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What is the Naval Information Force Reserve?

Over 8,000 Selected Reserve Sailors

- 19% of the Navy’s uniformed Information Warfare (IW) Community (~8000 RC, ~34000 AC)
- 15% of the total Navy Reserve
- 140 IW Units who directly augment and support Active Component commands
- 2,471 IW Sailors who directly augment and support units in other warfare communities
- 92% of IW IA Mobilization requirements
  - 551 Sailors mobilized to 12 countries, CONUS, & afloat
  - Support to SOF, USFOR-A, CJTF-HOA and CENTCOM

Echelon III Reserve Type Commander with six Regional Commands supporting Man, Train, and Equip requirements for ~8,000 IW SELRES serving in 140 IW Reserve units, 480+ “embed” units, and 9 Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers (JRICs).
Our Mission Statement

**From the CNO NAVPLAN:** A larger, more lethal, more ready fleet manned by the world’s greatest Sailors is required to maintain our advantage at sea and protect America for years to come. We will deliver, operate, and maintain that Navy with a focus on our core roles of sea control and power projection.

**From CNR’s Fighting Instructions:** WARFIGHTING READINESS IS PRIORITY ONE: we are focused unambiguously on warfighting readiness. It is my number one and only priority—period. We will generate the combat power and critical strategic depth the Navy requires to prevail in conflict in an era of great power competition. That’s our job, and why we exist. All else is secondary.

CNIFR will deliver highly skilled, Information Warfare ready Sailors to compete and win during peacetime, contingency, and full mobilization operations.
What do IW Sailors do?

• The IWC's mission is to defeat any enemy by using ...
  • Assured Command and Control
  • Battlespace Awareness
  • Integrated Fires
  ... to achieve Freedom of Maneuver across all warfighting domains.

• We must understand how our adversaries think and work, develop the battlespace, and provide our forces with timely and accurate information.

• Intelligence, Cryptologic Warfare, Meteorology and Oceanography, Networks, and Space...and Cyber Warfare
Evolution of Information Warfare in Fort Worth

• 1988: Commander, Naval Reserve Intelligence Command (CNRIC) created
  • HQ established in Fort Worth.
  • Provided leadership to and coordination of multiple Naval Reserve Intelligence units.
  • Commanded by a Reserve rear admiral (lower half) with a full-time Captain as deputy
  • Naval Reserve Security Group, fulfilled similar role for Reserve cryptologic community in the same building

• 2009: Information Dominance Corps formed
  • Intelligence
  • Cryptology
  • Information Professional (networks)
  • Oceanographic/Meteorological
  • Space cadre

• 2012: CNRIC became the Information Dominance Corps Reserve Command (IDCRC)
  • Began providing community management for all of IDC
  • No increase in staff size

• 2016: IDC re-designated to Information Warfare Community (IWC)
  • Modeled after Aviation, Surface, Subsurface warfare communities

• 2017: IDCRC renamed Commander, Naval Information Force Reserve
Where do Reserve IW Sailors work?

- 46 supported commands including
  - National Agencies (i.e. NSA, NGA)
  - Defense Agencies (i.e. DIA, SECDEF)
  - Geographic Joint Commands (INDOPACOM, CENTCOM, EUCOM, AFRICOM, NORTHCOM, SOUTHCOM)
  - Functional Joint Commands (TRANSCOM, SPACECOM, CYBERCOM)
  - Service Commands (ONI, Fleets, ships, squadrons, submarines, SEAL Teams, SEABEEs, etc.)

- We drill on-site and at Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers (JRICs)
  - Top Secret facility
  - Multiple classified and unclassified networks
  - Reachback support to forward units
  - Facilitates “real world” work during a drill weekend

- CNIFR manages nine of the DoD’s 28 JRICs
Fort Worth, TX
Joint Reserve Intelligence Center (JRIC)

(U/FOUO) JRIC Profile: The JRIC at Fort Worth, Texas supports more than 300 drilling Reservists, 100 full and part-time military, government civilians, and contractors. The JRIC is managed by full-time operations and security personnel.

(U/FOUO) Supported Commands and Agencies:
- USINDOPACOM
- USSOUTHCOM
- DIA
- NSA
- NASIC
- US NRC
- NGB
- TX Air National Guard
- AFOSI
- COMPACFLT
- FCC / C10F
- DCIS

(U/FOUO) Growth Potential: The Fort Worth JRIC can accommodate an increase of 85 personnel during the week and up to 15 personnel during the drill weekends (may vary by weekend if there are multiple drill weekends per month). With social distancing guidelines, the JRIC can accommodate an increase of 27 personnel during the week and eight personnel during the drill weekend. Additional weekend or weekday use may be arranged on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the Operations Officer and Site Manager.

(U/FOUO) JRIC Capabilities:
- Square Footage: ~13,300 sq. ft. of classified space
- Analyst Workspaces: 174 (50 social distancing)
- Terminals:
  - JWICS - 110
  - NIPRNet - 74
  - SIPRNet - 75
  - NGDE - 4
- Communications and IT:
  - JWICS VTC suite
  - JWICS DVTcs
  - JWICS & SIPRNet VoIP phones
  - NMCI access
- JRIC Address:
  Fort Worth JRIC
  Naval Air Station Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base
  1720 Doolittle Ave.
  Fort Worth, TX 76127-1134
- Operations Officer: (817) 782-6463
- Site Manager: (817) 782-3477
- SSO: (817) 782-6457
  SMO Code: N479183
Our Core Competencies

- *Serve* as principal Information Warfare advisor to the Chief of the Navy Reserve
- *Serve* as Navy Reserve Force’s Special Security Office (SSO)
- *Represent* Navy to the Joint Reserve Intelligence Program and the OUSD(I) Reserve Military Integration Office
- *Run* Direct Commission Officer boards for Reserve IW officers
- *Track* RC officer information warfare qualifications to completion
- *Lead* modularization of AC IW accession training for RC
- *Identify and articulate* IW-specific funding requirements for the Navy Reserve
- *Identify and articulate* IW-specific IT requirements for the Navy Reserve
- *Operate* and maintain nine Joint Reserve Intel Centers jointly with the DIA
- *Manage* front-end Mobilization for the Reserve IWC
- *Drive* integration and advanced warfighter training for Reservists
Our Structure

~230 HQ-affiliated personnel across the country

Six Regional HQs
- Reserve Triad: Cdr, Deputy, and REGSEL
- Full-time staff: OIC, AOIC, and SEL
- Civilian SSO
- JRICs with Active OICs
- Most military billets are cross-slated
- Most unit O-6 CO billets are cross-slated

CNIFR HQ (Ft Worth)
- Reserve O7 Commander
- Active O6 Deputy
- Reserve Cmd Master Chief
- Deputy Chiefs of Staff: Civilians and Reservists
- Community Leads and Rating Advisers
- All other military billets are cross-slated (open to all designators)

Liaisons and Embeds
- Navy PERSCOM: IW Reserve Officer & Enlisted Community Managers
- OPNAV N2N6: budget and program
- Naval Information Forces: integration with IW Active Component
- IW Schools: training and quota management

Integrated Active/Reserve/Civilian Structure for Leadership, Oversight, and Liaison. Significant cross-slaying among all IW sub-communities at senior levels.
Our Footprint (Regions & Sites)
Providing Extensive Reachback Mission Support

- U.S. Army, Army Reserve, Army NG (14)
- U.S. Marine Corps (1)
- U.S. Navy Reserves (9)
- U.S. Air Force and ANG (4)
- NAVIFORES SELRES Drill Location

Map of U.S. military installations and regions, including:
- Fallon
- Vandenberg
- Alexandria, VA
- Andrews AFB
- Bolling AFB
- Chantilly, VA
- Pentagon, VA
- Springfield, VA
- Suitland, MD
- Washington DC
- Pittsburgh
- New York
- Greensboro
- Miami
- Fort Gordon
- NORFOLK
- Suffolk
- Virginia Beach
- Honolulu
- Molesworth, UK

Other locations include:
- Bremerton/Oak Harbor
- Camp Murray
- Portland NG
- Camp Parks
- Draper NG
- Colo Spgs/ Fort Carson
- Fort Leavenworth
- Fort Sheridan
- Wright-Patterson
- Quantico
- Bolling AFB
- Naval Station
- Joint Reserve Intelligence Center

NAVFORES REGIONS:
- MID ATLANTIC
- NORTH
- SOUTH
- SOUTHEAST
- SOUTHWEST
- WASHINGTON DC
Item 5

FY 2019 Defense Spending Report

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>$66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td><strong>$54.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All States:** $550.9  
**Texas Share:** 9.9%
## United States Defense Contract Spending

<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>$50.2</td>
<td>Tarrant, TX</td>
<td>$17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$43.4</td>
<td>Fairfax, VA</td>
<td>$17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$41.6</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>$14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$22.3</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>$13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$19.0</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>$10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$18.4</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>$9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$15.3</td>
<td>Madison, AL</td>
<td>$9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$14.7</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$13.4</td>
<td>King, WA</td>
<td>$8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
<td>Jefferson, KY</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All States</td>
<td>$403.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Share</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## United States Defense Personnel Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>SPENDING (billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>279,000</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>All States</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,700,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>All States</strong></td>
<td><strong>$146.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Texas Share</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Texas Share</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas Defense Contract Spending

**TOP DEFENSE CONTRACTORS**

- Lockheed Martin: $22.5 B
- L3 Technologies: $2.0 B
- Bell Boeing Joint Project Office: $1.6 B
- Raytheon: $1.3 B
- Textron: $998.1 M
- Royal Dutch Shell: $627.9 M
- General Dynamics: $617.2 M
- Cerberus Capital Management: $533.6 M
- Elbit Systems: $434.8 M
- Airbus: $349.7 M
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Spending Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17.6 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9.3 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.3 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.6 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.6 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.5 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td></td>
<td>$812.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$629.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>$568.0 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>36,612</td>
<td>22,606</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>9,189</td>
<td>71,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>33,816</td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>40,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>26,172</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>33,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>6,484</td>
<td>11,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>3,994</td>
<td>8,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>7,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>5,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>5,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>4,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Texas Personnel
- **Total Texas Personnel**: 224,531

### Tarrant Share
- **Tarrant Share**: 5.3%

### Total Texas Payroll
- **Total Texas Payroll**: $11.4 Billion

### Tarrant Share
- **Tarrant Share**: 4.1%
Texas Defense Personnel Spending Locations

- **Bexar**
  - $4.1 B

- **Bell**
  - $2.2 B

- **El Paso**
  - $1.8 B

- **Tarrant**
  - $471.8 M

- **Nueces**
  - $371.5 M

- **Taylor**
  - $296.2 M

- **Harris**
  - $267.8 M

- **Wichita**
  - $258.5 M

- **Dallas**
  - $256.5 M

- **Travis**
  - $222.1 M
Item 6

Meandering Road Update
Design of Meandering Road from East Gate of NASJRB to River Oaks/SH 183
## Project Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Worth PM</td>
<td>Lissette Acevedo</td>
<td>CFW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lissette.Acevedo@fortworthtexas.gov">Lissette.Acevedo@fortworthtexas.gov</a></td>
<td>817-392-2722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of River Oaks</td>
<td>Gordon Smith</td>
<td>CRO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gsmith@riveroakstx.com">gsmith@riveroakstx.com</a></td>
<td>817-626-5427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Eric Greenman</td>
<td>Lamb-Star</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eric.greenman@lamb-star.com">eric.greenman@lamb-star.com</a></td>
<td>972-764-4606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Jill Van Hoewyk</td>
<td>Lamb-Star</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jill.vanhoewyk@lamb-star.com">jill.vanhoewyk@lamb-star.com</a></td>
<td>214-440-3630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT PM</td>
<td>Raj Mahida</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Vanrajsinh.Mahida@txdot.gov">Vanrajsinh.Mahida@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td>817-399-4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Amy Brook</td>
<td>BOA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abrook@bergoliver.com">abrook@bergoliver.com</a></td>
<td>817-548-9998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SCOPE OF THE PROJECT AND DESIRED OUTCOME

- RECONSTRUCT MEANDERING ROAD FROM 4 TO 3 LANES, REALIGN INTERSECTION AT ROBERTS CUT OFF, CONSTRUCT ROUNDBOUTS AT YALE ST AND LTJG BARNETT, ADD SIDEWALKS WITHIN PROJECT LIMITS AND BIKE LANES ON LT JG BARNETT.

- Complete Preliminary Design, Environmental Clearance, and Final PS&E
Project Overview
Project Overview
Project Overview
PROPOSED LTJG BARNETT ROAD TYPICAL SECTION
Typical Section
Meandering Road
Key Intersection
Meandering Road at LT JG Barnett Rd
Key Intersection
Meandering Road at Yale St
Key Intersection
Meandering Road at Roberts Cut Off
## Environmental Documentation

### Open Ended D

### ROW Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total ROW Needed (SF)</th>
<th>Total ROW Needed (AC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>7667.69</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oaks</td>
<td>43991.55</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51659.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Environmental Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submitted for Review Comments Addressed</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table of Impacts for TCEQ Stream Segments</td>
<td>Indicates what nearby streams are listed in TCEQ’s 303(d) List of Impaired Waters</td>
<td>August, 2018 No update required</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Impacts for Potential Waters of the US Surface Water Analysis Form</td>
<td>Table and map of the waterbodies within the project vicinity</td>
<td>August, 2018 No update Required</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft of Archeological Background Study</td>
<td>Identifies the potential for intact, buried archaeological resources</td>
<td>June 2021 Comments Addressed July 2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Historic Resources Project Coordination Request</td>
<td>Identifies potentially historic resources that could be impacted by the project</td>
<td>June 2021 Comments Addressed July 2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submitted for Review</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment</td>
<td>Identifies the potential for encountering hazardous materials during project construction</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments Addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Evaluation &amp; Tier I Assessment Forms</td>
<td>Identifies protected species may be affected by the project</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments Addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Impacts Assessment Form</td>
<td>Identifies environmental justice populations &amp; community characteristics</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments Addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Technical Report</td>
<td>Addresses compliance with the Clean Air Act, NEPA, and Federal Aid Highways Code</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments Addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Conformity Report Form</td>
<td>Identifies compliance with State Implementation Plan (SIP), a requirement for projects in a non-attainment area.</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments Addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Amendment Approval, City Council Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise/Update Technical Reports (TRs) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRs - Client Review / Revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRs - TxDOT District / ENV Review / Revisions (3/15/21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources Reconnaissance Survey (HRRS)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRS TR - TxDOT District / ENV Review / Revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing - TxDOT stds (Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. TR Updates/Revisions per Public Hearing Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE Clearance Documentation/Checklists &amp; Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Schematic and Exhibits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish PS&amp;E (Revise 60% Plans)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% Submittal, TxDOT Review (05/01/21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Submittal, TxDOT Review (09/01/21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Submittal, TxDOT Review (12/15/21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final 100% Re-Submittal, if required to address any ROW or Utility Issues (05/01/22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Coordination and Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Letting (Pending move from Aug to Dec.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meandering Road

Design of Meandering Road from East Gate of NASJRB to River Oaks/SH 183
Item 7

RCC Branding Discussion
Current logo developed ~2008 at the creation of the RCC

When developed, it was important to brand this as a Texas initiative because it was a novel committee type at the time.

The star is a patriotic symbol.

The white swoop represents the aviation element of NAS JRB Fort Worth and roughly indicates that our work is in North Texas.
Presentation Slides
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NAS JRB Fort Worth Regional Coordination Committee
July 19, 2021
Complementary Effort Branding

2008 JLUS

Defending the Sound of Freedom

Joint Land Use Study Report
Prepared for:
This Plan of Use Study, Fort Worth, Lake Worth, Tarrant County
North Central Texas

2013 PLMC

Planning Livable Military Communities Appendix | 2013

2018 JLUS

JOINING FORCES
Regional Community Military Resources

REGIONAL JOINT LAND USE STUDY
December 2017
### Graphic Design Inspirations and Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspiration Ideas</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Blend military and community</td>
<td>• NCTCOG Graphic Design and RCC staff iterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilize “Defending the Sound of Freedom”</td>
<td>• RCC Officer Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feature F-35 aircraft</td>
<td>• RCC Member Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate Texas or Lone Star</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New RCC Logo Options

RCC
DEFENDING THE SOUND OF FREEDOM

RCC
DEFENDING THE SOUND OF FREEDOM

RCC
DEFENDING THE SOUND OF FREEDOM
New RCC Logo Options Usage
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Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth (NAS JRB Fort Worth)
Regional Coordination Committee (RCC)

April 20, 2021

The Honorable Beverly Powell
Texas Senate
P.O. Box 12098 - Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Dear Senator Powell:

On behalf of the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth (NAS JRB Fort Worth) Regional Coordination Committee (RCC) and its eight member communities, we would like to offer support for SB 141, relating to the preservation of the airfield of operation of an air station. We share your concern with regard to the need for additional funding for maintenance and upgrades to the NAS JRB Fort Worth airfield. We also support the recommendation that the federal government provide funding for the operation and maintenance of the airfield.

The Regional Coordination Committee was formed out of a 2002 joint land use study (JLUS) surrounding the NAS JRB Fort Worth. The study resulted in a joint agreement by the cities of Benbrook, Fort Worth, Lake Worth, River Oaks, Burleson Park, Weevorth, and North Central Texas Council of Governments to form the Regional Coordination Committee. The purposes of this Committee include the mission of the JLUS, which is to maintain and preserve the NAS JRB Fort Worth airfield.

We are concerned that without additional funding, the NAS JRB Fort Worth airfield will not be able to meet the needs of the military and civilian communities that rely on it. We urge you to support SB 141 and to work with your colleagues to ensure that the NAS JRB Fort Worth airfield is maintained and preserved for the benefit of all.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael A. Cohen
Regional Coordination Committee
City of Weevorth Village

We appreciate your continued support of NAS JRB Fort Worth and the surrounding communities’ commitment to compatible development and the continued operation of this base. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (817) 454-0745 or Amanda Kline at (817) 454-3254.

[Signature]

Michael A. Cohen
Regional Coordination Committee
City of Weevorth Village

www.rccrg.org/rcrc

Local governments surrounding the Naval Air Station, Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth have joined forces, formed the Regional Coordination Committee to preserve and promote the military installations. The Committee is responsible for ensuring compatible land use patterns by creating community support, and advocating for military and civilian facilities harmonious with the region. The Committee’s mission is to maintain and preserve the NAS JRB Fort Worth airfield.
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Letterhead

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

April 20, 2021

The Honorable Beverly Powell
Texas Senate
P.O. Box 12388 - Capital Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Dear Senator Powell:

On behalf of the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base (NAS JRB Fort Worth) Regional Coordination Committee (RCC) and its eight member communities, we would like to offer support for SB 145, relating to the preservation of the defense of operation of an air force base located in the county. The passage of SB 145 is critical to maintaining military installations and ensuring that the military can continue to operate effectively.

The RCC is comprised of the eight member communities surrounding NAS JRB Fort Worth, including Aledo, Weatherford, and Wise. These communities have a vested interest in maintaining the defense installations and ensuring the safety and security of military personnel and their families.

We appreciate the continued support of NAS JRB Fort Worth and the surrounding communities and look forward to working together to ensure the continued operation of this vital installation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Regional Coordination Committee (RCC)
City of Weatherford

www.nasjrb.org RCC

Local governments surrounding the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth have declared the Region or Coordination Committee to be an essential partner in preserving the military installations. This Committee is responsible for encouraging community support and understanding, maintaining strong relationships, and providing guidance for military bases surrounding NAS JRB Fort Worth.
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Letterhead

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

April 20, 2021

The Honorable Beverly Powell
Texas Senate
P.O. Box 12388 - Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

City of Fort Worth
City of Tarrant County
City of Weatherford
City of Grapevine
City of North Richland Hills
City of Colleyville
City of Roanoke

The Regional Coordination Committee was formed out of a 2002 Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) surrounding the NAS JRB Fort Worth. The study results included a joint agreement by the cities of Benbrook, Fort Worth, Lake Worth, River Oaks, Benbrook Park, Weatherford, and Willow Springs to work together to support the Navy. As a result of the JLUS, the cities have continued working together to support the Navy and local communities. The Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) was developed to align with the new visual standards and aesthetic guidelines.

Letterhead:

RCC Logo

The RCC logo incorporates the letters "RCC" in a stylized font, with a red ribbon-like element above the letters. The logo is designed to represent the regional coordination efforts of the committee.

Presentation Slides:

- New RCC Logo Options Usage
- Presentation Slides
- Letterhead
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Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth (NAS JRB Fort Worth) 
Regional Coordination Committee (RCC)

April 20, 2021

The Honorable Beverly Powell
Texas Senate
P.O. Box 12368 - Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Dear Senator Powell:

On behalf of the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth (NAS JRB Fort Worth) Regional Coordination Committee (RCC) and its eight member communities, we would like to offer support for SB 1434, relating to the protection of the defense operations of an air force base.

The Regional Coordination Committee was formed out of a 2002 Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) surrounding the NAS JRB Fort Worth. The study resulted in a joint agreement by the cities of Bedford, Fort Worth, Lake Worth, River Oaks, Sanger Park, Weatherford, and the cities of Texas to promote the economic development of the surrounding communities. The intent of the 2002 JLUS was promoting compatible land use, minimizing footprint disruptions, and expanding community outreach toward the importance of base missions and operations. However, over the years the NAS JRB Fort Worth has become increasingly focused on the operation of unmanned aircraft and helicopters, and the economic development of the surrounding communities has been negatively impacted.

The regional coordination committee has been increasingly concerned about the operation of unmanned aircraft negatively impacting operations at NAS JRB Fort Worth and potentially creating a dangerous situation.

NAS JRB Fort Worth and other military installations to a list of critical infrastructure in and around which unmanned aircraft are not permitted to operate in a way that disrupts or interferes with operations. The issue is included in the RCC’s legislative position, which is attached, and the committee requests your support.

We appreciate your continued support of NAS JRB Fort Worth and the surrounding communities’ commitment to compatible development and the continued operation of this base. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at [email] or [phone].

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mike Coleman, Chair
Regional Coordination Committee
City of Weatherford

www.rccrog.org/rrc

[Logo and signature of Texas Senate and Texas House representatives]
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Development Review and Encroachment Issues
RCC Development Review Tool

Sound Mitigation Program

Real Estate Disclosure
RCC Development Review Tool Discussion

Current Process

1. City staff voluntarily submit project details through an online mapping tool – system generates email notification

2. RCC members comment on project – Navy compatibility guidelines provided on webpage

3. RCC generates letter to submitting city providing member comments
The parcels used in this map are for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. They do not represent an on-the-ground survey and represent only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.
## Project 132 – Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Meason</td>
<td>City of Lake Worth</td>
<td>4/5/2021</td>
<td>While the project does not fall into the APZ zones, the 75 noise contour would be incompatible for a multi-family (apartment) use and would definitely warrant sound attenuation. I would think it would need to be to the highest degree available, especially considering it is a planned &quot;senior&quot; community and that should be relayed to the developer for consideration when designing the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Spurlin</td>
<td>CPLO at NAS JRB, Fort Worth</td>
<td>4/6/2021</td>
<td>NAS JRB analysis finds the project incompatible as outlined by DoD Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) standards. A designated 55+ senior living, multi-family, 120-unit proposed development within proximity of a military installation with active jet aircraft has the following negative considerations: Incompatible: military aircraft 70-75 db noise hazard zone. Incompatible: encroachment to a strategic military installation. Safety: military munitions/ordnance hazard within 480-yards of proposed location. Safety: 1,330 yards from strategic fuel storage facility. Safety: military jet low-altitude airfield pattern, overflight hazard. A residential proposal, at that location, is counter by all standards of compatible land use that close to military jet base operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hoelke</td>
<td>Lockheed Martin Aeronautics</td>
<td>4/8/2021</td>
<td>Lockheed Martin analysis finds the project incompatible as outlined by DoD Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) standards. A designated 55+ senior living, multi-family, 120-unit proposed development within proximity of a military aircraft manufacturing facility and military installation, both with active jet aircraft, has the following negative considerations: Incompatible: military aircraft 70-75 db noise hazard zone. Incompatible: encroachment to a strategic military aircraft production facility. Safety: military jet low-altitude airfield pattern, overflight hazard. A residential proposal, at that location, is counter by all standards of compatible land use that close to military jet operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The parcels used in this map are for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. They do not represent an on-the-ground survey and represent only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.
## Project 133 – Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Spurlin</td>
<td>CPLO at NAS JRB, Fort Worth</td>
<td>6/8/2021</td>
<td>This project was previously discussed with the City of Fort Worth Planning and Zoning and the proposed project lead, Habitat for Humanity. Agreement was reached that APZ boundaries would be preserved and that no dwelling would be included in the APZs as part of the development plan, and noise mitigation measures would be incorporated within dwellings impacted within noise contours. Discussions were for signal family homes and no higher density townhome structures. APZs – Residential of any type is strongly discourage IAW DoD directives within APZ I and by exception only within APZ II with a maximum density of 1-2 dwellings per acre. APZs are the statistical accident potential zone of air ports and should be strictly preserved by city zoning standards for the health, safety and welfare of the public. Greater than 65 decibel DNL (day-night average) noise contour is also present in proposed area and residential development is also discourage; with an exception that single-unit, detached-structures comply with noise mitigation that reduces the outside noise levels by 25-30 disables within the dwellings. NAS JRB strongly discourages any type of residential dwelling within APZ I and a maximum density of 1-2 dwelling per acre within APZ II. Additionally, per plan, the proposed dwellings outside the APZ boundaries and within high-level noise contours incorporate in construction standards noise/sound mitigation reductions of 25-30 db from outside to inside noise levels. High-density type development (townhomes) within APZ II is discouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hoelke</td>
<td>Lockheed Martin Aeronautics</td>
<td>6/8/2021</td>
<td>Lockheed Martin analysis finds the project incompatible as outlined by DoD Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) standards. Proposed single-family and townhome residential developments within proximity of a military aircraft manufacturing facility and military installation, both with active jet aircraft, has the following negative considerations: Incompatible: military aircraft 65-70 db noise hazard zone. Incompatible: encroachment to a strategic military aircraft production facility. Safety: military jet low-altitude airfield pattern, overflight hazard. A residential proposal, at that location, is counter by all standards of compatible land use that close to military jet operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of Current Process

Projects are often entered at the end of the development process. Entering projects is voluntary and may not be part of city staff procedures.

The current system is outdated, difficult to use, and often yields an error for any non-standard development.

It is difficult to find information on compatibility, and for parcels in both noise contours and APZs the guidance can be conflicting.

Feedback to the submitting city depends on RCC member availability to respond within the requested timeline.
RCC Development Review Tool Discussion

- JBSA Risk Assessment: Composite Rasters
- Regional Ecosystem Framework

Risk Assessment Score:
- Low Risk
- Medium Low Risk
- Medium High Risk
- High Risk
New Approach
Compatibility information, along with other data, would be embedded into each parcel for noise contours and APZs. City staff and developers can refer to the Development Review Tool at the outset of the process. Projects would no longer be entered and commented on by RCC members. Developers would be able to query the system to find appropriate parcels meeting desired criteria.
Proposed Parcel Data

City

Zoning (Including Overlays), Future Land Use Plan

Noise Contour and/or APZ or CZ

Structure Age and Current Use

Compatible Uses

Area Characteristics (demographics, value, tax revenue, etc.)

Local Government/Base Contact Information
Local Government Zoning

Focus to-date has been on overlay zoning or future land use plans in the Accident Potential Zones

Some cities address noise through city Building Code

Examples nationwide of cities adding overlay zoning or changing base zoning in noise contours to match military compatibility

NCTCOG is preparing sample ordinance text and presentation materials that can be used at city council meetings or during comprehensive plan efforts
RCC Development Review Tool Discussion

Legend
- NAS JRB Boundary
- AICUZ Boundaries
- NAS JRB Clear Zones
- Accident Potential Zone 1
- Accident Potential Zone 2

Change in Compatibility
- Increase in Compatibility
- Decrease in Compatibility

Other Features
- Major Roads
- Other Arterials
- Major Lakes

Scale: 0.25, 0.5 Miles

May 18, 2017

2016-2017 Regional Joint Land Use Study
2015-2016 Change in Safety Compatibility (Study Area North)
US Congress provided $50 million for noise mitigation surrounding military installations in the FY21 Appropriations Bill. The program will be administered through OLDCC (same group that funds JLUS projects). It requires a 10% local match.

Eligible properties include hospitals, daycare facilities, schools, facilities serving senior citizens and private residences located within one mile of a base or in a 65+ dB DNL noise contour. Use of funding must be prioritized within the community. Rules have not been released, but expected to be similar to an FAA program.
HB 890 passed during the 2017 Texas legislative session

Added proximity to military installations to seller’s disclosure form for existing residential property

Military installations, cities and counties are required to ensure that the most recent Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study (AICUZ) or Joint Land Use Study is publicly available on the entity’s website

City Attorneys should verify, but NCTCOG currently hosts the JLUS final report and this can likely be linked from local government websites

NCTCOG will be reaching out individually to cities regarding this provision
Item 9

NAS JRB Fort Worth Update
Item 10

Legislative Update
SB 1- General Appropriations Bill

• $30 million included in the FY 2022-2023 Budget for military defense impacted communities through the DEAAG Program.
• This amount is identical to the FY 2020-2021 Budget.
Legislation Passed This Session

• **SB 149 (Powell)** Relating to the prosecution of the offense of operation of an unmanned aircraft over certain facilities.
  • Airports and military installations to be added to the list of ‘Critical Infrastructure.’

• **SB 780 (Hinojosa)** Relating to the authority of a local government to enter into an intergovernmental support agreement with a branch of the armed forces of the United States.
  • Local governments may enter into an intergovernmental support agreement with a branch of the armed forces of the United States.

• **HB 3399 (Ortega)** Relating to the authority of the Texas Department of Transportation to provide road services on federal military property.
  • TxDOT may enter into agreements with the United States Department of Defense or another federal entity to assist with road maintenance, improvement, relocation, or extension services for military installation.
Failed to Pass

- **HB 2825 (Bonnen)** Relating to certain transactions involving real property located near military bases.
- **SB 1003 (Springer) / HB 4007 (Spiller)** Relating to siting requirements for the construction of a wind turbine.
- **SB 1233 (Seliger) / HB 3277 (Raymond)** Relating to a study of the disaster preparedness for each state military installation.
Questions and Comments

Amanda Wilson
Program Manager
(817) 695-9284
awilson@nctcog.org

Rebekah Hernandez
Communications Manager
(682) 433-0477
rhernandez@nctcog.org

Nicholas Allen
Communications Coordinator
(817) 704-5699
nallen@nctcog.org

Kyle Roy
Communications Coordinator
(817) 704-5610
kroy@nctcog.org
## RCC Scheduling Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2021</td>
<td>RCC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2022</td>
<td>RCC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2022</td>
<td>RCC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18, 2022</td>
<td>RCC Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional 2021 or 2022 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>August 5, 2021</td>
<td>West Tarrant Alliance Meeting</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2021</td>
<td>West Tarrant Alliance Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2022</td>
<td>West Tarrant Alliance Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5, 2022</td>
<td>West Tarrant Alliance Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Expansion/Reconstruction Projects $
10. Las Vegas Trail Design $
11. Bomber Spur Bike Trail Plan
12. IH 20 Frontage and CTP Connection Plan
13. IH 820 Asset Optimization Project
14. IH 20 Auxiliary Lanes $
15. Chapin School Road TxDOT Corridor Plan

$ Indicates Transportation Project All or Partially Funded for Construction
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  
avilson@nctcog.org

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