

Your Response to the Draft Air Force Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

How to Make it Count

Safe Skies Clean Water (safeskiescleanwaterwi.org)

Responses Due:

- Friday, September 27, 2019

How to Respond:

- Online: <http://www.angf35eis.com/Comments.aspx>
- Mail: Mr. Ramon Ortiz, NGB/A4AM, 3501 Fetchet Avenue, Joint Base Andrews MD 20762-5157
- Email: usaf.jbanafw.ngb-a4.mbx.a4a-nepa-comments@mail.mil

Please also send a copy of your comments to: safeskiescleanwaterwi.org/eiscomments

Responses That Count in EIS Analysis (excerpt from Air Force EIS statement):

When providing your comments on the EIS, the National Guard (NGB) requests that comments be substantive in nature. All substantive comments, either written or verbal received during the public comment period, will be given full and equal consideration in the preparation of the Final EIS.

- **Substantive Comments Count:** Comments that challenge the analysis, methodologies, or information in the EIS as being factually inaccurate or analytically inadequate; that identify impacts not analyzed or developed and evaluate reasonable alternatives or feasible mitigations not considered by the NGB; or that offer specific information that may have a bearing on the decision, such as differences in interpretations of significance, scientific, or technical conclusions, or cause changes or revisions in the proposal.
- **Non-substantive Comments Do Not Count:** Comments which do not require a specific NGB response, are generally considered to be those comments that are non-specific; express a conclusion, an opinion, agree, or disagree with the proposals; vote for or against the proposal itself, or some aspect of it; that state a position for or against a particular alternative; or that otherwise state a personal preference or opinion.

Examples of Substantive Comments That Count:

We encourage you to include any – or all – of the following examples with your response to the EIS.

- The EIS should be revised to list the five sites in order of environmental impacts to clearly show Truax Field and Madison is by far the worst choice.
- The Air Force should amend the EIS to more accurately show residents impacted by the new fighter jets by: 1) expanding the noise analysis to include people within the 60 and 55 dB DNL, and 2) determining the number of households, people, schools, day care centers, and other sensitive receptors in these areas.
- The Air Force should update the EIS to explain the assumptions used for the noise modeling including afterburner usage and flight patterns, and explain how these assumptions will be verified and enforced.
- The Air Force should update the EIS to describe noise abatement methods, provide cost estimates and determine who can provide the funds to implement noise abatement.
- The EIS should be updated to explain measures that are available to avoid impacting low-income and minority children.
- The EIS should be updated to estimate the liability and cost to the Air National Guard for investigation and cleanup of the PFAS groundwater contamination.
- The EIS should be updated to review other non-PFAS chemicals which have contaminated surrounding soils and groundwater at Truax Field, and provide an estimate of the liability and cost to the Air National Guard for investigation and cleanup of the contamination.
- The EIS should be updated to include specific types and amounts of chemicals required for F-35A operations, how and where they will be used, and all the potential ways they could be released into the environment.
- The EIS should be updated to include extensive details about how the Truax Air National Guard staff will comply with specific city, county, and state stormwater laws to prevent release of contamination all over the base into Starkweather Creek.
- The EIS should be updated to identify the specific chemicals released as emissions by F-35A fighter jets and compare these emissions with the limitations and standards under NR 445.