

Comment regarding Eglin F-35 SEIS Public Scoping Meeting

I feel compelled to make a personal statement about the F-35 deployment to Eglin. I am not against aircraft and, in fact, I, and many others in this room, have made Eglin AFB and its aircraft their careers. I favor progress. As a research engineer, progress and new technology were my main products.

The F-35 will bring positive economic input to Okaloosa County to replace the loss of the 33rd TFW F-15s. I say it again.... Positive economic input to ALL of Okaloosa County. Actually, the Army 7 SFG will more than economically replace the 33rd with the F-35 providing SURPLUS stimulus. But there are always downsides and negative impacts for progress and growth.....loss of woodland areas, increased auto traffic, denser population, etc.

In the case of the F-35 arrival, up to this point in time, the people of, and the City of Valparaiso have taken almost the FULL BRUNT of the negative impacts of the F-35 deployment.....Very high noise levels, lower housing values, lower quality of life, massive changes in city layout, tax revenue problems, etc.

I have been absolutely appalled at the way other municipal government entities in the area, particularly the County Commission have heartlessly sacrificed Valparaiso residents' quality of life for their own gain. The just completed JLUS has only minor suggested changes for all other entities while Valparaiso has MASSIVE changes mandated. Look at the JLUS for yourself. It's on the web.

Where am I going with this? Here is the point. Since the F-35 will bring upside economic gain to the whole area population, then the negative impacts from the F-35 should be equally shared also. Crestview wants and "needs" the F-35 so they should be willing to accept some additional noise from the aircraft flying in and out of Duke Field. The same thing goes should the Air Force decide to utilize Choctaw Field to some extent.

I would ask the Air Force, in their SEIS and ROD deliberations, to "share the downside wealth" and offload some of the noise of an admittedly very loud aircraft with our neighbors. Valparaiso wants the F-35.....We just don't want it ALL.

Robert Webb

SEIS Public Scoping Meeting Questions

1. Noise Questions. With the standup of the F-35 Initial Joint Training Site at Eglin AFB, the main mission of the Eglin complex will change from one of weapon system development and testing to one of flight training. And with that mission change comes an increase in aircraft activity and noise. Not only will the community of Valparaiso be affected, but so will areas of Niceville, Shalimar, Shalimar Point, Destin, Kelly Plantation, and Noriega Point.
 - a. All of the questions apply to the group of the first 59 aircraft authorized in the existing Record of Decision and the full complement of 107 aircraft which may be authorized later.
 - b. Instantaneous Noise. The FEIS presented noise data as a value or number averaged over a 24 hour period. Obviously, this average included periods of times when no noise was generated because an aircraft was not flying over or nearby. While this average decibel number may be meaningful for government studies, it does not represent the real world situation for some of us who live, play and work in Valparaiso, Niceville, Shalimar, Shalimar Point, Destin, Kelly Plantation and Noriega Point. We need to know how loud the aircraft will sound to us as it flies over or nearby when we walk down the street, go for a run, sit in our back yards to enjoy the outdoors, get ready to play tennis or tee up a golf ball. For certain locations in our area, the peacefully quiet times on the golf course and tennis courts or that afternoon stroll may be over. The SEIS should present the instantaneous noise levels when a single aircraft flies over, near, and around our homes, businesses, churches, recreational facilities, and city offices in our communities. With the Apr 09 test data collected at Edwards AFB, which used an array of over 100 microphones, those instantaneous noise levels are now known and can be presented. We need to see the real number for noise generated by this aircraft and not only a number that is averaged down by periods of relative quiet.
 - c. Noise Penalty. The FEIS assigns a 10dB DNL penalty to any sortie flown after 10PM and before 7AM. And the FEIS recognizes that aircraft noise in the evening hours is very irritating to those affected, yet there is no penalty in what is normally considered evening hours from 7 – 10PM. One California study for a school assigned a 5dB penalty for noise between the hours of 7 – 10PM and a 10dB penalty after 10PM. I suggest that the SEIS consider this 5dB penalty for operations performed in that same time frame of 7PM to 10PM and retain the 10dB penalty for flights between 10PM and 7AM.
 - d. Number of Operations. The SEIS Public Scoping Briefing states that the number of operations will be reduced from 240,000 to 150,000 per year. I understand that the complete training syllabus is still under development at this time. The question is then how valid is the 150,000 number which will be used to generate the 24 hour average DNL noise levels and contours. It would seem that this 37% lower number of annual flight operations must lower the overall 24 hour average DNL noise level of the F-35. How do we know that this number will not increase in the future after the

SEIS is completed and approved and the final ROD is signed? And if it does increase, and the noise levels that we are exposed to correspondingly increase, what will the Air Force do in that event and what recourse do the affected areas have?

- e. Day Weeks. Identify how many sorties will be flown in a typical day-week scenario. Provide noise levels for a typical day-week when most of the sorties are flown in day hours. If an average noise level is to be produced, the noise levels should be averaged over that period of time that the sorties are flown in, approximately 10 hours (7AM – 5PM), and not over 24 hours.
 - f. Night Weeks. Identify how many sorties will be flown in a typical night-week scenario. Provide noise levels for a typical night-week when most of the sorties are flown in night hours. If an average noise level is to be produced, the noise levels should be averaged over that period of time that the sorties are flown in, approximately 5 hours (6PM – 10PM), and not over 24 hours.
 - g. Training Syllabus. The training syllabus is the basis for the noise study and it should be clearly presented in the SEIS. SEIS should explain the training syllabus used in generating the noise data – familiarization flights, formation flights, instrument flights, bombing missions, strafing missions, etc. – where these flights are flown and when they are to be performed.
 - h. Screening Criteria. The SEIS Public Scoping briefing states that screening criteria may be used to eliminate some of the alternatives under consideration. If any alternatives are eliminated using this screening criteria, the SEIS should identify factors in this criteria and those alternatives that are eliminated in this way.
2. All of or most of the adverse noise effect on our communities can be averted if the F-35 flight operations move to Duke Field. And I am very pleased that the Duke Field option is under consideration. Of all the alternatives, it is the one choice that can avert the noise impact to our communities.