, 1908, 1914, 1915, 1918, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1929, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1945,	F-35A noise would hurt the economy as a whole, make neighborhoods undesirable places to live, decrease resale values/property values, and/or decrease the assessed valuation of entire districts.	The EIS quantifies the residential population and acres subject to noise levels of 65 dB DNL or greater. For example, Section BO 3.11.1.2 states, “residents within the 65 dB DNL could be significantly affected by the increased noise.” And EIS Section TU 3.11.1.2 further states, “the noise generated by the F-35A could have an adverse impact on property values that would be newly exposed to noise levels above 65 dB DNL and especially for properties newly exposed to noise levels above 75 dB DNL, which the EPA considers incompatible with residential use.” The EIS Section LU 3.11.1.2 states, “the potential adverse impact on property values may be considered a significant impact on those residents newly affected by noise levels above 75 dB DNL” (see also EIS Section 3.9.2 and response to SO-13). In addition, as noted in Section 3.9.2 of the EIS, the DoD and FAA have identified residential use as incompatible with annual noise levels above 65 dB DNL unless special measures are taken to reduce residential interior noise levels. Appendix B clarifies that this concept of land-

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	1946, 1949, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1957, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1971, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1993, A1000, A1004, A1007, A1012, A1014, A1022, A1023, A1025, A1027, A1037, A1040, A1042, A1043, A1048, A1050, A1051, A1052, A1055, A1056, A1060, A1067, A1069, A1070, A1071, A1073, A1076, A1076, A1077, A1083, A1085, A1087, A1090, A1092, A1093, A1095, A1098, A1104, A1108, A1109, A1121, A1122, A1132, A1137, A1140, A1145, A1162, A1163, A1165, A1166, A1167, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1175, A1179, A1180, A1185, A1187, A1190, A1195, A1210, A1211, A1214, A1217, A1223, A1227, A1229, A1231, A1232, A1234, A1235, A1236, A1237, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, A1255, 2066, 2067, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2107, 2115, 2120, 2123, 2125, 2128, 2129, 2144, 2151, 2163, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2176, 2177, 2179, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2195, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2202, 2204, 3001, 3005, 3008, 3055, 3115, 3137, 3145, 3148, 3179, 3184, 3209, 3218, 3227, 3228, 3229, 3232, 3235, 3238, 3241, 3242, 3244, 3248, 3253, 3255, 3256, 3257, 3263, 3265, 3266, 3267, 3270, 3271		use compatibility was developed by the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise published guidelines and subsequently adopted by the DoD and FAA. These guidelines are only used to assess noise impacts on community land uses (see Response SO-24) The DoD and FAA do not have the authority to change community land uses or declare houses as unsuitable.
SO-2	1002, 1551, 1552, 1562, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1578, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1785, A1046, A1190, A1223, A1234, 2070, 2071, 2072, 3218 3232, 3248	A house by house list including an appraisal, evaluation, and any avigation easements needs to be done in the EIS to determine lost property values.	Response SO-1 explains the EIS recognition of significant impacts to property values. Response SO-13 explains that EIS Section 3.9.2 provides a referenced discounted value to property values per decibel (dB) above 65 dB DNL. The information provided to decision makers presents the significance of environmental impacts as required by NEPA.
SO-3	1002, 1440, 1510, 1551, 1552, 1567, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1580, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1664, 1769, 1783, 1785, 1833, 1852, 1898, 1899, A1046, A1190, A1202, A1234, 2070, 2071, 2072, 3218, 3273, 3278	Will a program be initiated to move residences and businesses out of the 65 dB DNL and above areas or will these areas be condemned and residents/businesses forced to abandon homes/buildings?	The EIS identifies environmental consequences for review and evaluation by the public and decision makers. The EIS process is informational and does not include any program to move persons and/or condemn any structures. When and if a basing decision is made, a Record of Decision would be prepared identifying significant impacts, mitigations designed to address significant impacts, and unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the decision. A subsequent mitigation plan would commit to mitigations, which would be applied to reduce or avoid significant

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			impacts where practicable.
SO-4	1025, 1576, A1077	Jets fly late and impact children and commuters	EIS Section 2.4.3.1 describes the pilot training courses, which include an estimated 1.5 hours of night operation training for each pilot. Flight operations after 10:00 p.m. and before 7:00 a.m. are given a noise penalty, which is included in the noise analysis for each base and airspace. EIS Section 3.12 for each base (for example, Section TU 3.12) identifies populations of concern, which include youth population. The EIS explains that noise levels above 75 dB DNL are not compatible with children outside and could contribute to hearing loss in children regularly exposed to aircraft noise (see Section TU 3.12, for example). The noise levels generated under the F-35A scenarios in regard to schools and child care centers affected by 65 dB DNL or greater has potential adverse impacts on children which may be considered significant (Section BO 3.12.1, for example). As explained in Section 3.2 and Appendix B, Section B.1.2.5, noise measures such as the onset rate – adjusted sound exposure level (SELr) accounts for the onset-rate of a sound, which could especially impact individuals not anticipating the overflight, such as under MOAs or MTRs.
SO-5	1070, 1592	Final EIS should include cost saving figures realized by using local contractors already working in the area on other bases	Federal procurement procedures do not permit the limitation of contracts to contractors within a geographic region although contractors already locally established often have cost savings, which result in lower bids. An exception is made for minority or disadvantaged businesses, which may have preference in certain procurements.
SO-6	1087	A change in mission would have a short-term negative impact on local economy.	The transition of aircraft from and into a base typically has early construction activity, described in each base Section 2.1.2, which would serve to reduce short-term economic effects. Each base Section 3.11.1.2 presents the construction employment which represents short-term stimulated economic activity as well as the mission employment (jobs) which represents the long-term employment associated with the decrease or increase in base employment for the different aircraft scenarios; (see, for example, LU 3.11.1.2). Communities proximate to Air Force bases have experience with mission changes and economic variability associated with such mission changes.
SO-7	1091, 1100, 1182, 1485, 1486, 1758, 1790, 1793, 1807, 1885, 1886, 1900, 1915, 1925, 1931, 1977, 1980, 1985, 1987, A1037, A1047, A1067, A1069, A1087, A1140, A1162, A1163, A1165, A1166,	Aircraft overflights would affect campers and diminish business incomes from that effect. The EIS does not place a value on loss of	The EIS considers recreation both locally and under training airspace in base Section 3.10. Noise levels associated with specific recreational resources are presented for each airspace. As noted in these sections, noise levels (DNL) could change by from a

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
	A1167, A1168, A1169, A1170, A1171, A1172, A1173, A1196, A1206, A1210, A1227, A1235, A1236, A1237, A1239, A1240, A1241, A1242, A1243, A1244, A1245, A1246, A1247, A1248, A1249, A1250, A1251, A1252, A1253, A1254, 2120, 2151, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2184, 2195, 2199, 2200, 3006, 3008, 3169, 3176	enjoyment of areas negatively impacted by the F-35 program. Noise would adversely impact the tourism industry.	reduction to an increase of one to five or more dB DNL to the recreational areas under the respective airspaces. Noise levels at recreational locations under MTRs can have a 7 dB DNL noise increase. Average noise levels and overflights would change and be noticeable for recreation areas and, as noted for night operations in HO 3.10.2.2, "could be incompatible with summertime outdoor camping and vacationing in the area (and) could interfere with the quality of recreational experience for some persons." Table B–3 presents the analytical surveyed results of persons annoyed by an increase of 5 dB DNL. Each 5 dB DNL increase results in an approximate doubling of the percentage of people annoyed. Overflights typically would not be scheduled on weekends or holidays (base Section 3.10.2.2) and noise would generally be lower on weekends. Individuals may or may not experience increased noise or overflight depending on the timing of their recreation. If exposed to overflight noise, persons could select alternative locations for activities more suited to quiet environments. Weekend military training could be disruptive to specific recreational activities (Section BO 3.10.2.2).
SO-8	1016, 1407, A1162, A1177, A1207	Need to include costs associated with fighting fires caused by flares including possible loss of homes and life.	As explained in Section 2.4.5 and in response SA-4, flares are used only in approved airspace and flares are restricted in airspace under selected fire danger conditions. The reliability of flares is described in edited Section 2.4.5 of the EIS. Altitude restrictions partially derived from the 1998 Air Combat Command technical report and manufacturing standards have resulted in very few flare-caused fires under airspace outside active military ranges or airspace treated as a range complex (for example, Nellis Test and Training Range). In an 18-month study performed at a variety of military airspaces where Air Force aircraft deployed an estimated 350,000 flares training during the period, there were 7 fires attributed to flares. This calculates to an average likelihood that a flare could cause a fire under airspace treated as a military training range of 0.00002. During that 18-month period, there were no reported cases of fires in MOAs outside of airspace treated as a military range (U.S. Air Force: Air Combat Comment: Technical Reports on Chaff and Flares, Technical Report No. 6, Flare Fire Risk Assessment, Updated 1998).
SO-9	1110	Will the vibrations or effects from aircraft overflights require additional insurance on my home or would the government provide	As explained in the EIS, F-35A supersonic events under the airspace would be expected to decrease by up to 1.8 per flight day (LU 3.2.2.1, TU 3.2.2.1) or to increase, depending on the base and aircraft scenario, by up to 0.4 per flight day (BO 3.2.2.1, HO

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		assurance in writing?	3.2.2.1). The change in supersonic events may not be detected and would not be expected to have any significant effect upon any structure or property. Noise from aircraft operations at an airfield or from low-level overflight would cause annoyance and could affect property values near an airfield depending upon the basing location and aircraft scenario. The response to SO-13 explains the impacts to property values. As noted in Section BO 3.2.1.2, for example, any damage claims would begin by contacting the base PA office with details of the claim.
SO-10	1216, 1560, 1578, 1945, 1953, A1088, A1093, 2166, 2167, 3232, 3214	F-35A proposal represents a confiscation of private property without just compensation. Believes there is no legal recourse to noise.	The EIS presents the noise consequences to bases and under the airspace for all environmental resources. Impacts to the human environment are described as ranging from personal annoyance to significant impacts upon property values (see Response to SO-13). As explained in Section LU 3.2.1.2, for example, claims of damage caused by the Air Force can be submitted, and the damage claim process begins by contacting the base PA with details of the claim.
SO-11	1010, 1153, 1587, 1793, 1863, 1875, 1906, 1952, 1954, 1966, 1985, A1014, A1051, A1093, A1175, A1195, A1202, A1235, A1236, A1255, 2174, 2175, 2199, 3073, 3261, 3263, 3271, 3273, 3274, 3145, 3197	Will the Air Force compensate people for property (homes, schools, child care centers, etc) effected by noise >65 dB or lost standard of living? What have homeowners been compensated when they can't live in that residential area anymore?	Section HO 3.2.1.2, for example, explains that claims for damages can be filed with the Air Force. The process for filing a claim begins by providing details of the damage to the base PA office. As noted in response SO-3, the EIS provides information to the decision makers and does not include any program to move persons and/or condemn any structures.
SO-12	1089, 3110	Buyers in vicinity of Luke AFB have to sign a disclosure about knowing Luke AFB is nearby when purchasing property and many homeowners in the takeoff and landing paths were not made aware of that, or flight pattern changes.	EIS Section LU 3.10.1.1 and LU 3.2.1.2 explain the Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) line and the “box” where real estate buyers sign a disclosure form. Airfield operations to enhance safety have changed flight patterns and overflight patterns within portions of the JLUS. The operation change was a safety-driven adjustment to have pilots take off and land into the projected prevailing wind as opposed to accepting up to a 10-knot tailwind for launch and recovery. The baseline conditions, even with the operations adjustment, did not result in the 65 deci bels Day-Night Average Level (DNL) contours extending outside the JLUS line to the northeast (see Section LU 3.10.1.2).
SO-13	1182, 1569, 1766, 1795, 1900, 1909, 1953, 1984, 1987, A1047, A1077, A1140, A1210, A1235, A1236, 2107, 2115, 2120, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2184, 2188, 2195, 2200, 2202, 3144, 3149, 3201, 3221, 3224, 3240, 3247, 3249, 3252, 3255, 3267	EIS analysis does not take into consideration the net impacts on local economy (positives job creation and tax revenues vs. negative impacts from F-35A such	Analysis contained in the EIS is focused on environmental consequences. For example, the Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) economic model is a nationally applied regionalized input-output model, which uses direct employment and expenditure to calculate indirect and induced changes in regional employment.

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		as property values, loss of business income, and costs to build new schools and hire teacher for projected additional students, cost to noise attenuate buildings).	Those changes can be either increases or decreases from baseline conditions (for example, Section LU 3.11.1.2). IMPLAN-calculated changes are used to estimate population changes and potential environmental consequences (such as to air quality) through traffic; changes in recreation, which could affect biological resources; changes in numbers of students, which could affect schools; changes in need for law enforcement or firefighter personnel; and changes in state and local taxes collected as a result of the changes in employment. IMPLAN regionalized input-output model includes secondary jobs (either increase or decrease) associated with business or service industries. As a regionalized input-output model, IMPLAN includes all appropriate economic sectors of the regional economy. In the case of Ada County and Boise, the IMPLAN model includes indirect and induced employment associated with aircraft operations. Property values are defined by multiple variables as explained for each alternative location (for example, BO 3.11.1.1) The EIS specifically states that noise generation above 65 dB DNL by F-35A operations could have an adverse impact on property values (for example, LU 3.11.1). Section 3.9.2 notes the need for special measures to reduce residential interior noise where noise levels exceed 65 deci bels Day-Night Average Level (DNL). When discussing noise impacts above 65 dB DNL, Section 3.9.2 explains the basis for potential adverse impact from noise to property values by referencing studies (including Nelson 2003). The EIS notes that the value of a specific property could be discounted between 0.5 and 0.6 percent per decibel between 65 dB DNL and 75 dB DNL when compared to a similar property that is not affected by aircraft noise. The property value impact could be greater for a property subject to noise levels above 75 dB DNL.
SO-14	1412, A1162, A1255	Draft EIS does not provide accurate socioeconomic analysis under Military Training Routes. Some Military Training Routes are more than 20 miles and Air Force can fly at 100 feet. Final EIS should have a list of businesses under the fly zone with the SEL level each business will be exposed to.	As explained in Section 2.4.3.1, low altitude training, which includes all offensive/defensive operations, would involve approximately 1.5 hours of training time, a small portion of which would be for navigation. Approximately three percent of pilot flight training would result in an F-35A aircraft between the altitudes of 500 feet and 2,000 feet AGL. This percentage of flight training between 500 and 2,000 feet AGL includes all time spent in MOAs, Ranges, or on MTRs (Section 2.4.3). Sections HO 3.10.2.1 and HO 3.10.2.2 present land use and noise consequences for multiple locations under each training airspace, including along the Military Training Routes (MTRs). Section HO 3.11.2.1 presents the population within

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			the airspaces currently used by military aircraft and projected to be used under the F-35A scenarios. As stated in Section 3.11.2.2, residents under Military Operations Areas (MOAs) and Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace (ATCAAs) will likely notice the increase in noise levels and be annoyed. Based on public input at the public hearings, MTRs have been added to the locations where people could notice increased noise be annoyed.
SO-15	1412, A1037, A1163	Draft EIS should evaluate socioeconomic impacts from not being able to base observatories in Otero County because of vibrations from noise and loss of environmental quality.	Section HO 3.2.2.1 presents the difference in noise levels and sonic booms per day between existing conditions and the different F-35A training scenarios. The siting of observatories at any location is based on multiple factors, including altitude, meteorological conditions, and other variables. The changes from baseline noise conditions presented in Section HO 3.2.2.1 for areas under the Beak MOA/Cowboy ATCAA or the Talon MOA/ATCAA resulting from an F-35A training mission, such as a change in supersonic events from 1.4 per day up to 1.8 per day, would not be expected to affect such siting decisions.
SO-16	1305, 3041	Would like to know how Luke currently affects the west valley financially.	Luke AFB has been a factor in the Phoenix regional economy since 1941. The State of Arizona established Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) line to define high noise areas (see Section LU 3.10.1.1). The EIS is not a cost-benefit study for any Air Force base alternative. The EIS does explain some benefits and costs, which could affect environmental resources. For example, the EIS projects regional employment and expenditures and permits comparison of those regional effects with baseline employment. The employment and expenditures can result in either an increase or a decrease in the regional economy as quantified by the Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) economic model. The EIS also recognizes that individuals involved in the transfer of property within the vicinity of the military bases in Arizona acknowledge that they would be located near an active military base. Property values are defined by multiple variables as explained for each alternative location (for example, LU 3.11.1.1). The EIS specifically states that noise levels above 65 dB DNL generated by F-35A operations could have an adverse impact on property values (see also response to SO-13).
SO-17	1407, 3010	Loss of cattle due to noise as stated in 1983 study would result in financial loss.	The EIS Section 2.8.1 states that low-level training would avoid, to the extent practicable, identified seasonal ranching activities. Range cattle are especially sensitive during herding and branding operations and the Air Force would establish temporary avoidance areas for locations identified for such ranching operations. The EIS,

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			for example, Section BO 3.2.1.2, explains that any claims for Air Force-related damage would begin by contacting the respective base public affairs office with details of the claim.
SO-18	1448, 1454, 1488, 1510, 1516, 1517, 1536, 1587, 1639, 1643, 1660, 1799, 1801, 1896, 1897, 1900, 1908, 1912, 1929, 1948, 1977, 1986, 1987, A1022, A1023, A1027, A1042, A1076, A1087, A1162, A1163, A1195, A1210, A1211, A1229, A1235, A1236, 2066, 2071, 2074, 2081, 2107, 2115, 2123, 2125, 2128, 2129, 2149, 2151, 2163, 2164, 2168, 2179, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2195, 2202, 2204, 2207, 3011, 3195, 3227, 3229, 3253, 3255, 3257, 3259, 3263	Noise (or F-35A) would negatively impact local businesses resulting in lost revenues, force business owner to leave/close down, or deter businesses from investing in the area.	As presented in EIS Section 3.9.2 and the response to SO-13, multiple studies were used to estimate that "the value of a specific property could be discounted between 0.5 and 0.6 percent per decibel" between the 65 dB DNL and 75 dB DNL noise contours "when compared to a similar property that Is not affected by aircraft noise". EIS Appendix B, Section B.1.3.2, notes that different business activities are considered compatible with different noise levels. As explained in the response DO-10, the EIS is an assessment of environmental impacts. A diverse variety of conditions affects business location decisions within a high noise area. Some business is discouraged from locating within such an area and other businesses are encouraged to locate within such an area.
SO-19	1778, 3001	Why have potential socioeconomic impacts of the F-35A been focused only on Alamogordo, when other communities in addition to Alamogordo will be significantly impacted by the F-35A	Project elements, which can drive environmental consequences, include facility renovation and construction, personnel increases or decreases, and flight operations. Any potential for socioeconomic effects outside the Alamogordo region of influence would be associated with flight operations. As noted in Section HO 3.11.2.2 in the Final EIS residents of rural locations under the training airspace have expressed past annoyance and potential future annoyance with the use of training airspace. These include rural communities under the Sacramento Mountains, such as Weed, Mayhill, Piñon, and Sacramento, New Mexico. As described in EIS Section HO 3.11.2.2, the noise generated at auxiliary airfields could have an adverse impact on property values for properties newly exposed to noise levels greater than 65 dB DNL. Section 3.9.2 explains that a specific property subject to noise levels above 65 dB DNL has been estimated to be discounted between 0.5 and 0.6 percent per decibel when compared with a similar property not affected by aircraft noise.
SO-20	A1037, A1094	What methodologies were used to determine the specific environmental impacts the F-35 A would have on communities in the Sacramento Mountains and what pages in the Draft EIS address the specific environmental , social, health and economic	Aircraft operations in training airspace would be the source of potential environmental consequences to areas under the MOAs, ATCAAs, and MTRs. The methodologies used to quantify noise consequences under Holloman airspace are explained in Section 3.2 and Appendix B. As explained in Section HO 3.11.2.2, residents under the Beak MOA (and overlying Cowboy ATCAA) would likely notice the increase in noise levels under some basing scenarios, and additional residents could be annoyed. The number

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		Impacts the F-35A would have on Weed, Mayhill, Pinon and Sacramento New Mexico.	of flights using MTR IR 192/194, which overflies Weed, Sacramento, and Mayhill would increase from an estimated existing 459 annual overflights to a possible 641 overflights. Assuming 253 days of flying missions per year, there would be an average of from a baseline of 1.8 to a projected 2.5 overflights per day. The number of overflights on any given day could be greater or less than the average. The change in overflights would result in an increase in noise and continued annoyance. Sections HO 3.2.2.1 and HO 3.10.2.2 present the change under IR 192/194 from a baseline calculated 53 dB DNL to 58 dB DNL for Scenario H3W and 60 dB DNL for Scenario H5. As noted in Section 3.11.2.1, such noise levels would result in residents being annoyed although such noise levels would not be expected to adversely affect economic decisions, property values, or other socioeconomic resources. The risk of fire from a flare deployed in a MOA or an ATCAA is extremely slight as a result of restrictions placed on flare use and the reliability of flares (see Final EIS Section 2.4.5 and response to DO-7). As explained in Section 2.4.5, the weight and configuration of flare residual materials would not result in any significant impact although an identified plastic or nylon flare piece could cause annoyance to a person finding the piece. The number of plastic or nylon pieces deposited on the ground under training airspace would generally decline from baseline conditions because F-35A pilots do not use chaff countermeasures in training (Section 2.4.5).
SO-21	1566, 1577, 1767, 1783, 1852, 1908, A1001, A1014, A1042, A1073, A1082, A1231, 2083, 2105, 2200, 3074	How many jobs would be brought to the communities where F-35s would be based? How many will be local hire, transfers, military, civilian, etc., versus workers and companies from outside the affected area? Would construction jobs be the primary type?	EIS Section 2.4.2 presents the number of F-35A personnel, contractors, and students. The students would not be permanent positions but would rotate through the training programs, so the number of students would reflect a full-time-equivalent number of active students at any given time. Construction expenditures presented in Section 2.4.1 provide a rough order of magnitude construction cost estimate for each base alternative. As noted in SO-5, contracts cannot be specified for a specific region, but local contractors frequently have lower costs and can successfully compete for construction contracts. Each base Section 3.11.1.2 calculates direct, indirect, and induced jobs. As explained in SO-27, personnel filling direct jobs at National Guard locations, such as Idaho and Arizona, are drawn from the state. At Holloman or Luke AFB, active duty Air Force personnel are rotated and civilian personnel either are, or become, long term residents of the community. In a large regional economy, indirect and Induced jobs are drawn from the local labor pool.

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
SO-22	1766, 2188, 3258	Socioeconomic analysis methodology is not internally consistent. Use of IMPLAN assumes no negative impacts but analysis cites articles noting negative impacts to property values.	The nationally recognized IMPLAN model is a regionalized input-output model that quantifies both increases and decreases in regional economic activity attributable to economic activity (for example, see the negative values in Section LU 3.11.1.2). EIS Section 3.9.2 recognizes the negative impacts to property values from noise. The cited Nelson meta-analysis of airport noise and hedonic property values combines the results of 33 estimates at 23 airports and reflects studies in multiple locations throughout the U.S. and Canada. The Air Force analysis is both correct and valid regarding use of the IMPLAN model and recognition of noise impacts to property values (see also SO-13).
SO-23	1719, 1766, 3187, 3283, A1145, A1202, A1235, A1236, 2168, 3224, 3246, 3258	Socioeconomic analysis is insufficient because it does not address impacts to quality of life and productivity from noise. Analysis should be supplemented with real-world experiences from similar basing actions or from before/after surveys in affected area. A sensitivity analysis should also be conducted.	The analysis in Appendix B dealing with annoyance at different noise levels is derived from extensive surveys of real-world experience beginning in 1978, validated in 1989, and updated in 1994. The community reactions used extensively in the development and updating of the Schultz curve and other analyses of annoyance are based upon objective and reproducible surveys of persons affected by aircraft noise. Questions regarding productivity and other aspects of home or work satisfaction can be inferred from surveys of annoyance. As is demonstrated in Appendix B, the percentage of individuals annoyed increases non-linearly with the increase in dB DNL. As described in Section 3.2.2, a variety of noise measures is used in addition to DNL for comparison and is used to assess potential impacts. These measures are applied throughout the EIS. Each base Section 3.2.1.2 maps a set of sensitive locations and quantifies the number of times individuals would be subjected to noise levels above 50 dB L_{max} with windows open and with windows closed. The analysis of sleep disturbance is based upon eight field studies used in 2008 by the American National Statistics Institute and the Acoustical Society of America to publish a method to estimate awakening of exposed populations (see EIS Section 3.2.2). These data from published real-world comparable analyses are consistently applied throughout all basing alternatives and aircraft number scenarios. The EIS explanation of noise contains an accurate description of DNL in Section 3.2.2 and includes a variety of noise measurements used to quantify noise consequences at specific locations.
SO-24	1766, 1984, A1142	Analysis assumes noise impacts are on a discrete scale: i.e., 65 dB DNL has socioeconomic effects but 64.9 dB DNL does not. A	The EIS does not assume there is no effect of noise levels between 55 decibel (dB) Day-Night Average Level (DNL) and 65 dB DNL. As demonstrated in EIS Section 3.2.2 and Appendix B, community surveys of noise annoyance demonstrate that noise annoyance has

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		gradual impact throughout the community would be more accurate.	been documented below 55 dB DNL. In 1980, the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise (FICUN) published guidelines relating DNL to comparable land uses and identified outdoor values above 65 dB DNL as normally not compatible with residential land uses. The 65 dB DNL is the recognized noise measure used at airports throughout the continental U.S. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) provided a response to the question about the 65 dB DNL noise contour as follows: "As directed by the U.S. Congress in the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act (ASNA) of 1979, the FAA and other branches of the federal government have established guidelines for noise compatibility based on annoyance. FAA Order 1050.1E, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, Appendix A, paragraph 14.3, Page A-61, defines the threshold of significance for noise impacts as follows. A significant noise impact would occur if analysis shows that the proposed action will cause noise sensitive areas to experience an increase in noise of DNL 1.5 dB or more at or above DNL 65 dB noise exposure when compared to the no action alternative for the same timeframe." http://www.faa.gov/airports/airport_development/omp/FAQ/Noise_Monitoring/index.cfm?print=go#q4
SO-25	1766, 2200	Statements in analysis seem to show the Air Force is concerned with the socioeconomic impacts being too positive.	The EIS objectively presents an analysis of employment and expenditures and relates that demand to other services within the region, including housing, schools, police, and fire. The EIS presents the baseline conditions and assesses employment and housing availability within the Region of Influence (see Section BO 3.11.1.2). The analysis determines that adequate personnel and housing currently exist to fill calculated indirect and induced jobs. Individual decisions regarding what jobs would be filled by who would depend upon the individual and current employment status. Ada County has estimated 282,056 employment positions based on 2010 data with an unemployment rate of 8.9 percent. The EIS accurately explains that an increase in employment of up to 2,246 jobs could be filled by available regional labor (Section BO 3.11.1).
SO-26	1766	Draft EIS states that city would be subject to noise levels incompatible with residential use and property values would decline but assumes that no one would move from the area.	Appendix B describes the percentage of people annoyed by different noise levels. An estimated 5 to 8 percent of the population is highly annoyed at 55 dB DNL, 10 to 15 percent at 65 dB DNL, 20 to 25 percent at 70 dB DNL, and approximately 35 percent at 75 db DNL (see Figure B–3). It is important to note that 65 percent of the population is not highly annoyed by noise levels as high as 75 dB DNL. Individuals and businesses would make independent

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			decisions based upon a variety of variables, one of which is assumed to be noise conditions as reflected in the individual's level of annoyance with noise. The results of a change in noise has the potential to change residential and business behavior, but whether that change would be a net increase or decrease at any specific location would be speculative. Some individuals would seek to avoid noise and others would be willing to accept the noise, both for residences and for businesses. Individual residence and business decisions are made based upon multiple variables where aircraft noise or lack of aircraft noise can be one of the variables.
SO-27	1736, 1766, A1077	Draft EIS states that new jobs could be filled by unemployed persons but does no further analysis matching skills of unemployed to the skills of the new job openings. No analysis done of people leaving existing jobs to work for the Air Force.	Employment from secondary and induced economic activity as a result of an F-35A basing decision takes into consideration the regional economic diversity. The IMPLAN model is a regionalized input-output model, which includes all relevant economic factors within the Region of Influence (ROI). When the ROI is sufficiently large, and unemployment and housing availability are such that any potential stimulated economic activity could draw from the existing employment and housing base, the conclusion that indirect and induced jobs could be filled by unemployed persons in Ada County is entirely valid (see Section BO 3.11.1.2 and response to SO-25). The Idaho National Guard is a local direct employee for individuals within Idaho. The 282,057 Boise employees in 2010, along with the 8.9 percent unemployment rate, are economic factors, which would allow for 2,246 direct, indirect, and induced employees to come from the local community (see Section BO 3.11.1.2). The EIS is not a cost-benefit analysis, nor is it an analysis of how individuals could make employment decisions based upon different employment opportunities.
SO-28	1766	Regarding cited Fidel et al 1996 study, if impact cannot be quantified how would you know the impact is minor?	Impacts to property values are not ignored. Property value impacts newly under the 65 dB DNL contours are described as adversely to significantly impacted (see base Sections 3.11.1.2). The Nelson 2003 meta analysis of airport noise and property values is a widely referenced 2003 study of 33 property value studies at 23 airports in the U.S. and Canada (see EIS Section 3.9.2). Using those studies, Nelson approximated property value impacts from changes in the dB DNL level between 65 dB DNL and 75 dB DNL. Fidel et al., in a 1996 study, estimated a minor impact on property value but were not able to quantify the impact. Nelson used the Fidel study as well as the other studies to estimate a value for noise impacts. EIS Section 3.9.2 presents the results of that study as "specific property could be discounted between 0.5 and 0.6 percent per decibel

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			(between 65 dB DNL and 75 dB DNL) when compared to a similar property that is not affected by aircraft noise (see also SO-30).
SO-29	1766	Regarding cited Nelson 2003 study, cited potential impact to property values from noise is enormous with estimated reduction in property values of up to 40 percent.	Section 3.2.2 explains the different noise measurements, noise baseline conditions, and the meaning of DNL. It is important to understand the meaning of a noise measure to be able to understand how to evaluate noise consequences. The EIS presents an accurate understanding of DNL and quantifies potential numbers of persons and acres by types of land use which could be affected by changes in the DNL and other noise metrics (see base Sections 3.10.1.2, 3.11.1.2, and response to SO-28). The mathematical analyses presented in the EIS are correct.
SO-30	1766	Cited studies on property values are over ten years old. Have any relevant studies been done within the last decade?	The EIS cites comprehensive and defensible studies performed to quantify the property value consequences of noise. The Nelson 2003 paper combines diverse studies conducted between 1967 and 1995, which addressed the full spectrum of noise analysis and effects on property values. Additional studies using different methodologies and different definitions of noise characteristics have produced varying results. Housing, with lower assessed values near airports, incurred a lower impact than estimated by the Nelson study. Housing within the 65 dB to 70 dB DNL did not have a significant discount value as high as the Nelson study. Housing with higher assessed values incurred a higher impact than estimated by Nelson. Housing between 65 decibel (dB) Day-Night Average Level (DNL) and 70 dB DNL incurred a higher impact than estimated by Nelson. In general, the Nelson average results can be reasonably applied to representative property located in areas with noise levels from 65 dB DNL to 75 dB DNL. Properties in areas above 75 dB DNL could incur a greater impact to property values (see Cohen, Jeffrey P. and Coughlin, Cletus C.; Spatial Hedonic Models of Airport Noise, Proximity, and Housing Prices; Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis; 2007, Valdes, Christian; Comparing Methodologies that Correlate Property Values and Airport Noise; San Jose State University; 2008, and EIS Section 3.9.2).
SO-31	1810, 1984	Please take into consideration the report completed by Dr. Timothy D. Hogan titled "An Evaluation of the Potential Loss in West Valley Home Values From Locating F-35 at Luke Air Force Base".	The Hogan report considers different approaches to evaluating noise impacts upon property values within the vicinity of Luke AFB. The report recognizes that the values of existing homes is substantially lower than they could be otherwise because of their being located in the vicinity of Luke AFB and being subject to actual or potential high levels of aircraft noise. Properties currently within the Arizona Revised Statute Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) designated high noise area, whether or not they are within the

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
			existing 65 decibel (dB) Day-Night Average Level (DNL) noise contour, are already discounted as if they were within the 65 dB DNL noise contour. The only properties to which the Hogan report could has direct application would be properties outside the JLUS line but newly within the 65 dB DNL contour under one or more of the EIS aircraft scenarios at Luke AFB. Such properties outside the JLUS line but near Luke AFB (a military airport) also have disclosure requirements, which would contribute to a pre-existing property value discount.
SO-32	A1140, 3069, 3082, 3231, 3235	Will retrofitting be done for communities in the direct path of descent?	The Air Force would not be the agency for any home renovation projects. In the State of Arizona, state law has provisions to support noise attenuation renovation within high noise areas (see Arizona Revised Statutes [ARS] 28-8481, -8482 adopted by the State of Arizona, which utilized noise contours from a 1988 Joint Land Use Study [JLUS]).
SO-33	1900, 1987, A1093, A1140, A1145, A1223, 2120, 3144, 3258	The Draft EIS considers only two studies of the effects of aircraft noise on property values and these show low correlation between noise and property values. The Draft EIS ignores studies that show a much higher correlation.	The EIS cites comprehensive and defensible studies performed to quantify the property value consequences of noise. The Nelson 2003 paper combines 33 studies conducted between 1967 and 1995, which addressed the full spectrum of noise analysis and effects on property values. Additional studies using different methodologies and different definitions of noise characteristics have produced varying results. Housing, with lower assessed values near airports, incurred a lower impact than estimated by the Nelson study. Housing within the 65 decibel (dB) to 70 dB Day-Night Average Level (DNL) did not have a significant discount value as high as the Nelson study. Housing with higher assessed values incurred a higher impact than estimated by Nelson. Housing between 65 dB DNL and 70 dB DNL incurred a higher impact than estimated by Nelson. In general, the Nelson average results can be reasonably applied to representative property located in areas with noise levels from 65 dB DNL to 75 dB DNL. Properties in areas above 75 dB DNL could incur a greater impact to property values (see Nelson, J. 2003. Meta-Analysis of Airport Noise and Hedonic Property Values: Problems and Prospects. July; Cohen, J. and Coughlin, C. 2007. Spatial Hedonic Models of Airport Noise, Proximity, and Housing Prices; Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis. Valdes, C. 2008. Comparing Methodologies that Correlate Property Values and Airport Noise; San Jose State University.).
SO-34	1908, A1077, A1082, 2200	Military personnel stationed here will buy goods and supplies on base, which will not be subject to	Boise and Tucson National Guard personnel live in the communities. Base housing provides for some personnel at Luke AFB and Holloman AFB. Military personnel and retirees have the

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		state and local taxes and will likely live on base and not purchase homes. The percentage who does buy will not necessarily buy them in the impacted area.	ability to purchase goods both on and off base. Some durable goods, as well as a variety of non-durable goods, are not available on base. The EIS Sections 3.11.1.2 explain employment and population changes associated with different aircraft scenarios.
SO-35	1948	The area designated as Not Suitable for Residential Use also has offices that employ hundreds of people. If this area is unsuitable for residential use, how can it be suitable for professional office use?	EIS Appendix B.1.3.2 identifies land use compatibility for different DNL noise levels. Professional services are identified generally compatible above 70 dB DNL when measures to achieve indoor noise levels of approximately 50 dB DNL are applied. See also response to SO-1.
SO-36	1987, A1031	What will be the financial impacts of potential lawsuits filed against the Air Force, Boise, the City of Tucson, and Pima County by businesses and individuals negatively impacted by basing the F-35A?	Litigation analysis is not an EIS requirement.
SO-37	A1047	The EIS sampled only 4 schools, all of which (under Scenario B3) failed to meet ANSI standards for new school construction, if more schools were sampled would they also not meet ANSI standards?	EIS Section 3.6 explains the ANSI guidelines schools for school sound attenuation. Schools and child care centers subject to noise levels greater than 65 dB were identified in most alternative locations. Based on the sampling of schools, the EIS analysis assumes that most schools subject to noise levels at or above 65 dB DNL would not meet current ANSI guidelines. EIS base Sections 3.12.1.2 not that noise levels would have a potential adverse impact on children at these locations and may be considered significant.
SO-38	A1047	Increased demand for teachers relies on tax revenues when property values will plummet due to F-35 noise and pollution. More law enforcement, firefighters, and medical professionals will be needed just as property taxes will generate less money to pay for such services due to F-35's negative impact on property values.	Response SO-28 and SO-1 addresses noise effects on property values. Response SO-26 explains that individual decisions will affect residential and business decisions. EIS base Sections 3.11.1.2 quantify changes in the demand for representative safety personnel and acknowledges that new personnel is dependent on the availability of tax revenues.

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
SO-39	A1022, A1077	Concerned that the Air Force wants to station 72 jets at the local Boise Airport and that this will change the character of the city irrevocably and forever.	The EIS extensively presents aircraft noise consequences in terms of acreage and population affected. Various noise measures are used to provide decision makers with the extent of the noise impact upon the Region of Influence for each base.
SO-40	A1140, 2176, 2179, 3149, 3209, 3240	Where's the economic analysis of human health problems, of increasing emissions so much that kids have more asthma, of losing federal funding for highways and jobs that come with federal funding. Other issues that need to be considered include reduced influx of retirees, costs to purchase land as a buffer against encroachment, and costs of moving or closing schools and other public facilities such as the closing of Julia Keen Elementary, Vail Academy, and High School in Tucson.	EIS Section TU 3.3.1.2 presents details regarding emission estimates from construction and operation. Both construction and operation emissions were calculated. No human health issues associated with emissions would be expected. F-35A basing scenario would reduce emissions of all pollutants, except that Scenarios T2 and T3 would increase emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_X). Emission increases would not exceed any applicable conformity or PSD threshold. Operation of 72 F-35A aircraft would produce less than significant air quality impacts. Projected F-35A flights would produce less than significant contributions to visibility impairment within nearby Class I areas. Operations within the airspaces would reduce emissions of all pollutants from current F-16 levels and, as a result, would not exceed any applicable conformity or PSD threshold. F-35A training operations would produce less than significant impacts on NAAQS pollutant levels. No health effects would be expected. Response SO-7, LU-1, and LU-39 include issues related to tourism, land use actions, and school closures.
SO-41	2111	Page 2-55: Table 2–12 (Comparative Summary of Environmental Consequences) - 2nd bullet and Page BO–129, paragraph 3, Question the statement that "Noise generated from F-35A training at MHAFB has the potential to adversely affect property values, as described for noise levels in the vicinity of Boise AGS." Elmore Co. was rezoned in the 1970s to include a two-mile buffer around the base to plan for an increase in noise levels and the Air Force continues to be an economic drive in Elmore Co. Land surrounding MHAFB is agricultural and	Last bullet in table in Final EIS changed to read, Elmore County zoning provides a two-mile noise and safety buffer to reduce development near MHAFB and avoid adverse impacts.”

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		restricted to only one residence per 320 acres. Except for one house, lands under the noise footprints are all non-residential, agricultural, and a mixture of Bureau of Land Management, state, and private lands. The only thing that might impact property value is a base closure. Recommend deleting reference or refer to Elmore County's zoning that supports greater noise at MHAFB.	
SO-42	2111	On pg BO-128, paragraph 4, the EIS calls for no personnel changes at MHAFB. Would the increased activity, especially on the weekends, require an increase in Tower and Range control activity and therefore a need for increase in people? Recommend that the requirements for manpower for the Auxiliary Operations at MHAFB be studied to either increase MHAFB manpower or Gowen Field Guardsmen to accomplish the required training at the Auxiliary Field, MHAFB, on the weekends.	Manpower adjustments would be anticipated following any decision to base F-35A training aircraft at Gowen Field. Should there be any manpower adjustments deemed necessary for Mountain Home AFB, appropriate personnel would be assigned.
SO-43	A1037	I have noticed that the Air Force often uses generalizations about noise not affecting property values and have used generalities to gloss over the impact on the local economy. AVERAGES that are neither meaningful nor accurate are often used to DILUTE the TRUE effects of this action. The Air Force must study, specifically, property in quiet,	Studies of property values have been prepared for airports (see SO-30). The studies have been based upon effects above 65 dB DNL (see SO-24). The noise overflight effects on Weed and surrounding New Mexico communities are discussed in SO-19. Text has been added to Section HO 3.11.2.2 where impacts to these areas were discussed to identify Weed and other nearby communities specifically. Application of objective reproducible studies of annoyance from EIS Appendix B suggest that the percentage of people highly annoyed under IR 135/195 and IR 192/194 could increase from a No Action range of 0 to 10 percent up to a scenario H3W range of from 5 to 20 percent.

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		peaceful mountains that have been turned into a high noise training area, then analyze and publish the findings for the changes in property values in constant dollars. Discussing changes in property values in an urban or non-mountainous location is not a VALID or CORRECT analysis. Weed, New Mexico and all the surrounding mountain communities are unique in this respect and MUST be treated as such. How will the over flights expansion affect my property value and the real estate market in Weed?	
SO-44	A1037, A1162, A1163	What socioeconomic impacts have other base expansions had on surrounding communities?	Base Sections 3.11.1.2 describe population, housing, safety, services, and other socioeconomic measures. Comment SO-30 describes property value effects from aircraft operations at airports. The EIS analysis and conclusions, including conclusions of significant impacts, are derived from changes in regional economic activities. Comparing the socioeconomic impacts of this basing action with previous base expansions on surrounding communities is out of the scope of this EIS.
SO-45	2164, 2207	If F-35s are used anywhere near towns, the public will suffer increased costs at all levels – including such things as air conditioning bills that skyrocket. People will not even be able to leave their windows open for fresh air, or to take advantage of natural cooling at night.	The EIS provides the number of times when individuals could be subject to a 50-decibel (dB) L_{max} noise event in representative locations near airfields shown in base Sections 3.2.1.2. There would be an infinite number of specific locations subject to different noise levels under baseline and different F-35A training basing alternatives and aircraft scenarios. The number of training overflights per year on a Military Training Route can be obtained from base Sections 2.2.1. Each overflight could produce a 50 dB L_{max}. This means, for example, that a community such as Weed, NM, could have an estimated 685 annual overflights on IR 134/195 and IR 192/194 under No Action (baseline) conditions which could result in a 50 dB L_{max} or higher noise event. Under Scenario H3W, the annual number of overflights producing an estimated 50 dB L_{max} or higher noise event could increase to 935. This level of detailed impact information can be obtained for any of an infinite number of locations by applying data presented in the EIS.

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
SO-46	2168	A comprehensive study of socioeconomic and environmental justice impacts is needed at the county level as well as at the regional market/services level, many of which cross state and county lines.	Socioeconomic and environmental justice base Sections 3.11.2 and 3.12.2 present total population, minority population, low-income persons, and youth by county for each county within the airfield Region of Influence and within the counties potentially overflown by scheduled training flights. The auxiliary fields are evaluated for selected socioeconomic and environmental justice resources.
SO-47	A1093	The EIS says ANSI standards for new construction may not be met at some of the schools. What does "may not be met" mean? Will they be met, or will they not? If not, in what way not? What are the implications of noncompliance?	Information on noise impacts to schools are discussed in Sections TU 3.2, TU 3.12, and Appendix B of the EIS. Section TU 3.2 explains that noise levels experienced during a typical school day from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. could exceed 65 dB Equivalent Sound Level during the school day (L_{eqSD}) for at least an hour. This noise metric averages the sound level during the specified period. This metric indicates that for an hour during the school day certain schools would be exposed to noise levels exceeding the American National Standard's Institute standard for a maximum of 40 dB in a classroom, assuming the school building has a standard level of noise attenuation. Section TU 3.12 discusses which schools would be affected by average noise levels that would exceed guidelines established for educational services as determined by ANSI. This indicates that children attending these schools may be impacted by noise including interference with learning. More details on the noise effects on children is provided in Appendix B.
SO-48	A1093	The following statement seems unsupported, please indicate where this statement is corroborated: Construction expenditures and personnel changes would generate beneficial socioeconomic impacts on the surrounding communities by generating additional jobs and income.	The effects of construction expenditures spent by the Air Force as a part of basing the F-35A Training Center were estimated using the Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) model. Information on the model, and how it was used in the analysis, is described in Section 3.9 of the EIS. IMPLAN is a nationally recognized regionalized input-output model, which uses a change in expenditures and regional multipliers developed by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis to estimate the number of jobs and additional income that would be created within a region such as a county. Sections BO 3.11.1.2, HO 3.11.1.2, LU 3.11.1.2, and TU 3.11.1.2 provides the change in employment from the increased construction expenditures provided in Section 2.1.2 of each base section.
SO-49	2200	The latest Census data for Alamogordo reflects a reduced number, which probably is associated with the beddown of the F-22 and would be expected to continue on this downward	Federal government employment in Otero County declined from a high in 2005 of 6,899 to 6,269 in 2010, a loss of 630 jobs. Administrative and waste services jobs declined over the same period from 1107 to 455 jobs, a decline of 652 jobs. Total Otero County jobs declined from 18,133 to 17,026. Just the loss of jobs in these two sectors more than accounted for the entire county job

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		spiral if the F-16 and F-35A aircraft are bedded down at Holloman AFB.	decline. During the same period, professional and technical services jobs increased from 582 to 754 jobs. With the decline in government and administrative and waste services jobs and the increase in professional jobs, there is absolutely no basis for suggesting that aircraft overflights contributed to job or population changes in Alamogordo or Otero County. http://www.dws.state.nm.us/LMI/pdf/ tabled2010.pdf
SO-50	A1092	According to an Air Force representative at a public information meeting in Boise, the Air Force is considering using Gowen Field because it should cost less because they already own quite a bit of land there. Think the Air force should sell the land and buildings at public auction so the citizens could take advantage of the considerable commerce produced by the businesses that could move in that need immediate access to general aviation services. The money the Air Force would make in such sales would most likely generate more than enough money to buy uninhabited land. In addition, the Air Force could avoid destroying and rebuilding existing infrastructure and buildings and build exactly what they want.	Section BO 2.1.2 and BO 3.10.1.1 of the EIS explains that Boise AGS is located on 576 acres leased by the Air National Guard from the City of Boise and 1,476 acres that are in joint use with the Boise Air Terminal Airport. As part of the lease agreement Boise AGS does have exclusive rights for management and construction activities within the 576 acres. Therefore, the Air Force does not have the ability to sell the land and buildings at a public auction. Additionally, Section 2.2.2 of the EIS describes the selection criteria the Air Force used in identifying in candidate bases. One criterion evaluated the installation's capacity including aircraft facilities and the length of the runways. Installations without a functioning runway (such as Malmstrom AFB) or the creation of a new base were not considered to be viable alternatives.
SO-51	2200	Stating that the recession is the cause of declining housing values in the Alamogordo area is debatable. Area growth is centered on the influx of elderly people that favor the southwest weather, lower population density, and open peaceful spaces. This people group is mobile because their income is based on	Section HO 3.11.1.1 of the EIS notes that the recent housing recession has had an effect in housing values nationwide. In Otero County, housing values were not as negatively affected as other cities; however, as shown by the Otero County Assessors' Office, the increase in average sales prices did slow (http://www.co.otero.nm.us /assessor/newsletter%202012.pdf). Individuals and businesses would make independent decisions based upon a variety of variables, one of which is assumed to be noise conditions as reflected in the individual's level of annoyance with noise. The results of a change in noise has the potential to change residential

SO=Socioeconomics			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		retirement funds. As the environment becomes more hostile, they simply move. As word spreads of the abuses of the residents of Alamogordo by Holloman AFB, the hope of attracting newly retired folks will become more difficult. There is also an increase in the departure of employed people that have been forced to seek employment elsewhere to return to a normal lifestyle.	and business behavior, but whether that change would be a net increase or decrease at any specific location would be speculative. Some individuals would seek to avoid noise and others would be willing to accept the noise, both for residences and for businesses. Individual residence and business decisions are made based upon multiple variables where aircraft noise or lack of aircraft noise can be one of the variables. See Response SO-26.
SO-52	2200	Growth in jobs but a decline in population in Otero County points to something other than economics. The school system has not changed, the job market is steady, more housing than people with over 1,000 units available. So, what has changed significantly in the past three years, it is the sonic booming of the people by the Air Force.	Federal government employment in Otero County declined from a high in 2005 of 6,899 to 6,269 in 2010, a loss of 630 jobs. Administrative and waste services jobs declined over the same period from 1107 to 455 jobs, a decline of 652 jobs. Total Otero County jobs declined from 18,133 to 17,026. Just the loss of jobs in these two sectors more than accounted for the entire county job decline. During the same period, professional and technical services jobs increased from 582 to 754 jobs. With the decline in government and administrative and waste services jobs and the increase in professional jobs, there is absolutely no basis for suggesting that aircraft overflights contributed to job or population changes in Alamogordo or Otero County. http://www.dws.state.nm .us/LMI/pdf/ tabled2010.pdf

SW=Soils and Water			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
SW-1	1469, A12074, A1211, 2200	F-35A activities will result in contaminated soil and/or water.	Section TU 3.15 of the EIS identifies groundwater contamination associated with past practices at or in the vicinity of Tucson International Airport. This contamination extends beneath the 162 FW installation and that portion is currently being treated. There are no known F-35A operational or maintenance activities that would result in contaminated soil and/or water.
SW-2	1518, A1159, A1162, A1163	The stability of the rocky terrain was not addressed. Sonic booms and vibrations from low flying jets can loosen rocks and cause rock slides or change the course of the water and cause our wells to go dry.	Text has been added to Base Sections 3.5 in the Final EIS to address the potential of rock slides as a result of sonic booms.
SW-3	2136	The proposed action, especially for the 4-6	Text has been added to Section HO 3.5 of the Final EIS to address the potential effects

SW=Soils and Water			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
		squadron scenarios, would have a large carbon footprint and the increased pollution could affect soil crusts (which play a key role in retaining soil moisture and reducing water loss), especially in places like White Sands National Monument.	of increased pollution on soil crusts.
SW-4	A1037, 2200	What impact will flares and chaff have on water resources?	The EIS identify that the F-35A aircraft would not use chaff as a defensive countermeasure. Flares would be used in approved airspace at altitudes that would allow for the complete expenditure of the flare materials. Residual materials deposited on the ground are identified in Table 2–11 of the EIS are primarily plastic or nylon and are anticipated to degrade in the arid western environment. Additional detail has been added to each base Section 3.5 of the Final EIS evaluating the effects of flares and their residual materials on water resources.

TN = Transportation			
Code	**Letter Number**	**Description**	**Response**
TN-1	2102	No mention of the Phoenix-Goodyear Airport located 8 miles south of Luke AFB	Section LU 3.14 of the Final EIS now identifies the location of the Phoenix Goodyear Airport as 8 miles from Luke AFB with service to general aviation.