

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

F-35 Ops EIS HAF/ACC Telecon and Follow-On Discussion

28 March 2013

1. A telecon was led by Mr Pohlmeier (HAF/A8PB) and Col Ed Oshiba (HAF/A7CI) on the afternoon of Thursday, 28 March 2013. The purpose of the telecon was to initiate HAF-ACC discussions regarding HAF's findings and directions on its preliminary security and policy review of the draft final F-35 Ops EIS. Participating in the telecon, in addition to Mr Pohlmeier and Col Oshiba, were the following:

Mr Bush, HAF/A7CIB
Mr Nash, HAF/A7CIB
Ms Engleman, HAF/A7CII
Col Kilbourn, ACC/A7P
Mr Sabochick, ACC/A7P2
Col Hill, ACC/A3TO
Lt Col Dambrauskas, ACC/A3TO
Mr Sanders, ACC/A3AA
Mr Meyer, ACC/A8F-2
Mr Dittmyre, ACC/A8BA
Mr Murr, ACC/A5B
Mr Flood, ACC/A5B
Mr Ardern, ACC/A5BA
Mr Dittmyre, ACC/A8BA
Mr Reed, SAF/GCN
Mr Oliver, SAF/IEI
Maj Heavener, AFLOA/JACE-FSC
Maj Hutchings, ACC/A7PF
Mr Dryden, ACC/A7PS
Mr Germanos, ACC/A7PS

2. The telecon began with HAF providing general direction to ACC regarding required documentation and completion of the CRF 989 Section 106 process. HAF also indicated that it would provide suggested wording to the general public in the preface on how to review the document and what types of comments would be considered relevant. Additionally, HAF provided direction that all "Incorporations of Reference" should include access information assisting reviewers on where items could be found, and Letters of Agreement concerning ATCAAs should be provided, if possible. HAF provided further guidance concerning wording to be used to address certain public comments.

3. HAF indicated that all preliminary security and policy comments would be provided in written form to ACC during the week of 1-5 April. All parties agreed that the HAF preliminary security and policy review period would end on or before the scheduled 5 April 13 date. HAF also indicated that another public comment period would be necessary, and the new timeline goal for completion of the ROD would be October 2013.

4. After the telecon with HAF/SAF ended, ACC participants discussed the contents of the preliminary draft Record of Decision, which states that the environmentally preferred alternatives are Hill AFB (24 total F-35 aircraft scenario) and McEntire ANG Base (18 total F-35 aircraft), for the ACC and ANG basing decisions, respectively. Due to the overwhelming evidence provided by the EIS documentation, A7P proposed the ROD recommendation be structured around Hill and McEntire for the decision maker.

To make that position, A5B needed to discuss the basis/reasoning for identifying Burlington ANG Base as the preferred ANG basing alternative in the basing scoring model. ACC/A5B leadership indicated that there is no operational benefit of Burlington ANG base over McEntire ANG base, and that Burlington scored higher than McEntire overall due to incorrect scoring (Burlington was scored higher than it should have been and McEntire was scored lower than it should have been regarding encroachment and development) during the initial enterprise wide look. Furthermore, ACC/A5B provided information that Burlington ANG Base also received a higher number of operational points than it should have, based on the reasoning that its older F-16 aircraft (Block 30 versions) would have to be replaced before McEntire and other ANG based, newer F-16 aircraft. Discussions revealed that there would be minimal costs to relocating the Block 50 F-16 from McEntire to Burlington if the decision was made for the OPS 3 basing at McEntire.

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