NAS FORT WORTH, JRB
REGIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE
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Update on F-35 Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Update on F-35 Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dan Kessler, NCTCOG

NAS JRB Fort Worth Regional Coordination Committee
April 20, 2020
US Air Force (USAF) proposed a beddown of 24 F-35A aircraft at one of four bases where the Air Force Reserve Command leads a global precision attack:

- Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona
- Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida
- NAS JRB Fort Worth, Texas
- Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri

Existing bases offer compatible base infrastructure and access to existing airspace

Draft EIS identifies NAS JRB Fort Worth as the preferred alternative

24 F-35s would replace 24 aging F-16s currently at NAS JRB
US Air Force hosted a hearing to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the findings of the Draft EIS
Thursday, March 5, 2020 at Brewer High School in Fort Worth
US Air Force presentation followed by public comments
RCC Chair provided oral comments; followed by written comments
RCC coordinates with communities to implement the recommendations of the 2017 JLUS.

Local governments have passed zoning ordinances and building codes to prevent additional incompatible land development in areas exposed to high noise levels.

RCC’s Development Review Tool is a feedback mechanism for communities planning projects located within or near the base’s compatible use zone and has been used to recommend measures to prevent or mitigate land uses involving noise contours and accident potential zones.

Community around NAS JRB Fort Worth is familiar with noise from military aircraft.

Base’s runway is suitable for test flights because it is 4,000 feet longer than the minimum length required.
Lockheed Martin assembles the F-35A at a neighboring plant and regularly uses the runway for its test flights.

NAS JRB Fort Worth would not require new airspace or changes to existing airspace boundaries.

F-35A aircraft emissions would primarily replace existing emissions from F-16 operations, maintenance and testing.

NCTCOG is prepared to offset any increase in emissions caused by the F-35A aircraft.

RCC supports USAF’s intention to validate the noise impacts and noise levels identified in this Draft EIS in a new compatible land use study after the F-35A beddown is complete.

NCTCOG does not currently see impacts that would be inconsistent with our ongoing planning assumptions.
### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date/Expected Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
<td>March 22, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>April 19, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EIS</td>
<td>February 14, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>March 5, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final EIS</td>
<td>Expected Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of Decision</td>
<td>Expected Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction activities start</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aircraft arrives</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Environmental Assessment for Dallas Army Aviation Support Facility Relocation

NAS JRB Fort Worth Regional Coordination Committee
April 20, 2020
Proposed Relocation of AASF To NAS JRB Fort Worth

Current AASF Location Grand Prairie Texas

Relocation of AASF From Grand Prairie to Fort Worth

26.42 Miles

Measure distance
Click on the map to add to your path
Total distance: 26.42 mi (42.52 km)
Current AASF Location in Grand Prairie

Approximate TXARNG Leased Property Boundary
NAS JRB Fort Worth Proposed Action Location Map

Hangars Location

Keyhole Location

Hangars Location

Keyhole Location
Close Up of Hangars Buildings 1404 and 1405

Proposed Expansion Areas (Phase 1)

Proposed Expansion Areas (Phase 2)
Proposed Phase 1 - Building 1405 Hangar Expansion
Proposed Phase 2 - Building 1404 Hangar Expansion

Proposed Phase 2 Hangar Expansion Area
Aircraft Keyhole Area

BLDG 1404

3 Aircraft Keyhole Area – 6.51 Ac
Item 5
Office of Economic Adjustment FY 2018 Defense Spending Report
Presents the results of a state by state analysis of US Department of Defense contract and personnel spending during FY 2018.

State and local officials may use this information to assess a region’s dependence on defense spending and to target assistance to support more resilient communities and companies.

Analysis primarily entailed an examination of DoD-funded prime- and sub-award contract data and defense personnel and payroll figures.
# Top 10 States by Total Defense Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>DEFENSE SPENDING (billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>$57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td><strong>$50.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All States:** $500.0  
**Texas Share:** 10.2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>SPENDING (billions)</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SPENDING (billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
<td>Tarrant, TX</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$39.90</td>
<td>Fairfax, VA</td>
<td>$16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$38.20</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>$11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$17.80</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>$11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$16.90</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$15.20</td>
<td>Madison, AL</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$13.60</td>
<td>King, WA</td>
<td>$7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$13.40</td>
<td>Pima, AZ</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$13.40</td>
<td>Middlesex, MA</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$13.20</td>
<td>Jefferson, KY</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All States</td>
<td>$358.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Share</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>SPENDING (billions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>273,000</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>$15.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>219,000</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All States | 2,626,434 | All States | $141.20
Texas Share | 8.34% | Texas Share | 7.70%
Texas Defense Contract Spending Locations

Tarrant
$17.8 B

Dallas
$6.0 B

Bexar
$3.7 B

Harris
$3.0 B

Potter
$2.0 B

Collin
$1.6 B

Hunt
$1.5 B

El Paso
$1.0 B

Travis
$410.1 M

Bell
$400.3 M
## Texas Defense Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Active Duty</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>National Guard</th>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>35,972</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>8,934</td>
<td>70,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>32,206</td>
<td>5,405</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>38,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>25,785</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>32,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>11,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>8,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>5,969</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>7,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>5,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>4,383</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>5,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>4,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Texas Personnel
- **218,993**

### Tarrant Share
- **5.2%**

### Total Texas Payroll
- **$10.9 Billion**

### Tarrant Share
- **4.0%**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>$3.9 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>$2.1 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>$1.7 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>$431.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>$386.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>$284.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>$247.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>$244.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>$240.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>$177.7 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Draft RCC Position for 87th Texas Legislature
87th Legislative Position Development

Legislative Process

- Develop Policy Position
- Work through a large city lobbyist or lobbying group
- Identify bill sponsors in House and Senate
- Personal meetings, letters, supporting materials
87th Legislative Position Development

Dates of Interest

- April 20, 2020 – Draft Position at RCC Meeting
- July 20, 2020 – Approve Final Position at RCC Meeting
- November 9, 2020 – Prefiling for bills begins
- January 12, 2021 – 87th Texas Legislature Convenes
- May 31, 2021 – 87th Texas Legislature Ends
# Previous RCC Legislative Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>RCC Position</th>
<th>Actions and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 86th Legislative Session 2019 | • Promotes compatible growth and provides cities and counties enhanced options to manage growth near military installations and within training areas  
• Promotes compatible development and minimizes encroachment through the following tools:  
  • Creating effective methods to initiate dialogue between project developers, military bases, and City, County, and State Officials prior to development for proposed activities (e.g. wind turbines, communications towers, sensitive land uses, lighting, etc.) that may affect military operations;  
  • Expanding communication efforts to inform current and potential residents or tenants of new construction residential, multifamily, and commercial development who may be affected by military operations;  
  • Adding military installations and training areas and adjacent land to the list of restricted areas for UAS operation per Texas Government Code Sec. 423;  
  • Supporting collaboration between local governments, state, and the Federal Aviation Administration to advance regulations to ensure safe operations of unmanned aircraft vehicles. | • SB 2299 (Powell): Relating to the prosecution of the offense of operation of an unmanned aircraft over certain facilities. Base Commander and NCTCOG staff testified. Made significant progress but failed to pass.  
• Passage, then Veto of HB 3082 (Murphy): Bill related to penalties for UAS flights over critical infrastructure; was amended to include SB 2299. |
**Wind Energy**

- **HB 3168** (Flynn) Relating to the applicability of the prohibition on certain ad valorem tax incentives related to wind-powered energy devices located near a military aviation facility.
  - Did not pass

**Texas Military Value Revolving Loan Fund**

- **SB 2131** (Powell) Relating to the application for and loans from the Texas military value revolving loan fund account.
  - Passed
- **HB 2119** (Cortez) Relating to the application for and loans from the Texas military value revolving loan fund account.
  - Passed
86th Legislative Session Summary

DEAAG

• $30 million for biennium ($15M available in first round)

Governor’s Committee to Support the Military

• Study and make recommendations on how best to make Texas a more attractive destination for additional military missions

• Study and make recommendations on how best to maintain and enhance military value at existing military installations in Texas
Continuing voluntary dialogue
UAS lawsuit impact on critical infrastructure designations
DEAAG funding
Effort to repeal statutes on military sustainability commission (LGC 397A)
Governor’s Committee to Support the Military recommendations
• The RCC supports legislation that promotes compatible growth and provides cities and counties enhanced options to manage growth near military installations and within training areas.

• The RCC seeks legislation which promotes compatible development and quality of life, as well as, minimizes encroachment through the following tools:
  • Creating effective methods to initiate dialogue between project developers, military bases, and City, County, and State Officials prior to development for proposed activities (e.g., wind turbines, communications towers, sensitive land uses, lighting, etc.) that may affect military operations;
Draft RCC Legislative Program

• Expanding communication efforts to inform current and potential residents or tenants of new construction residential, multifamily, and commercial development who may be affected by military operations;

• Adding military installations, training areas, and adjacent land to the list of restricted areas for UAS operation to create a safe environment that does not impede military operations;

• Supporting collaboration between local governments, state, and the FAA to advance regulations to ensure safe operations of UAS;

• Supporting continued funding for the DEAAG program;

• Expanding real estate disclosure near military installation requirements to include new residential construction, residential leases, and commercial properties
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NAS JRB Fort Worth Update

NAS JRB Fort Worth Regional Coordination Committee
April 20, 2020
NAS JRB RCC

Captain Jon Townsend, Commander

FACE MASKS OR COVERINGS REQUIRED IN ALL SHOPPING FACILITIES.
- Installation Mission Posture
- Community Mission Support
- Health of Personnel
- Facilities Access
- Future Requirements
- F-35 EIS Process, No Impact
Item 8

Administrative Updates
### RCC Scheduling Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 20, 2020</td>
<td>RCC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19, 2020</td>
<td>RCC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 2021</td>
<td>RCC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2021</td>
<td>RCC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional 2020 or 2021 committee meetings may be scheduled as needed at the discretion of the Chair.
## West Tarrant Alliance Scheduling Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 2020</td>
<td>West Tarrant Alliance Meeting</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6, 2020</td>
<td>West Tarrant Alliance Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5, 2020</td>
<td>West Tarrant Alliance Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4, 2020</td>
<td>West Tarrant Alliance Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLMC Transportation Implementation Update

Project Status
- **Completed**
- **Upcoming Planning Initiative**
- **Completed**
- **Planning/Design Study Underway**
- **Under Construction**
- **Upcoming Planning Initiative**

$ Indicates Transportation Project All or Partially Funded for Construction

Base Access Improvements
1. Commercial Vehicle Gate Construction
2. NASJRB Main Gate Construction
3. Meandering Road Design $

Area Road Improvements
4. Westworth Village Bike Trail $
5. SH 199 TxDOT Corridor Project $
6. FM 1220 (Azle Ave) Corridor Plan
7. SH 199 TxDOT Corridor Plan $
8. SH 183 TxDOT Corridor Plan
9. IH 30 Capital Asset Management $
10. Las Vegas Trail Design $
11. Bomber Spur Bike Trail Plan
12. IH 20 Frontage and CTP Connection Plan
13. IH 820 Access Enhancements
14. IH 20 Auxiliary Lanes $
15. Chapin School Road TxDOT Corridor Plan
Other Business

- Media Alerts
- Correspondence
- Attendance Report
- Public Comments
Questions and Contacts

Dan Kessler
Assistant Director of Transportation
817-695-9248
dkessler@nctcog.org

Amanda Wilson
Program Manager, Government Relations
817-695-9284
awilson@nctcog.org

Kyle Roy
Communications Coordinator
817-704-5610
kroy@nctcog.org