



# U.S. Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth (NAS JRB Fort Worth) Regional Coordination Committee (RCC)

**AGENDA**  
NAS JRB Fort Worth Regional Coordination Committee  
April 19, 2021  
1:30 pm

The RCC meeting on April 19, 2021, will be conducted as a virtual meeting via Zoom.

## Voting Entities

City of Benbrook

City of Fort Worth

City of Lake Worth

City of River Oaks

City of Sansom Park

City of Westworth Village

City of White Settlement

Tarrant County

## Non-Voting Entities

Benbrook Area  
Chamber of Commerce

DOD Office of Local  
Defense Community  
Cooperation

Fort Worth Chamber  
of Commerce

Fort Worth Independent  
School District

Lockheed Martin

Naval Air Station Joint  
Reserve Base, Fort Worth

North Central Texas  
Council of Governments

Tarrant Regional Water  
District

Texas Department of  
Transportation

Trinity Metro

White Settlement Area  
Chamber of Commerce

All participants can log into Zoom to view the presentations live.  
Go to [join.zoom.us](https://join.zoom.us) | Enter Meeting ID: 815 9682 0878

For audio only, call +1 346-248-7799 (toll-free) and enter the Meeting ID. The presentations will be available to download in advance at [www.nctcog.org/rcc](http://www.nctcog.org/rcc).

### Item 1

Welcome and Roll Call  
Dennis Shingleton, Chair

### Item 2

NAS JRB Fort Worth Tenant Commands Series: Tenth Air Force  
Major General Brian K. Borgen, US Air Force

### Item 3

Approval of January 25, 2021 Meeting Summary (Action)  
Dennis Shingleton, Chair

### Item 4

Election of 2021-2022 Officers (Action)  
Dennis Shingleton, Chair

### Item 5

Tarrant County Transportation Bond Program  
Randy Skinner and Mike Galizio, Tarrant County

### Item 6

SH 183 Update  
Helen Tran and Joy Carter, TxDOT, and Brad Hernandez, AECOM

### Item 7

Noise Mitigation and Encroachment Management  
Ed Spurlin, NAS JRB Fort Worth

### Item 8

NAS JRB Fort Worth Update  
Captain Mark McLean, NAS JRB Fort Worth

### Item 9

Legislative Update  
Nick Allen, NCTCOG

### Item 10

Administrative Updates, Amanda Wilson, NCTCOG  
- Scheduling Update  
- Media Alerts  
- Correspondence  
- Attendance Report

### Item 11

Public Comments

**Next Meeting**  
July 19, 2021  
Location TBD

**Naval Air Station Fort Worth, Joint Reserve Base  
Regional Coordination Committee  
April 2021**

**Voting Members**

Dennis Shingleton, **Chair**  
Councilmember  
City of Fort Worth

Debbie Whitley, **Vice Chair**  
Assistant City Manager/Director of Finance  
City of Lake Worth

Randy Skinner, **Treasurer**  
Planning Manager  
Tarrant County

**Secretary**

Vacant

Jack Adkison, **Immediate Past Chair**  
Former Councilmember  
City of River Oaks

Stacey Almond  
City Manager  
City of Lake Worth

Dan Chisholm  
Councilmember  
City of River Oaks

Mike Coleman  
Citizen Representative  
City of Westworth Village

Carolyn Gilmore  
Police Chief  
City of Sansom Park

Jeff James  
City Manager  
City of White Settlement

Laura Mackey  
Councilmember  
City of Benbrook

Dr. Larry Marshall  
Councilmember  
City of Benbrook

Alice Moore  
Precinct 4 Administrator  
Tarrant County

Paul Moore  
Councilmember  
City of White Settlement

Mike Murray  
City Manager  
City of Westworth Village

Paul Paine  
Citizen Representative  
City of Fort Worth

Angie Winkle  
City Administrator  
City of Sansom Park

**Non-Voting Members**

Art Cavazos  
Chief of District Operations  
Fort Worth ISD

Terri Davis  
President  
Benbrook Area Chamber of Commerce

Grant Jackson  
Member  
White Settlement Area Chamber of Commerce

Dan Kessler  
Assistant Director of Transportation  
North Central Texas Council of Governments

Captain Mark McLean  
Commanding Officer  
Naval Air Station Fort Worth, Joint Reserve Base

Rebecca Young Montgomery  
Senior Vice President, Advocacy  
Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce

Tina Nikolic  
Neighborhood and Recreation Enhancement  
Coordinator  
Tarrant Regional Water District

Kenneth B. Ross  
Director, Communications & Public Affairs  
Lockheed Martin

Sandip Sen  
Transit Planner  
Trinity Metro

Jay Sweat  
Department of Defense  
Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation

Vacant  
Texas Department of Transportation  
Fort Worth District



*Meeting Summary January 25, 2021*

**DRAFT Meeting Summary**

**NAS JRB Fort Worth Regional Coordination Committee  
January 25, 2021  
1:30 p.m.**

**Remote Access  
via  
Zoom Meeting**

The Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth (NAS JRB Fort Worth) Regional Coordination Committee (RCC) convened at 1:30 p.m. on January 25, 2021. The meeting was hosted by COG through Zoom meeting. Due to the nature of the virtual meeting technology, a full list of attendees will not be provided. Roll was called for Voting Members and that information is reflected here.

**Voting Members in Attendance**

Councilmember Dennis Shingleton, Chair, City of Fort Worth  
Debbie Whitley, Vice Chair, City of Lake Worth  
Randy Skinner, Treasurer, Tarrant County  
Stacey Almond, City of Lake Worth  
Councilmember Dan Chisholm, City of River Oaks  
Mike Coleman, City of Westworth Village  
Jeff James, City of White Settlement  
Councilmember Laura Mackey, City of Benbrook  
Councilmember Dr. Larry Marshall, City of Benbrook  
Councilmember Paul Moore, City of White Settlement  
Paul Paine, City of Fort Worth  
Angie Winkle, City of Sansom Park

**Meeting Summary Outline**

1. Welcome and Roll Call
2. Approval of October 19, 2020 Meeting Summary (Action)
3. Officer Nominating Committee Report
4. NAS JRB Fort Worth Tenant Commands Series: Commander, Fleet Logistics Support Wing (CFLSW)
5. Joint Land Use Study Implementation Grant Update
6. Development Review Project Update
7. NAS JRB Fort Worth Update
8. Administrative Updates
  - Scheduling Update
  - West Tarrant Alliance Group Scheduling Update
  - Transportation Project Implementation Update
  - Media Alerts
  - Correspondence
  - Attendance Report
9. Public Comments



*Meeting Summary January 25, 2021*

**Item 1. Welcome and Roll Call:**

Councilmember Dennis Shingleton called the Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

**Item 2. Approval of October 19, 2020, Meeting Summary (Action):**

The motion to approve the meeting summary was made by Mike Coleman. Councilmember Larry Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**Item 3. Officer Nominating Committee Report:**

Councilmember Shingleton provided an overview of the nominations committee and announced the list of proposed RCC officers. There was a general agreement to move the slate of officers to the next meeting for action. No additional nominations were received from the floor.

The officer nomination slate is as follows:

Mike Coleman, City of Westworth Village, as Chair  
Councilmember Dr. Larry Marshall, City of Benbrook, as Vice-Chair  
Councilmember Dan Chisholm, City of River Oaks, as Secretary  
Jeff James, City of White Settlement, as Treasurer

**Item 4. NAS JRB Fort Worth Tenant Commands Series: Commander, Fleet Logistics Support Wing (CFLSW):**

Captain Todd Boland, USN. Commander FLSW, with NAS JRB Fort Worth, presented on the Fleet Logistics Support Wing. The headquarters is located at the NAS JRB in Fort Worth. Captain Boland said the wing supports 14 separate squadrons (located from Italy to Hawaii), with 52 aircraft (3 types supported are the K/C – 130T “Hercules”, C-40 A “Clipper”, C-37A/B – “Gulfstream”) and 2,900 personnel.

He gave background on the wing to the group. Established in December 1941, the Navy VR squadron was created to support the War in the Pacific. The initial pilot training center was established with American Airlines at Meacham Field the same year. After the war, the Navy retained a core group to support Navy Unique Fleet Essential Airlift requirements. This support has expanded and continues today under the Fleet Logistics Support Wing. The wing serves as an on-demand logistics support site for fleet operations 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Captain Boland said global fleet support and international response capability is demonstrated through the Navy Air Logistics Office (NALO) in New Orleans by scheduling logistics missions; and Forward Fleets schedule deployed aircraft in Bahrain, Sigonella, Italy, and Atsugi, Japan with aircraft/personnel rotating every 45-60 days during the pandemic.

Some of the events Captain Boland said he is proud of was the wing provided support to the USS Theodore Roosevelt during a COVID outbreak in Guam, and in moving 1,200 sailors a month from boot camp to follow-on training to mitigate COVID risks to the sailors.



Meeting Summary January 25, 2021

#### **Item 5. Joint Land Use Study Implementation Grant Update:**

Amanda Wilson presented an update on the JLUS Implementation Grant. This is an 18-month grant which is scheduled to be finished by February 2022. Amanda gave a summary of the grant scope of work and grant tasks that are underway. Some of the current efforts that have taken place are updates to the project theme, logo, design style and website updates, notably [www.nctcoq.org/jlus](http://www.nctcoq.org/jlus) and [www.JoiningForcesNTX.org](http://www.JoiningForcesNTX.org). There have been no updates to the RCC webpage. She also said several tasks related to sound attenuation have been started, and we are looking to see if there are any assistance programs presently available for energy efficiency that will create benefits with sound efficiency. Parcel compatibility as it relates to sound attenuation will be a work focus issue until 2022.

Other major grant tasks that occurred, since the last RCC meeting, were virtual meetings coordinating with other agencies in Texas working on JLUS projects or implementation of JLUS projects. Participants were Council of Governments, counties, and cities who are in the middle of, finished, or implementing a JLUS. The first virtual meeting in November 2020 was mainly introductions; individuals and issues at each Texas installation. The second virtual meeting discussed the top priority – the upcoming legislative session. There were five issues in the legislative arena in the areas of compatible development, the main one being SB 149 - the critical infrastructure/UAS bill which garnered a broad agreement of support across the state. It is a high priority for the Texas Commanders Council. Dan Kessler followed up Amanda's overview by highlighting another legislative issue regarding limited county authority to approve wind farm siting. One was approved in the Del Rio area (approximately 200,000 acres in size) directly adjacent to Laughlin Air Force Base. Dan said it can potentially become a huge issue in the future.

Amanda said both coordination meetings were very helpful and quarterly meetings will be scheduled.

#### **Item 6. Development Review Project Update:**

Amanda Wilson presented three projects in the City of Lake Worth submitted through the Development Review Tool since the last RCC meeting. They are Project 128, Project 130, and Project 131, in particular, is a replat. It is a combination of two plots of land for a single-family home remodel. NAS JRB Fort Worth had no objections to any of the proposed projects. Amanda relayed to please submit projects for a zoning or land use change to the Development Tool and the RCC will provide comments and feedback.

#### **Item 7. NAS JRB Fort Worth Update**

Captain Mark McLean introduced Sr. Chief Clinton Cochran to give a slide presentation on the NAS JRB Fort Worth Counter Small UAS (Unmanned Aircraft System) Program. Chief Cochran said the base has a couple of drone detection systems for use. The systems can pick up a large number of various manufacturers, makes, and models of drones around the vicinity of the base. One is a Fixed System which is a fixed antenna mounted semi-permanently on base with a coverage radius of potential detection and electronic countermeasure defense. It has the capability to detect 85% of drones on the consumer market. The other is a Mobile System which is a mobile emitter system with the ability to employ security patrol forces capable of electronic attack by means of overwhelming sensors on UAS. UAS will respond as programmed in the event of loss of connection with the controller. Sr. Chief Cochran said as of 2020 the FAA requires all



*Meeting Summary January 25, 2021*

drone pilots to register their drone with the agency and to provide their serial number (which also will be broadcasted during flight) not only in Texas but the United States as well. This ensures the base will have drone owner contact information, location, and identification. UAS/drone operators who plan to fly within 5 miles of the NAS JRB Fort Worth fence line must contact Base Operations prior to flight. Mike Coleman asked when will the system go into effect. Sr. Chief Cochran said it went into effect last March/April. Captain McLean said the main area of interest for the system is just inside the base's fence line.

Captain Mark McLean gave an update on the health of the installation. He said there have been 500 total cases of COVID since last March averaging 20-30 a day and 19 total hospitalizations. As of January 20, there are 28 cases and 2 unfortunate losses. Masks are mandatory on base following Executive Order. Captain McLean reported that Moderna vaccinations have begun for service and civilians – 500 total with 800 doses received.

Captain McLean gave the good news that on January 8<sup>th</sup>, the Secretary of the Air Force gave a Record of Decision naming the 301<sup>st</sup> as an operational beddown location of the F-35. It will be the first Air Force reserve unit for the F-35. They said Lockheed Martin being located across the runway of the base made NAS JRB Fort Worth an optimal location. The first F-35 should appear summer of fiscal year 2024.

The base is planning events (all COVID dependent) to hold a drive-in July 4<sup>th</sup> fireworks show, a Veteran's Day event in November of 2021 and an 80<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Pearl Harbor celebration on December 7, 2021.

#### **Item 8. Administrative Updates:**

- **Scheduling Update:** The next RCC meeting will take place Monday, April 19, 2021 via Zoom.
- **West Tarrant Alliance Group Scheduling Update:** The next meeting scheduled for February 4, 2021 has been cancelled.
- **Transportation Project Implementation Update:** Dan Kessler said the Westworth Village Bike Trail project is complete. The next project focus will be connecting Westworth to the Bomber Spur Bike Trail.
- **Media Alerts:** Included in the packets.
- **Correspondence:** Included in the packets.
- **Attendance Reports:** Included in the packets.

#### **Item 9. Public Comments:**

There were no public comments made.

**TARRANT COUNTY 2021 TRANSPORTATION BOND PROGRAM POLICY  
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQs)**

- 1) Does the City have to pay for 100% of the roadway project initially before it can be reimbursed by the County for the 50% share from the Call for Projects category?**

No. If the project is selected for funding, the City and Tarrant County will enter into an interlocal agreement (ILA) that will include a reimbursement schedule that allows the City to request reimbursement as the project proceeds. The City is not required to wait until the project is complete to request reimbursement.

- 2) If the City's project is selected for bond funding, how would the money be distributed?**

The distribution of the bond funds will be dependent upon passage of the bond election, the timing of the issuance (sale) of the bonds, and the execution of an interlocal agreement (ILA) between the City and Tarrant County. The ILA will include a reimbursement payment schedule that takes into account the awarded amount and the construction schedule submitted by the City.

- 3) Will the Bond Program fund cost overruns for a project selected for funding in the Call for Projects category?**

No. The lead agency is responsible for the cost overruns. However, the lead agency may request additional funding for any project with cost overruns from the Discretionary funding category subject to Commissioner Court approval. Also, as noted in the Transportation Bond Policy, if a project cost comes in under anticipated levels, the County will only fund up to fifty (50%) of the actual project costs.

- 4) The City has multiple projects that it wants to apply for, but currently does not have the funding available for all of them. However, the City does have a bond election later this year that, if approved, will provide funding to multiple roadway projects. Would we be able to count this funding for the grants? If so, how can we prove the intent to have this money available?**

We suggest that you include the future City bond funds as part of the local match for consideration by the Project Evaluation Committee (PEC). The project submittal should state that the City's funding match is contingent on a future bond election and should include the bond election schedule. The submittal should also include any additional information (e.g. previous success with bond elections) to demonstrate the likelihood of this bond measure being passed or if other funding sources are available for the project.

- 5) As part of the grant, does the municipality have to have 100% funding for the project at time of the application, or just 50%?**

For each project submittal in the Call for Projects funding category, the City must be able to show the committed and anticipated funding sources for just the 50% local match. Each project submittal should include the cost estimate for all phases of the project (preliminary engineering, design, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation, and construction).

**6) Will storm drain and water/sewer improvements eligible for reimbursement?**

Yes. The relocation or replacement of utilities within the right-of-way are eligible if done in conjunction with a roadway improvement; stand-alone utility projects that are not required as part of a road improvement project are not eligible.

**7) Can the County provide us with a sample copy of a Mayor Letter of Request or City Resolution?**

Yes. Upon request, the County can provide sample documents from the 2006 Transportation Bond Program to serve as a guide. Please contact Mike Galizio or Randy Skinner with the Transportation Services Department. You can use the same resolution for more than one project submittal.

**8) Are you able to provide a sample application to us?**

The County does not have a standard format or application form that cities must follow, so cities have the flexibility with the format of their project submittals. Each project submittal should be kept to 10 pages and must include the following items:

- Letter of Request from the City's Mayor;
- City Resolution by the governing body supporting the project(s) submittal;
- Identification of each project's cost estimate and funding sources;
- Detailed description of each project, including concept drawings or preliminary schematics; and
- If the project is included in a local planning document (e.g. Master Thoroughfare Plan), please identify the plan and the date of its adoption by the submitting agency.

**9) Can you provide any additional guidance on what issues should be addressed in the narrative and schedule for our project submittal?**

The project narrative should focus on how the project meets the Program Goals (increase mobility, reduce congestion, enhance safety, improve connectivity, priority to "shelf ready" projects) identified in the Bond Policy. Since each project submittal is limited to ten pages, the narrative should be concise.

The submittal should include the project schedule, including the start and end timeline for all phases of the project (preliminary engineering, design, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation, and construction).



**10) Is the installation of internet structure (e.g. at least broadband, if not 5G connectivity), mobility innovation, and other transportation technologies (e.g. Radar, Lidar, GPS and Video, and necessary components for artificial intelligence systems to manage and control autonomous vehicles and other forms of communication) eligible for bond funding?**

In general, County bond funds can be used for certain technological advances that improve the road or the ability to utilize the road. Given the unique nature of such projects, each project submittal will have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, creating the infrastructure for the roads so that autonomous vehicle technology can be used is eligible for consideration.

**11) Is the County planning on public meetings after the selection of projects in the Call for Projects category?**

The County will publish notice of the election according to statutory requirements. However, no public meetings are planned at this time. Should any public meeting be scheduled, notice will be posted to the Bond Program website at: [www.tarrantcounty.com/tbp](http://www.tarrantcounty.com/tbp)

**12) In addition to the Call for Projects category, should we submit projects for consideration in the Discretionary and the Countywide Initiatives and Partnerships funding categories?**

Tarrant County is requesting projects for consideration in the Call for Projects category only at this time. However, cities are encouraged to coordinate with your respective Commissioner and the County Judge regarding any potential project submittals for any of the funding categories.

**13) How do you define “shovel ready”?**

As defined in the Bond Policy, “shovel ready” refers to projects that, if selected for funding, will be fully funded and can begin construction within five years from the date that the bond election (November 2, 2021) is approved by voters.

**14) If our project is selected for funding, can the City be reimbursed for any project costs incurred prior to the execution of the bond funding interlocal agreement with Tarrant County?**

Project costs incurred before the bond election date (November 2, 2021) are ineligible for reimbursement. Project costs incurred after the bond election date are eligible.

**15) Can traffic signals or intersection improvements be packaged together into a program and submitted in one project submittal?**

As allowed in the 2006 program, signal programs can be submitted as one project submittal; however, we recommend that the construction/installation schedule for each signal should be included in the project submittal.

Because of their higher costs and variable schedules, intersection improvements should be submitted as separate projects. The same applies to individual phases of multi-phase projects.

**16) Where can we get information on the “priority corridors” that were referenced in the Bond Policy?**

The reference to “priority corridors” in the Bond Policy is referring to those corridors identified by the Commissioners Court as having priority in meeting the goals of the proposed bond program. For example, the County conducted a preliminary analysis a few years ago to prioritize roadway corridors west of IH-35W called the “West Tarrant Transportation Initiative”. If the bond election passes, we anticipate that the Court may revisit these corridors or other corridors recommended by TxDOT, NCTCOG, or other entities.

**17) Where can we get information about the TxDOT and NCTCOG performance measure targets that were referenced in the Bond Policy?**

The TxDOT and NCTCOG performance measure targets pertain to the “on-system” roadways (TxDOT) and “off-system” roadways included on the National Highway System (NHS). For more information about the NHS and the related federal performance measures, please refer to FHWA’s NHS web page and NCTCOG’s Federal Performance Measures web page below.

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/national\\_highway\\_system/](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/national_highway_system/)  
<https://www.nctcog.org/trans/data/info/measures/system>

**18) Are transit related projects eligible for funding in the Tarrant County Transportation Bond Program?**

Tarrant County does not have statutory authority to expend County funds, including bond funds, on transit related projects.

**19) Our project has already started. Are we still eligible for funding in the County’s Bond Program?**

Projects that are underway may be eligible. However, any project costs incurred prior to the date of the bond election date (November 2, 2021) are not eligible for reimbursable.

**20) Our project already has funding from other sources. Can we submit for additional funds from the County?**

Yes, if current funding will not cover the total project costs as currently designed. However, through the Bond Program's Call for Projects category, Tarrant County will typically only fund up to fifty percent (50%) of the remainder necessary to fully fund the project.

**21) Our project received previous County assistance. Can we submit for funding additional work?**

Projects that have received previous County funding or will receive County funding from a different source other than the 2021 Transportation Bond Program will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

**22) Will the Bond Program fund overlays or reconstruction projects?**

Yes. However, unless funded with discretionary bond funds, these projects are subject to local match requirements and their prioritization is subject to an evaluation process that focuses on the criteria defined by the Bond Program Policy.

**23) How should we submit projects that have multiple segments or phases?**

Cities are encouraged to submit each project segment or phase independently, as each may be scored and prioritized differently.

**24) We would like to submit a partnership project that extends beyond our city limits. Is this permissible?**

Yes. However, we will require that one entity be designated as the lead agency for project implementation and for serving as the recipient of bond funds. Any agreements between partnering entities to designate the lead agency must be executed prior to the County entering into an interlocal agreement with the lead agency to commit the bond funding.

**25) May we submit a project for only one project element, such as right-of-way preservation, utility relocation, or design?**

Yes. However, the County reserves the right to assess the viability of a project when considering approval for funding.

**26) Is a local funding match required for projects that are funded through the Discretionary category?**

No. Although a local match is desired, a Commissioners Court member may elect to recommend to the full Commissioners Court that a project be fully funded using that Court member's discretionary fund allocation.

## **Fort Worth base will be home to Lockheed Martin F-35 fighter jets, Rep. Kay Granger says**

BY BRIAN LOPEZ  
FEBRUARY 01, 2021

Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth is set to be the home of F-35 fighter jets, new cargo aircraft and an airborne medical transport, U.S. Rep. Kay Granger said Monday.

Twenty-six Lockheed Martin F-35s will replace the aging F-16s used by the 301st Fighter Wing squadron, Granger said during a press conference at the base. Having the F-35s in Fort Worth has been in the works since March 2020. The fighter jets are built at Lockheed Martin Aeronautics in Fort Worth, which is next to the base.

The 301st Fighter Wing squadron is expected to receive its first F-35 jet in the summer of 2024, according to a press release.

The Texas Air National Guard's aging C-130-H aircraft, used for cargo and personnel transport, will be replaced with the new C-130J models. Sen. John Cornyn previously announced that the U.S. Air Force selected Fort Worth to house eight new C-130J aircraft and the planes would arrive in 2022 or early 2023.

The J models reduce manpower requirements, lowers operating and support costs and provide life-cycle cost savings.

"I'm glad the Air Force made the right decision to bring these modern aircraft forward, which add capability, performance and value," Granger said.

Fort Worth will also be the newest location of an aeromedical evacuation squadron, which uses aircraft to evacuate wounded military personnel and civilians from danger to medical facilities.

"It's amazing to see the same runway that trained pilots for World War II, now supporting the future of American air power," she said.

<https://www.star-telegram.com/news/local/fort-worth/article248923629.html>

## Air National Guard Delivers Water, Aid After Texas Winter Storm



Texas Air National Guardsmen from the 181st Airlift Squadron load pallets of water on a C-130H Hercules February 19, 2021, at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, Texas. Several aircraft delivered much needed bottled water to towns in South Texas after the devastating North America Winter Storm. (Texas Air National Guard photos by Master Sgt. Lynn Means)

FEBRUARY 26, 2021 – A winter storm without a name is just chilly weather. But when the National Weather Service names it, it becomes the winter storm of a lifetime ... or at least in the eyes of Texas.

From Feb. 14-20, Winter Storm Uri — the worst polar vortex to hit Texas since 1989 — spread cataclysmic damage and sent temperatures plummeting into the teens and single digits for more than four million Texans. Nicknamed “Snow-mageddon” by many, Uri’s cold wave resulted in widespread power outages. As homes lost power and temperatures dropped, water pipes froze, and in many cases, burst, leaving Texans without usable water or the energy source to boil it to render it potable.

In coordination with the Texas Division of Emergency Management, or TDEM, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA delivered approximately 1,300 tons of bottled water here to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth for central and

south Texas communities without potable drinking water and likely to remain so for days or weeks to come.

Enter the Texas Air National Guard. Even before the snow and ice began to thaw, these Airmen soared into action to serve their fellow Texans.

With props spinning in record time, the 136th Airlift Wing's C-130H Hercules flew more than 26 missions to places as far west as Abilene and Del Rio to far south including McAllen and Corpus Christi where additional Texas Guardsmen were waiting to distribute the water to local residents in need. Other aircraft, such as C-130Js, C-17 Globemaster IIIs and various rotary craft, augmented the deliveries.

Capt. Dave Ruthenbeck, 181st Airlift Squadron C-130H pilot, flew the mission. He said he wanted to pay it forward after having been without power or water for 35 hours himself.

"Now that I've got my power back, I want to help others not as fortunate," Ruthenbeck said. "We've got about 35,000 pounds of water loaded here and are headed to Austin. We've been flying water since Thursday (Feb. 18) and will continue until it's all delivered."

Working around the clock, Texas Army and Air National Guardsmen orchestrated the delivery of more than 40,000 cases of water themselves, while working in tandem with TDEM and other agencies, first responders, county officials, and volunteers to deliver millions of bottles of water overall, plus food and other necessities to Texans in need.

Tech. Sgt. Joshua Smith, 181st AS loadmaster, said he wanted to find a way to help his neighbors and delivering the water was a good start.

"I love helping people," Smith said. "People need water around the state right now and we're doing the job and making it happen. This is the greatest job that you can have!"

More than 300 local Guardsmen were activated in the Houston and San Antonio areas to help staff warming stations and support neighbors without power and water. Texas government officials and TDEM stated they will continue working to ensure the federal government provides appropriate assistance to individual Texans as well as to the state and local governments.

Texans in need of disaster assistance may apply at [disasterassistance.gov](https://www.disasterassistance.gov), or by calling FEMA at 800-621-3362.

By Julie Briden-Garcia, 136th Airlift Wing

# Congress Could Buy Fewer 'Fiasco' F-35 Fighters

"The more we buy, the worse the overall performance has been," said one key Congressman about the problematic plane.

**BY KYLE MIZOKAMI**

MAR 24, 2021

A key Congressman recently called the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program a "fiasco" and warned high costs associated with the plane would come to an end.

In a hearing last week, Rep. John Garamendi (D-Calif.), chairman of the House Armed Services Readiness subcommittee, singled out the "huge problem" with the F-35: "We buy more planes [but] we're not able to maintain the older ones, so the more we buy, the worse the overall performance has been. That is going to stop."

Garamendi is hardly the first Congressman to criticize the F-35 program. Earlier this month, Rep. Adam Smith, D-Wash., the new head of the House Armed Services Committee, called the F-35 a "rathole." Smith suggested the Pentagon should "cut its losses" and invest in a range of jets.

This content is imported from {embed-name}. You may be able to find the same content in another format, or you may be able to find more information, at their web site.

The U.S. Air Force plans to buy 1,763 F-35s and the Navy and Air Force will buy 693 of the planes, for a total of 2,456 aircraft.

It isn't clear which cost problem Garamendi was talking about. The F-35 is actually growing cheaper to buy, with unit costs falling as the Pentagon and allies buy more planes, and contractor Lockheed Martin makes the manufacturing process more efficient. Garamendi may have been referencing the operating costs, as the F-35 currently costs \$35,000 per hour to fly (recently down from \$44,000), compared to \$27,000 per hour for other jets.

Cost per hour adds up fast. Let's assume a single 24-jet F-35 squadron includes 24 pilots. (The actual number of pilots is typically higher, but varies from unit to unit.) The Air Force, as one example, wants each pilot to have a minimum of 200 hours of flight time a year. At \$35,000 a year, it costs \$168 million for 24 pilots to get their annual flight hours. A F-15 squadron, on the other hand, would cost \$129 million. A pilot with 1,000 hours in the cockpit, or 5 years of steady flying, would cost \$35 million alone.

Furthermore, the costs scale up. The Air Force could afford to fly 26 squadrons of cheaper planes for the same price as 20 squadrons of F-35s.

The Air Force desperately needs the cost per flight hour of the F-35 to come down. The goal is to arrive at \$25,000 per hour by 2025, but the service has already warned that may not be possible.

Garamendi might have also been alluding to the cost of upgrading older F-35s to keep them flying. In the 2000s, the Pentagon decided to begin low-rate production of the F-35 before the aircraft was complete. Under a concept known as concurrency, Lockheed Martin started producing planes prior to the design being finalized in order to get them into the hands of pilots faster. That's the good news.

The bad news? There are hundreds of older F-35s out there—nearly \$40 billion worth of planes—that will require upgrades to get them to the latest standard. The cost to upgrade the planes is a cool \$12.1 billion.

Congress has two alternatives. The first option: It could commit to canceling the F-35, replacing it with upgraded older jets like the F-16V, F/A-18E/F Block III, and F-15EX, and even a quickly developed, sub-fifth generation fighter like the F-36 Kingsnake.

But that wouldn't do anything to make existing F-35s cheaper to fly, and would likely make America's allies who have bought the planes, including the U.K., Japan, South Korea, Italy, and others, very mad at being left with a dead-end jet.



The other alternative is to wait and see if Lockheed Martin can get the cost per flight hour down to \$25,000 by 2025. The head of the Air Force's Air Combat Command has already expressed some skepticism that this will happen, but realistically, the lack of a real Plan B means even \$29,000 per hour by 2025 would probably allow the F-35 to survive—though not without a barrage of criticism.

**NAS Fort Worth, JRB  
Regional Coordination Committee  
Attendance Matrix  
October 2019-January 2021**

RCC Voting Members	Entity	10/21/2019	1/27/2020	4/20/2020	7/20/2020	10/19/2020	1/25/2021
Mackey, Laura	Benbrook	**	P	P	P	P	P
Marshall, Dr. Larry	Benbrook	P	P	P	P	P	P
Paine, Paul	Fort Worth	P	P	A	P	P	P
Shingleton, Dennis	Fort Worth	A	P	P	P	P	P
Whitley, Debbie	Lake Worth	P	P	P	P	P	P
Almond, Stacy	Lake Worth	P	P	P	P	A	P
Adkison, Jack	River Oaks	P	A	P	P	P	A
Chisholm, Dan	River Oaks	**	**	**	**	**	P
Gilmore, Carolyn	Sansom Park	**	**	**	**	P	A
Winkle, Angie	Sansom Park	**	**	**	**	P	P
Skinner, Randy	Tarrant County	P	P	A	P	P	P
Moore, Alice	Tarrant County	**	**	**	**	**	A
Naron, Sterling	Westworth Village	P	P	≠	≠	≠	≠
Coleman, Mike	Westworth Village	P	P	P	P	P	P
Moore, Paul	White Settlement	P	P	P	P	P	P
James, Jeff	White Settlement	A	A	P	P	P	P

Prior attendance matrices are available from NCTCOG staff upon request.

P	Present
A	Absent
R	Represented
**	Not Yet a Member
≠	No Longer a Member



