

**RECORD OF DECISION
FOR THE
REALISTIC BOMBER TRAINING INITIATIVE**

This document records the decision of the United States Air Force (Air Force) with regard to the Realistic Bomber Training Initiative (RBTI). In making this decision, the information, analysis, and public comments contained in both the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Realistic Bomber Training Initiative (Federal Register Notice of Availability February 4, 2000) and the Supplemental EIS for Realistic Bomber Training Initiative (Federal Register Notice of Availability published August 11, 2006), were considered, among other relevant factors.

This Record of Decision (ROD) has been drafted in accordance with the regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations, Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1505.2, Record of Decision in cases requiring environmental impact statements (40 CFR §1505.2); and the U.S. Air Force Environmental Impact Analysis Process, Title 32 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 989.21, Record of Decision (32 CFR 989.21).

After consideration of the issues addressed in the SEIS and the comments submitted, the Air Force decides not to change the decision described in the initial ROD (Air Force 2000b), and that record is hereby incorporated by reference (see attachment). The present ROD describes the purpose, background, alternatives analyzed, public involvement, supplemental pages, impacts, mitigation measures and management actions.

The purpose of RBTI is to:

1. Permit aircrews from Barksdale and Dyess Air Force Bases (AFBs) to train for their various missions while maximizing combat training time;
2. Provide the type and linked arrangement of airspace and other assets that support realistic training for bomber aircrews; and
3. Ensure that flexibility and variability in training support bomber combat missions.

RBTI fulfills this purpose by establishing a set of linked electronic scoring sites that provide realistic bomber training close enough to Barksdale and Dyess AFBs to effectively use limited flying hours.

BACKGROUND

On December 19, 1997, the NEPA process for RBTI began with publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register*. The Draft EIS was published in March 1999 (Volume 64, Number 53). Fifteen public hearings were held in 11 communities. The Final EIS, published and made available to the public in January 2000, identified the preferred alternative as Alternative B.

In March 2000, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Air and Space Operations issued the initial ROD (Air Force 2000b), choosing Alternative B for implementation. The Air Force then submitted to the FAA its formal airspace proposal to establish the Lancer MOA in April 2000. After conducting its own independent evaluation, the FAA adopted the Final EIS and gave its final approval for the RBTI airspace on December 11, 2001, with an effective date of February 21, 2002.

After issuance of the Air Force ROD (Air Force 2000b), the Air Force and FAA were sued by parties alleging the Air Force and FAA failed to comply with NEPA, among other things. In March 2003, the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas, Lubbock Division, granted summary judgment in favor of the United States. The plaintiffs appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. One of the plaintiffs also filed a separate petition in the Fifth Circuit alleging that the FAA had failed to comply with NEPA in approving the RBTI airspace. In a single opinion covering both the Air Force and FAA cases, the Court of Appeals (October 2004) upheld the adequacy of the Final EIS in most respects, but remanded the action to the Air Force and FAA to prepare a Supplemental EIS analyzing the impact of wake vortices on ground structures and complying with the CEQ and Air Force requirements for addressing FAA comments. Consequently, the Air Force and FAA prepared a Supplemental EIS in compliance with the order of the Court of Appeals.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED

Four alternatives were analyzed in the Supplemental EIS: they included the no-action alternative (Alternative A), and three action alternatives, Alternatives B, C, and D. All three action alternatives fulfill the need defined under the proposed action. Alternative B: Instrument Route (IR)-178/Lancer MOA and Alternative C: IR-178/Texon MOA are almost entirely in western Texas. Only a small portion of airspace in these alternatives extends into New Mexico. Alternative D: IR-153/Mt. Dora MOA is located primarily in northeastern New Mexico with portions of the MTR extending into northwestern Texas. Because all three action alternatives predominantly coincide with existing MTR or MOA airspace, little area not currently exposed to overflights would be affected. Under Alternative A: No-Action, the Air Force would continue using existing assets and airspace would remain unchanged. All three action alternatives met operational goals defined for RBTI. Based on the original analysis presented in the EIS and the additional analysis presented in the Supplemental EIS, Alternative B continues to be the Air Force's operationally preferred alternative, as well as the environmentally preferred alternative.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PERTAINING TO THE SEIS

In response to the Court of Appeals opinion, the Air Force, with the FAA as a cooperating agency, published a NOI in the *Federal Register* on January 12, 2005 to prepare a Supplemental EIS. Also in January 2005, the Air Force informed individuals, groups, and governmental entities that had been involved with or shown interest in the original RBTI process of its intent to prepare a Supplemental EIS. For this purpose, the Air Force sent out postcards to all individuals, groups, and governmental entities that had been on the mailing list for the original RBTI Final EIS.

The Air Force, in cooperation with the FAA, published a Notice of Availability for the Draft Supplemental EIS in the *Federal Register* on November 18, 2005 marking the beginning of the official comment period. Soon thereafter, the Air Force placed advertisements in six newspapers within the potentially affected areas to provide detailed information on the dates, times, locations, and format of the public hearings, local repositories within the potentially affected areas where the Air Force made copies of the Draft Supplemental EIS available to the public, duration of the comment period, and contact information for the Air Force.

Between November 10, 2005 and December 14, 2005, the Air Force distributed over 390 hard copies or compact disks (CDs) of the Draft Supplemental EIS to members of the public, organizations, libraries, and government agencies. An Air Force memorandum accompanied each document and listed the date, time, and location of the four public hearings, identified a website on which the Draft Supplemental EIS could be found, and provided a point of contact and address to submit written comments and request additional information.

Although originally slated to end after 45 days (January 3, 2006), the Air Force extended the public comment period for an additional 45 days. A notice was published in the *Federal Register* and press releases were sent to 50 newspapers in Texas and New Mexico announcing extension of the public comment period until February 17, 2006. Between December 5, 2005 and January 28, 2006, the Air Force and FAA conducted a total of five public hearings at locations in the proximity of the proposed action and alternatives. Lubbock, Texas was added as a fifth public hearing location based on requests from interested citizens.

SUPPLEMENTAL PAGES

The SEIS contains supplemental pages for 4-19 and 4-20 of Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the RBTI Final EIS, which examine wake vortex effects. These pages extensively supplement the analysis in the original Final EIS and also address issues raised during the public comment period. The SEIS also includes an introductory discussion and adds responses to comments addressing informal aeronautical information provided by the FAA. These pages attach to Volume II of the RBTI Final EIS, with comments on page 687 and responses on page 38.

IMPACTS

The analysis and data presented in the Final SEIS demonstrates that wake vortices, under normal flight operations, and in all but rare atmospheric conditions, from B-52 or B-1B low altitude flights fail to generate sufficient velocities to damage structures and vehicles, or pose a hazard to people or animals on the ground. The main conclusions derived from the analysis include:

- a) The maximum wind speed caused by vortices does not occur at ground level, but rather at a minimum height related to wing span (on the order of 1/3 of a wing span);
- b) Atmospheric conditions and winds, like those common to west Texas and northeastern New Mexico, may cause accelerated vortex decay and dissipation relative to that predicted by the model. Under rare conditions of calm winds and no atmospheric turbulence, vortices may persist longer and have greater velocities than predicted by the model;

- c) Model results indicate that vortices resulting from standard B-52 training operations would produce minimal velocities of no more than 3 mph at the surface and 27 mph at 66 feet above ground level (AGL);
- d) Vortices produced from standard B-1B flight generate vortex velocities of 10 mph at the surface and 27 mph at 22 feet AGL;
- e) A pull-up maneuver by the B-1B, which may be executed once or twice per sortie-operation, can generate much higher vortex velocities. Rare, rapid turns can also result in higher vortex velocities. These latter events, however are infrequent and the chance of these higher energy vortices impacting a windmill structure is extremely remote and improbable;
- f) Commonly used wind scales demonstrate that the vortices would, except in the case of a combination of B-1B pull-ups or rapid turns and rare atmospheric conditions, produce velocities below those likely to affect structures and objects;
- g) Structures, objects, persons, wildlife, and livestock in the area underlying proposed IR-178 and IR-153 are frequently subject to average winds and wind gusts that match potential B-52 and B-1B vortex wind speeds;
- h) Factors limiting the potential effects of vortices include: only a portion of MTR segments would permit flight down to 300-500 feet AGL, many segments would be flown less than the maximum (i.e., 1560) number of annual sortie-operations incorporated by this ROD, and FAA rules require avoidance of structures; and
- i) The probability of overflight of a windmill along the MTRs for Alternatives B, C, and D would be extremely low.

There would be no cumulative impacts within the scope of the Supplemental EIS from the interaction of RBTI Alternative B with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions.

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MANAGEMENT ACTION

The Air Force will continue implementing mitigation measures and management actions identified in the initial ROD (Air Force 2000b). If anyone suffers harm as the result of damages to ground structures which they believe were caused by B-1 or B-52 wake vortices, that person may submit a claim or make a complaint to the Air Force. The circumstance of each individual claim or complaint will be reviewed to determine whether compensation or some other action is appropriate.

DECISION

After consideration of the potential environmental consequences of the three RBTI action alternatives and the No-Action Alternative analyzed in the original and Supplemental EIS documents, inputs from agencies and the public, and subject matters addressed in the initial ROD (Air Force 2000b) and this ROD, it is my decision to continue implementing Alternative B of the RBTI. This alternative includes the appropriate training assets under Instrument Route (IR) R-178/Lancer Military Operations Area (MOA).

As in the original analysis and decision, this supplemental analysis and decision-making employs all practicable means to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental impacts. This ROD serves as public notification of my decision. This decision has been made based on economic, technical, operational, and environmental considerations.

The Air Force will take appropriate action to request FAA implementation of the airspace modifications necessary to continue implementing Alternative B.

The Air Force will continue to work with the FAA and other federal agencies, state agencies, and local communities relative to the Realistic Bomber Training Initiative. This interaction will form the basis for long-term actions that will continuously address community concerns throughout the life of the proposal. These actions will help achieve the Air Force goal to continuously balance readiness training with environment and community concerns.



CARROL H. CHANDLER, Lt Gen, USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff
Operations, Plans and Requirements



Date

Attachment:

Initial ROD (March 2000)

under the proposed action. Alternative B: IR-178/Lancer MOA and Alternative C: IR-178/Texon MOA are almost entirely in western Texas. Only a small portion of airspace in these alternatives extends into New Mexico. Alternative D: IR-153/Mt. Dora MOA is located primarily in northeastern New Mexico with portions of the MTR extending into northwestern Texas. All three action alternatives predominantly coincide with existing MTR or MOA airspace; little area not currently exposed to overflights would be affected. Under Alternative A: No-Action, the Air Force would continue using existing assets and airspace would remain unchanged. All three action alternatives meet operational goals defined for RBTI. Based on the analysis presented in the EIS, agency input, and public comments, the Air Force believes Alternative B is preferable to Alternatives A, C and D. Alternative B meets all operational requirements with less potential for adverse environmental impacts than Alternative C and significantly less than Alternative D. Therefore, Alternative B is the Air Force's environmentally and operationally preferred alternative.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The public involvement process followed by the Air Force for RBTI included:

- (1) Community meetings prior to issuing a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the RBTI Environmental Impact Statement (EIS);
- (2) Scoping comment period and meetings;
- (3) Intergovernmental /Interagency Coordination for Environmental Planning (IICEP) and Agency consultation; and
- (4) Public comment period and hearings.

Efforts for early public involvement began in December 1997. These efforts consisted of six informal community meetings in Texas and New Mexico to gain input on the RBTI alternative identification process. Input from the community meetings helped shape the alternatives.

Official notification of the Air Force RBTI proposal began with publication of the NOI in the Federal Register on December 19, 1997. In late January and early February 1998, 11 scoping meetings were held in affected communities in Texas, New Mexico, Colorado and Arkansas. This started the scoping period during which the Air Force solicited comments from the public, interest groups and agencies to help define the scope of analysis for the EIS and to aid in identification of additional alternatives. All comments and letters were considered and used to help develop the scope for the analysis for the draft EIS. The scoping period lasted through April 3, 1998, including a 45 day extension. Public involvement continued in April 1998 (following the formal scoping period), when Air Force representatives were invited to participate in two community meetings held in Taos and Angel Fire, New Mexico.

As part of Government-to-Government consultation for RBTI, 32 tribes and/or tribal-affiliated organizations that historically resided in the affected area were notified. At their request, ongoing discussions and consultations have continued throughout the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process with the Jicarilla Apache Tribe and the Taos Pueblo in New Mexico.

Through the IICEP process, appropriate federal, state and local agencies were notified of the proposed action. In total, over 100 IICEP letters were sent to agencies and officials. Comments from these agencies and officials were reviewed for incorporation into the environmental analysis. The IICEP process also provided the Air Force an opportunity to seek and obtain data on resources within the jurisdiction of each agency or organization, and to gather relevant information on issues affecting the RBTI proposal. Meetings with several agencies were conducted, including with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USF&WS) as part of consultation for Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) was a cooperating agency for this EIS.

A 45 day public comment period on the draft EIS began with publication of the Notice of Availability (NOA) on March 19, 1999. As with scoping, a 45-day extension was granted, allowing 90 days total for the public comment period. Fifteen meetings were held in 11 locations in Texas, New Mexico, Colorado and Arkansas. All comments were reviewed and considered in development of the final EIS, and this decision.

The Air Force goal is to continuously balance readiness training with the environment and community concerns. This includes actions during the proposal development process, management actions coincident with project start-up, and most importantly, those long-term actions that continuously address community concerns throughout the life of the project.

DECISION

After considering the operational utility and potential environmental consequences of the three RBTI action alternatives and the No-Action Alternative, the Air Force chooses to implement Alternative B, which involves locating the appropriate training assets under IR-178/Lancer MOA. The Air Force will take action required to request FAA implementation of the airspace modifications necessary to implement Alternative B.

IMPACTS

Historically, the affected airspace under RBTI accommodated aircraft overflights, including military flight training activities and civil aviation. Existing airspace will be used to the maximum extent possible for IR-178 and Lancer MOA. Some airspace will be eliminated and new airspace added. Under Alternative B, airspace management will remain similar to that found today. The potential for conflicts with civil aviation will not be significant, although coordinating with civilian aviators involving weather-modification, crop dusting, ranching and other similar management activities will require increased attention and resources from the Air Force. For Alternative B, average daily sortie operations will range from 1 to 10, depending upon the segment of the MTR. Sortie numbers will vary from an increase of 1 to 6 to a decrease of up to 5 per operational day as compared to historic airspace use on given segments.

Noise levels will range from 45 to 61 dB (Average Day-Night Sound Level [DNL]) for Alternative B. There will be an increase in noise of 2 to 13 dB depending on the route/MOA segment examined. Noise analysis indicated an increase in the percentage of people potentially

highly annoyed under RBTI. For Alternative B, the percentage of highly annoyed people could rise to a maximum of 8 percent for portions of IR-178. Under the Lancer MOA, the analysis showed approximately one percent of the people could be highly annoyed.

Effects of aircraft emissions on air quality and the potential for aircraft mishaps will be inconsequential for Alternative B.

Overall, there would be no likely effects to designated land use, recreation or visual resources. Increases in noise levels from aircraft could be perceived by some as affecting their quality of life. However, the analysis revealed no impacts on recreation, property values, or hunting leases. This is evidenced in other MOAs within the region where recreation, property values and hunting leases remain unaffected by aircraft overflights more numerous than those projected for RBTI. Six communities under Alternative B could experience increases in noise levels of 2 to 8 dB. Aircrews, however, will avoid overflights of communities by the standards set forth in FAA regulations.

Field surveys at the emitter and Electronic Scoring Sites for Alternative B did not identify any threatened, endangered or sensitive species. Under Alternative B, increased overflights would occur over estimated historic Aplomado Falcon habitat; however, only 11 sightings have occurred in the region since 1992. The Air Force has consulted with the USF&WS on the Endangered Species Act relative to RBTI. The USF&WS concurs with the Air Force determination that this action is not likely to adversely affect threatened and endangered species.

Construction of the Electronic Scoring Sites in Texas will result in a beneficial socioeconomic impact. Decommissioning of the Electronic Scoring Sites in Harrison, Arkansas and La Junta, Colorado will result in minimal negative socioeconomic impacts. The effects of flying activities are not expected to produce measurable impacts on the economic value of the land since this area has been generally overflowed since the 1940's. Other factors, such as drought, market prices, community amenities, and proximity to urban areas are more likely to affect land values than military aircraft overflights. The environmental justice analysis established that implementation of Alternative B will have no adverse impact.

The Air Force surveyed the proposed emitter and Electronic Scoring Sites for cultural resources that could be affected by construction and ground operations. One archaeological site could be affected under Alternative B. However, impacts to this site could be avoided or mitigated to insignificance through completion of the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act and employment of a combination of avoidance, monitoring, testing, and data recovery (if needed), or selection of an alternative site. Existing research and consultation with appropriate Native American tribes indicated no identified traditional resources within the affected airspace of Alternative B. Although 15 National Register-listed properties could be overflowed, overflights will occur in areas already subject to military aircraft overflights and aircraft would not create a new visual or audible feature in an otherwise historic or traditional landscape. Noise from aircraft overflights would not reach levels likely to damage structures. Therefore, the effects of visual or audible intrusions or damage from noise or vibrations would be negligible. No National Historic Landmarks are located under Alternative B.

Proper management will be followed to reduce effects of any potential short-term wind and water erosion of surface soils to insignificant levels. Landowners will retain control of any mineral or water rights. No long-term impacts to water resources will occur as a result of construction or use of the Electronic Scoring Sites or emitters.

There would be no cumulative impacts from the interaction of RBTI Alternative B with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The mitigation measures presented below reflect specific actions the Air Force will take to reduce the potential for particular effects to resources, as identified in the EIS.

- (1) The Air Force will reduce potential impact (as identified by USF&WS) to Aplomado Falcon habitat by:
 - (a) Evaluating the areas under IR 178 that are not currently being surveyed.
 - (b) Expanding the ongoing Aplomado Falcon survey into areas the evaluation determines may be Aplomado Falcon habitat.

- (2) The Air Force will avoid or reduce potential impacts to biological and cultural resources from construction or modification of access roads, power lines, and telephone lines by:
 - (a) Consulting with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).
 - (b) Consulting with USF&WS.
 - (c) Surveying rights-of-way for cultural and biological resources.
 - (d) Realigning rights-of-way to avoid resources, where feasible.
 - (e) Developing and implementing site-specific mitigation measures, if required.

- (3) The Air Force will avoid or reduce potential impacts to cultural resources from the decommissioning of the La Junta Electronic Scoring Site, including disposition of lands out of federal ownership, by completion of the National Historic Preservation Act's Section 106 process.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

In addition to the mitigation measures described above, two types of management actions are designed to address concerns:

Management Actions incorporated into the proposal: These actions used project design, configuration, and/or component location to reduce or eliminate potential impacts to a resource or suite of resources. Such actions include the use of existing information or data collected as part of the public involvement process to avoid siting alternative components in areas or settings known to contain resources that could be significantly

affected. Such avoidance is not absolute; rather it is balanced with training and operational considerations needed to perform realistic bomber training.

- (1) Citizens expressed concerns about creating new military airspace. The Air Force followed the FAA policy of using existing airspace to the maximum extent possible. This proposal used 85% existing airspace by:
 - (a) Linking segments of existing MTRs to form a complete MTR, IR 178.
 - (b) Linking portions of three existing MOAs to form a complete MOA, the Lancer MOA.
- (2) Concerns were expressed about the structure of the proposed MTR, IR 178. The Air Force reduced noise related to individual overflights and associated effects by raising the floor of several segments of the proposed IR 178.
- (3) Agencies expressed concerns that flexibility was needed in the number and siting of emitter sites and Electronic Scoring Sites to address potential environmental impacts. The Air Force provided flexibility and minimized impact by:
 - (a) Considering more sites than would be required for the Electronic Scoring Sites and emitter sites.
 - (b) Eliminating many candidate sites that contained known historical sites, or were located too close to homes, large structures, and obvious bodies of water.
- (4) The public expressed concerns with potential environmental consequences due to site and infrastructure construction associated with emitter sites and Electronic Scoring Sites. The Air Force minimized impact by:
 - (a) Selecting candidate sites as close as possible to existing roads, as well as power and telephone lines so that less area would be affected by construction.
 - (b) Choosing previously disturbed areas, where feasible.
 - (c) Conducting surveys to locate sensitive cultural or biological resources to avoid or minimize disturbance.
- (5) Citizens expressed concerns about exposing the public to radio frequency energy from emitters. The Air Force minimized risk and ensured public safety by using sites that contain an 800 X 800 foot fenced area that provides 150 feet of extra safe-separation distance.
- (6) Concerns were expressed that construction and maintenance of emitter sites and Electronic Scoring Sites could increase erosion and therefore affect soils and water resources. The Air Force will minimize impacts, preserve wetlands and drainages, and reduce erosion by specifying best management practices and selecting sites that avoid wetlands, drainages, and areas with sloped terrain.

- (7) The public and agencies expressed concerns regarding the altitude of the MOA floor. The Air Force will provide additional separation between military operations and civil aviation by establishing the floor of the MOA above the Instrument Approach Procedures minimum altitudes for all airports under or adjacent to the Lancer MOA.

Management Actions to address community/agency concerns: These actions were developed to address concerns voiced by the public and agencies. These concerns were received through oral and written comments during the public comment period.

- (1) Citizens expressed concerns about the increased number of flights proposed for IR 178. The Air Force will reduce the impact of individual low-altitude-flights, compared to projections in the EIS, by limiting the annual sortie-operations to 1,560 (about 6 per day), instead of the proposed 2,600 (about 10 per day).
- (2) The public expressed concerns that the floor of some segments of the proposed IR 178 were proposed to be lower (200 feet AGL) than the minimum flight altitude of 300 feet AGL. The Air Force will institute IR 178 segment altitudes that correspond with minimum flight altitudes by raising the floor of all segments of IR 178 to a minimum of 300 feet AGL.
- (3) Agencies and the public expressed concerns about the interaction between military use of the Lancer MOA and underlying airport traffic. They also indicated concern about the interaction between military use of IR 178 and the Lancer MOA with general aviation activities in the region. The Air Force will increase communication opportunities with civil aviators by establishing a 1-800 telephone number to Dyess AFB for airspace schedule information. Additionally, the Air Force will allow easier access to local airports, raise awareness and avoid potential conflicts between military and general aviation aircraft flying in local airspace by establishing a Military Radar Unit (MRU) and real-time communications. The MRU will be operational concurrently and co-located with the en route Electronic Scoring Site, and will become a critical part of the long-term actions that continuously address community concerns.
- (4) The public expressed concerns about conflicts between military flights and local aviation in the vicinity of the proposed re-entry route on IR 178. The Air Force will reduce the potential for conflicts by raising the floor of the IR 178 re-entry route to 6,000 feet MSL.
- (5) Concerns were expressed that there could be an increase in noise complaints and some citizens indicated that noise complaints are not handled effectively. The Air Force will provide improved communication opportunities between the public and the Dyess AFB Public Affairs Office by publicizing an existing 1-800 telephone number, and encouraging citizens to contact the base with concerns or complaints.

- (6) The public and agencies expressed concern about the potential adverse effect on known cultural resources associated with locating the en route Electronic Scoring Site near Dyess AFB. The Air Force will continue to develop and examine ways to minimize these potential effects to include the possibility of locating the en route Electronic Scoring Site on an evaluated candidate site under the Lancer MOA, at a local municipal airport, or other suitable location. In the event this management action leads to a substantive change, the Air Force will undertake any additional environmental analysis required by this change. Additionally, aircraft overflights will be limited to 5,000 AGL or higher when within 3 nautical miles of the en route Electronic Scoring Site.
- (7) Although not addressed in the EIS, the Air Force will also implement the following initiatives to further enhance public involvement:
- (a) Designate Dyess AFB as the single point of contact for all noise complaints within the confines of the Lancer MOA.
 - (b) Create a web site to provide the public RBTI information.
 - (c) Establish a team to routinely gather public issues and information to address citizen concerns.

SUMMARY

The Air Force will continue to work with the FAA and other federal agencies, state agencies, and local communities during and after the establishment of the Realistic Bomber Training Initiative. This interaction will aid in the reduction of noise impacts on the affected area and form the basis for long-term actions that will continuously address community concerns throughout the life of the project. These actions will help achieve the Air Force goal to continuously balance readiness training with the environment and community concerns.

The EIS used public involvement to identify alternatives and impacts, and assess the environmental consequences associated with the Realistic Bomber Training Initiative. Where feasible, the Air Force developed mitigation measures and management actions to minimize the environmental impact and address the concerns and comments of agencies and the public.



MARVIN R. ESMOND, Lt Gen. USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff
Air & Space Operations