COPY

DCN: 5234

City of Virginia Beach

MEYERA E. OBERNDORF
MAYOR

427 4308
BTNA

MUNICIPAL CENTER
BUILDING 1
2401 COURTHOUSE DRIVE
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA 23456-9000
(757) 427-4581
FAX (757) 426-5699
MOBERNDO@VBGOV.COM

December 15, 2003

The Honorable Kenneth Stolle
State Senate
700 Pavilion Center
Virginia Beach, VA 23451

Dear Senator Stolle: Ken

Congratulations on your appointment to the Task Force on Land Use in Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) created by the Virginia Beach City Council. The mission of this task force over the next several months will be to develop an understanding with the Navy in regards to the impact of the new OPNAV Instruction 11010.36B on Aircraft Installations Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Program involving Oceana Naval Air Station. This will also provide a venue to develop the Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) with the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense. Please refer to the following attachments for background information:

- *Chronology of City of Virginia Beach efforts to reduce encroachment.*
- *Responses to the City of Virginia Beach's comments on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the placement of the East Coast F/A-18 E/F Super Hornet aircraft. Our request to the Navy to utilize the 1999 AICUZ map was basically discarded for the reason that it was no longer valid. This map is what the Navy is proposing to use for AICUZ in Virginia Beach in the future.*
- *OPNAV Instruction 11010.36B issued by the Office of Naval Operations. I call your attention to page 16 that lists suggested land use compatibility in the various noise zones and also page 22 that lists the compatible uses in the various Accident Potential Zones (APZ).*
- *Chart prepared by City staff on land use compatibility with AICUZ comparing the pre-2002 and the post-2002 (i.e. new OPNAV Instruction) guidelines.*

- *Table prepared by the City staff indicating the impacts of the new OPNAV Instruction based on 1999 AICUZ map. For example, there are currently over 92,000 people residing in the 65-75 dB Ldn noise contour areas the Navy indicates as non-compatible.*

- *The JLUS prepared for Santa Rosa County and NAS Whiting Field.*

- *The Policy Advisory Committee for the Davis-Monthon Airforce Base Joint Land Use Study. This was provided to demonstrate a management board for the JLUS.*

- *Work plan for the City of Virginia Beach to respond to the OPNAV Instruction. As you can see, the City has held several meetings over the last few months and charts the foreseeable progress through the start of the JLUS.*

City staff is prepared to brief the task force on the City's understanding of the OPNAV Instruction, the EIS process for the Super Hornets, and the AICUZ map for the City of Virginia Beach. We are fortunate to have a number of knowledgeable City employees who can provide a balanced perspective on the impacts to the City. We also have dedicated City staff who will provide the task force with support, including members from the City Attorney's Office, the City Manager's Office, and any other department necessary for the successful outcome of your efforts.

You are invited to meet with Mr. Alan Zusman, author of the OPNAV Instruction, on December 19th at 10 a.m., at the Virginia Marine Science Museum. In addition, Senator Ken Stolle, Chair of the task force, has scheduled the first meeting for Thursday, December 18th, at 9 a.m., at the Pavilion. Chris Bolin in the City Manager's office will contact you for your availability in attending this inaugural meeting.

Again, congratulations on your appointment. I want to thank you for your volunteer service to the City. I also want to wish you and yours a very Merry Christmas and prosperous New Year.

Sincerely,

Meyera E. Oberndorf
Mayor

MEO/RRM/clb

c: The Honorable Members of Council
Mr. James K. Spore
Mr. Lesley L. Lilley
Mr. Robert R. Matthias
Ms. Diane C. Roche

CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH

AICUZ Zone Household Survey

Report Date: June 2004

Prepared for: The City of Virginia Beach

Prepared by: Jeannine Perry, Sr. Project Manager
Continental Research
757-489-4887

Table of Contents

PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

Methodology

This telephone survey about jet noise was conducted with Virginia Beach residents who live in AICUZ zones 65, 70, and 75+. The study was commissioned by the City of Virginia Beach and conducted by Continental Research Associates, Inc. The purpose of the research was to measure the extent to which jet noise was an issue with residents living in the specified AICUZ zones.

A questionnaire was jointly developed by Continental Research (CR) and representatives from the City of Virginia Beach. The survey topics flowed from general to specific, asking first about overall quality of life and later about jet noise-related issues. The questionnaire was pre-tested by CR senior staff members on a sub-sample of City residents. The pre-test identifies any problems with question wording, vocabulary, sequence, or layout. Twenty-nine households were included in the pre-test, which resulted in no survey modifications. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix of this report.

A random sample of households was selected to participate in the study. The list of addresses to be included was provided by the City of Virginia Beach GIS Coordinator. The AICUZ zones were defined as three noise contours near the flight path from Oceana Naval Air Station. The lists were separated by type of dwelling (parcel, condominium, multi-family, and manufactured home) within each AICUZ zone (see Sampling Plan). Because the lists did not contain home telephone numbers, they were sent to a telephone number matching service in Northern Virginia (TeleMatch). To improve accuracy, Continental Research used an Internet search site to confirm the most current telephone number for all rental units.

Methodology (continued)

The interviews were conducted between May 17th and June 6th of 2004. The data collection phase is extremely important to the quality of the research. Highly trained, staff interviewers administered the surveys. Interviewers assigned to the project attended a detailed briefing session where instructions for using the questionnaire and probing techniques were discussed. Role-playing exercises were used to practice the pace for reading the pre-formatted survey verbatim.

The telephone calls originated from our central telephone facility in Norfolk. The contacts were initiated between 5:15 and 9:15 p.m. from Monday through Thursday and from 4 to 9 p.m. on Sunday. These hours were selected to ensure the inclusion of both working and non-working adults. Re-calls were made at the resident's convenience.

The randomly-selected households were called up to six times, on different days, to reach a survey participant. After six attempts, a substitute phone number was used. This multiple attempt method is critical to secure interviews with a full cross-section of residents living in each zone. A few appointments were made with busy people who were not available at the time of the contact, and a few surveys were completed over two contact calls. Also, to eliminate an anticipated bias caused by female-headed households and females answering the phone more frequently, a statistical technique was used to select the adult in the household who would be asked to participate in the survey.

The responses were directly entered into the computer system using Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) technology. This process allows for the rotation of survey items within a grid-style question, thereby eliminating any sequence bias. All responses were recorded verbatim. Interviews took an average of 12 minutes to complete, and the survey was generally well-received.

Methodology (continued)

A Field Supervisor electronically monitored the fieldwork each evening. A portion of each interviewer's work was "dual recorded" on the Novell-based computer network to check for consistency in the recording of all answers while listening to both sides of the conversation. Over 38% of all calls were fully monitored, and an additional 25% were partially monitored. This is far in excess of the 5% industry validation standard.

Nightly de-briefings were held to discuss the survey's progress. While these meetings provide only anecdotal evidence, the information can be very useful when interpreting the results. De-briefings also help identify whether any current events or publicity may be impacting the survey results, warranting a delay of a few days. No such incidents occurred during this project.

After the surveys were completed, the open-ended responses were categorized into subject groupings and each response was numerically coded for computerization. Special attention was given to any remark pertaining to jet noise. The numeric codes were key entered twice to ensure 100% accuracy, and a detailed computer program was written to tabulate the data. Using SPSS (the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software, the data were analyzed. The results are presented by AICUZ zone and reflect the percentage of households in each zone.

Sampling Plan

The address lists provided by the City included the following household counts in the three noise contours. It is entirely possible that a small number of the lots counted in this census do not contain residences. The City made an attempt to clean the list accordingly, but some non-resident addresses were present on the list sent to Continental Research.

AICUZ Zone	# of Households	% of Total
65	20,956	35.4%
70	17,776	30.1%
75+	20,431	34.5%
	59,163	100.0%

A "housing type" analysis was conducted within each zone. Based on the data provided by the City, a sample of 400 interviews would be proportionately distributed as follows:

	Target Quota:		
Housing Type	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+
Parcel/Single Family Home	113	79	73
Condominium	16	20	14
Multi-Family/Apartment	13	19	46
Manufactured Home	0	2	5
	142	120	138

Margin of Error

Because random selection was used to create the sample of households for this study, the survey's results represent the residences of the three noise contours well. The term "Margin of Error" refers to the difference between the survey results and what one would get if a complete census of area households (in each AICUZ zone) had been conducted. With a sample size of 404 households, we are 95% certain any percentage in this report would be within ± 4.9 percentage points.

The following table displays the Margin of Error for a given percentage in this report. (Notice that the margin is the same for 90% vs. 10%, 70% vs. 30%, etc.)

If the reported percentage =		The "adjusted" Margin of Error =		
	99%		±0.97%	
	95%		±2.13%	
	90%		±2.93%	
	85%		±3.48%	
	80%		±3.90%	
	75%		±4.22%	
	70%		±4.47%	
	65%		±4.65%	
	60%		±4.78%	
	55%		±4.85%	
-------	50%	**- Highest Margin of Error -**	±4.88%	-------
	45%		±4.85%	
	40%		±4.78%	
	35%		±4.65%	
	30%		±4.47%	
	25%		±4.22%	
	20%		±3.90%	
	15%		±3.48%	
	10%		±2.93%	
	5%		±2.13%	
	1%		±0.97%	

Findings

This study was commissioned by the City of Virginia Beach and conducted by Continental Research Associates, Inc. The purpose of the survey was to examine the extent to which jet noise was a problem for residents living in three AICUZ zones (65, 70 and 75+). The zones were defined on a map as three "noise contours" adjacent to the flight path from Oceana Naval Air Station, with 75+ experiencing the loudest impact.

The questionnaire was developed by Continental Research and representatives from the City of Virginia Beach. It was pre-tested and then administered to 404 randomly-selected households between May 17 and June 6, 2004. Given the sample size of 404, the Margin of Error for any (full sample) percentage in this report is no greater than ±4.9 percentage points.

Results From Zones 65, 70, and 75+

Respondents were asked if they were Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in the City. About 90% reported being satisfied (Very Satisfied + Satisfied combined), and 10.4% were dissatisfied. (The responses were similar among the three zones.) When asked to explain their reasons, 2.2% were dissatisfied with how the City is managed (or certain elected officials), 1.5% found traffic backups to be annoying, 1.2% felt their property taxes were too high, and 1.2% felt the City was becoming overbuilt. Jet noise, however, was never mentioned as a reason for overall dissatisfaction with the quality of life in Virginia Beach.

The next question was more specific to the person's neighborhood. Residents were asked if they were Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in their immediate neighborhood. About 95% reported being satisfied (Very Satisfied + Satisfied combined) and 5.2% were dissatisfied. The responses were significantly less favorable in Zone 75+. So as not to mislead, it is important to know that Zone 75+ includes considerably more renters and households with lower incomes.

Findings (continued)

Of the 404 people surveyed, 1.2% were dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in their neighborhood because the neighbors don't keep up the appearance of their properties; 1.0% were dissatisfied because of jet noise, and just under 1% because the neighborhood has too many unruly children.

Next, survey participants were asked if they were satisfied with the decision to live in their specific neighborhood. About 93% were satisfied, while 6.7% were dissatisfied with their decision. Residents of Zone 75+ were significantly less likely to be satisfied.

When asked why respondents were dissatisfied with the decision to live in that particular neighborhood, 1.5% of the 404 people surveyed were unhappy because of jet noise. The top three reasons varied by zone as follows:

Reasons People Were Unhappy With the Decision to Select Their Neighborhood

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Jet noise	0.0%	1.6%	2.9%	1.5%
The neighborhood has crime	0.0%	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%
My neighbors don't keep up the appearance of their properties	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%
....etc....	(n=142)	(n=123)	(n=139)	(n=404)

Next respondents were asked, "If you were making the decision again today, would you choose to live in your neighborhood?" Again, the responses varied by zone.

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Yes	84.5%	80.5%	73.4%	79.5%
No	15.5%	19.5%	26.6%	20.5%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(n=142)	(n=123)	(n=139)	(n=404)

Findings (continued)

When asked why they would not choose to live in the same neighborhood again, the top five responses varied by zone. No one in Zone 65 mentioned jet noise.

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Jet noise	0.0%	4.9%	5.8%	3.5%
I want to move to a nicer place/home	1.4%	3.3%	4.3%	3.0%
My neighbors don't keep up the appearance of their properties	0.7%	2.4%	2.9%	2.0%
My neighborhood is getting rundown	2.1%	0.8%	0.7%	1.2%
My neighborhood has too many rentals	1.4%	0.0%	2.2%	1.2%
Would choose to live in same neighborhood if deciding today	84.5%	80.5%	73.4%	79.5%
....etc....	(n=142)	(n=123)	(n=139)	(n=404)

Participants were reminded that some people find certain things to be very bothersome, while others do not. The next questions used a 1 to 10 scale, where "10" meant Extremely Bothersome and "1" meant Not Bothersome. (People were encouraged to be candid about their feelings.)

How bothersome is the amount of traffic when you drive near your home?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Percent who said "1" or "2"	18.3%	21.1%	26.6%	22.1%
Percent who said "9" or "10"	12.7%	9.8%	10.1%	10.9%
Average Rating (1 to 10 scale)	5.28	5.07	4.83	5.06

How bothersome is jet noise during the daytime hours near your home?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Percent who said "1" or "2"	44.4%	26.0%	32.4%	34.7%
Percent who said "9" or "10"	4.9%	13.8%	17.3%	11.9%
Average Rating (1 to 10 scale)	3.52	4.79	4.81	4.35

Findings (continued)

How bothersome is jet noise near your home between 10 o'clock at night and 7 a.m.?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Percent who said "1" or "2"	64.8%	45.5%	45.3%	52.2%
Percent who said "9" or "10"	4.2%	13.0%	16.5%	11.1%
Average Rating (1 to 10 scale)	2.56	4.00	4.22	3.57

In the survey, everyone who gave a rating higher than a "2" for jet noise in the day or at night was asked a follow-up question about being bothered more indoors or outdoors.

When jets fly in the vicinity of your home, where is the sound most bothersome?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Inside my home	24.6%	29.3%	23.0%	25.5%
When I'm outdoors	33.1%	44.7%	40.3%	39.1%
Both are equally bothersome	1.4%	5.7%	8.6%	5.2%
Actually, it's not bothersome*	40.8%	20.3%	28.1%	30.2%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(n=142)	(n=123)	(n=139)	(n=404)

* Based on both earlier ratings being below a "3."

As an aside, a number of people mentioned that their ears were bothered by the noise "in a literal sense," but they believed the reason for the noise was important, or they felt patriotic when they heard the military jets fly overhead. This is not meant to ignore the people who were upset about the noise and voiced some anger over the sound levels, however, there were very few people in that category.

Findings (continued)

The fourth rating of things that are bothersome had to do with peripheral noise from neighbors or nearby traffic. This was somewhat less bothersome.

On the same 1 to 10 scale, how bothersome is noise from neighbors or vehicular traffic near your home?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Percent who said "1" or "2"	64.8%	60.2%	64.1%	63.1%
Percent who said "9" or "10"	3.5%	4.9%	3.6%	4.0%
Average Rating (1 to 10 scale)	2.66	2.83	2.81	2.76

Each respondent was asked if members of his/her household had phoned the NAS Oceana Complaint Line. Overall, 93.3% had never called the complaint line, 2% had called, but not in the past 12 months, and 4.7% had phoned one or more times in the past year.

Survey participants included both new residents (25% living in their neighborhood fewer than 3 years) and longstanding residents (23.5% having lived there for 16 or more years). Mirroring the housing types found in the three zones, about 66% were single family homes, about 12% were condos, about 9% were apartments, and the same proportion were townhouses. Overall, 84.7% owned the property they live in, although this was lower (74.1%) among residents of Zone 75+. Thirty-six percent had children under the age of 18 living in the household, and about 83% were Caucasian. Overall, 35.6% had a member of the household who had served in the military, and 14.4% were currently active duty military. The average age of the respondents was 48, and their annual household income varied by zone.

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Average Income (Mean)	$71,604	$66,383	$51,298	$63,068
Median Income	$58,571	$57,948	$45,000	$54,033

Findings (continued)

Responses of Those Who Were "Most Bothered by Jet Noise"

A special analysis was performed to estimate the proportion of residents who were most bothered by the jet noise. A sub-group of 69 respondents (out of the 404 surveyed) was analyzed. It was defined as all respondents who met **any** of the following criterion:

1) Mentioned jet noise as a reason for being dissatisfied with their quality of life in Virginia Beach. (There were no people who said this.)
2) Mentioned jet noise as a reason for being dissatisfied with the quality of life in their neighborhood.
3) Mentioned jet noise as a reason for being dissatisfied with the decision to live in their neighborhood.
4) Mentioned jet noise as a reason for not choosing to live in the same neighborhood again.
5) Rated jet noise as being bothersome at a level of "9" or "10" during the day.
6) Rated jet noise as being bothersome at a level of "9" or "10" at night.

Seventeen percent of those surveyed (69/404) met one or more of the criteria above. For simplicity, we will call these 69 people "those who are most bothered by jet noise." (As an aside, 14/404 (or 3.5%) mentioned jet noise in 1 - 4 above, and 55 more (13.6%) were added by including those who rated the noise a being bothersome (day or night) at a level of 9 or 10 even though they had not mentioned jet noise in 1 - 4.)

A profile of these 69 respondents found that 52.2% live in Zone 75+, 33.3% live in Zone 70, and 14.5% live in Zone 65. Overall, however, 79.7% of the 69 people in the "bothered" group were satisfied with the overall quality of life in Virginia Beach, and 85.5% remained satisfied with the overall quality of life in their immediate neighborhood.

When asked about the decision to live in that particular neighborhood, 84.1% of the 69 people who were "most bothered by jet noise" remained satisfied with their choice. About 20%, however, would not make the same decision again because of jet noise.

Findings (continued)

Using a 1 to 10 scale where "1" meant Not Bothersome and "10" meant Extremely Bothersome, this sub-group of 69 residents was asked to evaluate four things. While the means are skewed by selecting people with "9" or "10" scores, their average scores follow:

Mean*	
5.68	The traffic when you drive near your home
8.58	Jet noise during the daytime hours**
8.07	Jet noise between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.**
3.46	Noise from neighbors or vehicular traffic

* A "1" is the lowest possible mean, and a "10" is the highest.

** These means were impacted by how this sub-group was defined (many were 9's or 10's).

Of the 69 people who are "most bothered by jet noise," 18 (26.1%) had previously called the NAS Oceana Noise Complaint Line (ever) to report jet noise that was too loud. (About 4% of this subgroup had called prior to the past 12 months, but had not called more recently.) When asked whether the noise was most bothersome inside or outside their home, 34.8% said "inside," while 47.8% said "outside," and 17.4% replied that "both were equally bothersome."

Seventeen percent of the 69 who are "most bothered by jet noise" were renters, while 82.6% were owners. One-third had children under age 18 living in their home, and only 5.8% were active duty military. The average income of this sub-group of 69 people was lower than the larger survey sample of 404 ($57,912. vs. $63,068).

Summary

To recap, most of the 404 people surveyed in the three AICUZ zones did not find the jet noise to be very bothersome. About 90% of them were satisfied with their overall quality of life in Virginia Beach, and none of those who were dissatisfied cited jet noise as their reason.

Findings (continued)

Nearly 95% of the 404 surveyed were satisfied with the quality of life in their neighborhood, and 93% were happy with their decision to live there. In fact, about 80% would make the same choice again today. Of all 404 surveyed, fewer than 4% would not choose to live in the same neighborhood again because of jet noise.

It would be unfair to downplay the impact that jet noise has on some people. Clearly, there are people who are very bothered by the sound. Sixty-nine of the 404, or 17.08%*, mentioned jet noise as an issue or rated the amount it bothers them as "9" or "10." Given that the sample of 404 represents 59,163 households (in all three zones), 17.08% means that about 10,100 housing units in the three zones are "most bothered by jet noise." To further break down the estimates, Zone 65 = 10 out of 142 (or 7.04%), Zone 70 = 23 out of 123 (or 18.70%), and Zone 75+ = 36 out of 139 (or 25.90%) who were "most bothered."

Based on data provided by the City of Virginia Beach, the total housing units in the three zones were 20,956, 17,776, and 20,431 respectively. Therefore, the projected breakout of those "most bothered" by zone would be:

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Projected # of housing units "most bothered by jet noise"	1,480	3,325	5,295	10,100

These estimates may be high, considering that only 20% of the 69 people surveyed who were "most bothered by the jet noise" would not choose to live in the same neighborhood again because of jet noise. As such, the above projections may overstate the level of the problem.

* Additional decimal places have been added for accuracy during projections. For simplicity, projected numbers have been rounded.

Findings (continued)

To offer a more conservative estimate, one could consider only the 3.47% of the 404 people surveyed who would not choose to live in the same neighborhood again because of jet noise (14 out of the entire 404 surveyed):

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
My reason is: Jet noise	0.0%	4.88%	5.76%	3.47%

Projecting to the total housing units in each zone (20,956, 17,776, and 20,431 respectively), the following number of households in each zone would be impacted:

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Would not choose same neighborhood because of jet noise	0	870	1,180	2,050

To summarize, the number of households in the three zones that are "most bothered by jet noise" is estimated at 10,100, and the number who would not move into the same neighborhood again because of jet noise is 2,050. (The 2,050 people are also included in the 10,100.)

RESULTS

Are you Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in the City of Virginia Beach?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Very Satisfied	24.6%	26.8%	24.5%	25.2%
Satisfied	66.2%	62.6%	64.0%	64.4%
Dissatisfied*	5.6%	8.9%	8.6%	7.7%
Very Dissatisfied*	3.5%	1.6%	2.9%	2.7%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
Mean	3.12	3.15	3.10	3.12

Mean Scale: 4 = Very Satisfied
3 = Satisfied
2 = Dissatisfied
1 = Very Dissatisfied

* Asked the follow-up question on the next page.

(If "Dissatisfied" or "Very Dissatisfied" with the overall quality of life in Virginia Beach...) What is the most important thing that could be done to make you a more satisfied resident?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
I don't like how the City is managed/ certain elected officials	1.4%	4.1%	1.4%	2.2%
Traffic backups are very annoying	1.4%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
Property taxes are too high	0.7%	0.8%	2.2%	1.2%
The City is too overbuilt	2.1%	1.6%	0.0%	1.2%
Inadequate public transit	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%
Not enough nice low income housing	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.5%
The City spends too much on tourism	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
Other taxes are too high	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Virginia Beach is a racist city	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Virginia Beach has too many restrictions on my freedoms	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Not enough to keep teens busy	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Too much crime	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
The roads need to be improved	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
I'm getting evicted due to the mobile home park being sold	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
There were problems with the school bus service not including our street	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
The mosquitoes are breeding in ditches all over my neighborhood	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
The City built a canal in my back yard	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Need better discipline in the schools	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
I'm satisfied with the overall quality of life in Virginia Beach*	90.8%	89.4%	88.5%	89.6%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

* Not asked this question.

Are you Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in your neighborhood?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Very Satisfied	41.5%	42.3%	25.9%	36.4%
Satisfied	54.9%	53.7%	66.2%	58.4%
Dissatisfied*	3.5%	4.1%	7.2%	5.0%
Very Dissatisfied*	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
Mean	3.38	3.38	3.17	3.31

Mean Scale: 4 = Very Satisfied
3 = Satisfied
2 = Dissatisfied
1 = Very Dissatisfied

*Asked the follow-up question on the next page.

(If "Dissatisfied" or "Very Dissatisfied" with the overall quality of life in your neighborhood...) What, in particular, makes you dissatisfied with the quality of life in your neighborhood?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
My neighbors don't keep up the appearance of their properties	1.4%	0.8%	1.4%	1.2%
Jet noise	0.0%	0.8%	2.2%	1.0%
The neighborhood has too many unruly children	0.7%	0.0%	1.4%	0.7%
Pit bulls are running loose	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
The neighborhood has too many rentals	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
The neighborhood lacks stability	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
The neighborhood has crime	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Teenagers roam around using foul language	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
There is noise from vehicular traffic	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
There is too much traffic congestion	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Not enough nice low income housing	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
The City does not enforce the codes	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
I'm satisfied with the overall quality of life in my neighborhood*	96.5%	95.9%	92.1%	94.8%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

* Not asked this question.

Overall, are you Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with the decision to live in your neighborhood?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Very Satisfied	50.0%	52.8%	30.2%	44.1%
Satisfied	45.8%	40.7%	60.4%	49.3%
Dissatisfied*	4.2%	6.5%	7.9%	6.2%
Very Dissatisfied*	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.5%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
Mean	3.46	3.46	3.19	3.37

Mean Scale: 4 = Very Satisfied
3 = Satisfied
2 = Dissatisfied
1 = Very Dissatisfied

*Asked the follow-up question on the next page.

(If "Dissatisfied" or "Very Dissatisfied" with the decision to live in your neighborhood...) Why, in particular, are you dissatisfied with the decision to live in your neighborhood?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Jet noise	0.0%	1.6%	2.9%	1.5%
The neighborhood has crime	0.0%	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%
Neighbors don't keep up the appearance of their properties	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%
The condo association is difficult to deal with	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
I'm living too far from my job	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
We paid too much for our house	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Flood insurance is mandatory	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
The neighborhood is too overbuilt	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
The neighborhood is getting rundown	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
The neighborhood has too many rentals	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
The neighborhood lacks stability	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
The neighborhood has too many unruly children	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
The neighborhood has too many minorities	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
My apartment complex is getting rundown	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
My neighbors are racist	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
There is noise from vehicular traffic	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Not enough nice low income housing	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
The City does not enforce the codes	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
The Southeastern Parkway is coming close to my home	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
I'm satisfied with the decision to live in my neighborhood*	95.8%	93.5%	90.6%	93.3%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

* Not asked this question.

If you were making the decision again today, would you choose to live in your neighborhood?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Yes	84.5%	80.5%	73.4%	79.5%
No*	15.5%	19.5%	26.6%	20.5%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

*Asked the follow-up question on the next page.

(If you were deciding today and would not choose to live in your neighborhood...) Why wouldn't you choose to live in your neighborhood?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Jet noise	0.0%	4.9%	5.8%	3.5%
I want to move to a nicer place/home	1.4%	3.3%	4.3%	3.0%
Neighbors don't keep up the appearance of their properties	0.7%	2.4%	2.9%	2.0%
The neighborhood is getting rundown	2.1%	0.8%	0.7%	1.2%
The neighborhood has too many rentals	1.4%	0.0%	2.2%	1.2%
I want more land	1.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.7%
The neighborhood lacks stability	0.0%	0.8%	1.4%	0.7%
There is noise from vehicular traffic	0.7%	0.0%	1.4%	0.7%
There is too much traffic congestion	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%
We paid too much for our house	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.5%
The neighborhood has crime	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
The City does not enforce the codes	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
The condo association is difficult to deal with	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
A Wal-Mart Super Center just invaded the neighborhood	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
I want to move up to a single family detached home	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
I want to move to a different apartment complex	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
I want to move closer to the interstate	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
I want to move to Florida	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
The neighborhood is too overbuilt	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%

(continued)

(If you were deciding today and would not choose to live in your neighborhood...) Why wouldn't you choose to live in your neighborhood? (continued)

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
The neighborhood is too close to tourists	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
The neighborhood has too many minorities	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
My apartment complex is getting rundown	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
My mobile home park is getting rundown	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Teenagers roam around using foul language	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
Not enough nice low income housing	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
Whites are a minority at our local high school	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
I don't like the area schools	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
Mobile home residents can get evicted	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
My neighborhood association is too restrictive	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
The City is enlarging a parking lot in my neighborhood	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
The City built a canal in my back yard	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%
The Southeastern Parkway is coming close to my home	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
I prefer not to discuss my personal business	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
I would choose to live in my neighborhood if I was deciding today*	84.5%	80.5%	73.4%	79.5%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

* Not asked this question.

Some people find certain things to be very bothersome, while others do not. On a 1 to 10 scale, where 10 is Extremely Bothersome and a 1 is Not Bothersome, how would you rate the amount of traffic when you drive near your home?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
1 Not Bothersome	13.4%	15.4%	15.8%	14.9%
2	4.9%	5.7%	10.8%	7.2%
3	7.7%	9.8%	7.9%	8.4%
4	8.5%	7.3%	8.6%	8.2%
5	23.9%	18.7%	18.0%	20.3%
6	7.0%	8.9%	7.9%	7.9%
7	9.9%	15.4%	12.9%	12.6%
8	12.0%	8.9%	7.9%	9.7%
9	5.6%	2.4%	4.3%	4.2%
10 Extremely Bothersome	7.0%	7.3%	5.8%	6.7%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
Mean	5.28	5.07	4.83	5.06

On a 1 to 10 scale, where 10 is Extremely Bothersome and a 1 is Not Bothersome, how would you rate jet noise during the daytime hours near your home?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
1 Not Bothersome	29.6%	17.9%	23.0%	23.8%
2	14.8%	8.1%	9.4%	10.9%
3	11.3%	11.4%	7.9%	10.1%
4	10.6%	8.1%	10.8%	9.9%
5	14.8%	18.7%	12.9%	15.3%
6	4.9%	9.8%	2.9%	5.7%
7	5.6%	5.7%	5.8%	5.7%
8	3.5%	6.5%	10.1%	6.7%
9	3.5%	4.1%	2.9%	3.5%
10 Extremely Bothersome	1.4%	9.8%	14.4%	8.4%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
Mean	3.52	4.79	4.81	4.35

NOTE: Ratings higher than a "2" were asked a follow-up question about being bothered more indoors or outdoors.

On our 1 to 10 scale, where 10 is Extremely Bothersome and a 1 is Not Bothersome, how would you rate jet noise near your home between 10 o'clock at night and 7 a.m.?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
1 Not Bothersome	47.2%	30.1%	27.3%	35.1%
2	17.6%	15.4%	18.0%	17.1%
3	12.7%	9.8%	8.6%	10.4%
4	5.6%	8.1%	5.8%	6.4%
5	8.5%	8.9%	7.9%	8.4%
6	1.4%	3.3%	6.5%	3.7%
7	2.1%	4.9%	5.8%	4.2%
8	0.7%	6.5%	3.6%	3.5%
9	0.7%	3.3%	3.6%	2.5%
10 Extremely Bothersome	3.5%	9.8%	12.9%	8.7%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
Mean	2.56	4.00	4.22	3.57

NOTE: Ratings higher than a "2" were asked a follow-up question about being bothered more indoors or outdoors.

(If rated jet noise during the daytime or at night greater than a "2"...) When jets fly in the vicinity of your home, is the sound most bothersome to your household when you are inside your home or when you are outdoors?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
When I am inside my home	24.6%	29.3%	23.0%	25.5%
When I am outdoors	33.1%	44.7%	40.3%	39.1%
Both are equally bothersome	1.4%	5.7%	8.6%	5.2%
Actually, it's not bothersome*	40.8%	20.3%	28.1%	30.2%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

* Based on both earlier ratings being below a "3."

On a 1 to 10 scale, where 10 is Extremely Bothersome and a 1 is Not Bothersome, how would you rate other noise from neighbors or vehicular traffic near your home?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
1 Not Bothersome	42.3%	42.3%	43.2%	42.6%
2	22.5%	17.9%	20.9%	20.5%
3	12.0%	13.0%	10.8%	11.9%
4	7.0%	8.1%	3.6%	6.2%
5	4.9%	5.7%	7.2%	5.9%
6	2.1%	1.6%	2.9%	2.2%
7	1.4%	2.4%	2.9%	2.2%
8	4.2%	4.1%	5.0%	4.5%
9	1.4%	3.3%	0.7%	1.7%
10 Extremely Bothersome	2.1%	1.6%	2.9%	2.2%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
Mean	2.66	2.83	2.81	2.76

Have you or other adults in your home ever phoned the NAS Oceana Noise Complaint Line (433-2162) or used their on-line complaint form to report jet noise that is too loud?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Yes*	2.1%	8.9%	9.4%	6.7%
No	97.9%	91.1%	90.6%	93.3%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

*Asked the follow-up question on the next page.

(If phoned the NAS Oceana Noise Complaint Line...) About how many times in the past 12 months had you phoned the NAS Oceana Complaint Line?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Zero, I haven't ever called the NAS Oceana Complaint Line*	97.9%	91.1%	90.6%	93.3%
Zero, I called the Complaint Line, but not in the last 12 months	1.4%	2.4%	2.2%	2.0%
One time	0.7%	0.8%	3.6%	1.7%
Two times	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.7%
Three times	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.7%
Four times	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%
Five times	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%
Six times	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.5%
More than six times	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

AVERAGES:

Mean (all households)	.01 times	.23 times	.17 times	.13 times
Median (all households)	.00 times (n=142)	.00 times (n=123)	.00 times (n=139)	.00 times (n=404)
Mean (Complaint Line callers only)	.33 times	2.55 times	1.77 times	1.93 times
Median (Complaint Line callers only)	.00 times (n=3)	2.00 times (n=11)	1.00 time (n=13)	1.00 time (n=27)

*Not asked this question.

DEMOGRAPHICS

How many years have you lived in the neighborhood you live in now?

(Grouped for presentation purposes)

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
1-2 years	21.1%	26.8%	27.3%	25.0%
3-5 years	21.8%	18.7%	20.9%	20.5%
6-10 years	17.6%	21.1%	12.2%	16.8%
11-15 years	14.8%	13.0%	14.4%	14.1%
16 or more years	24.6%	20.3%	25.2%	23.5%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
AVERAGES:*				
Mean	10.9 yrs.	10.3 yrs.	11.7 yrs.	11.0 yrs.
Median	7.0 yrs.	7.0 yrs.	6.0 yrs.	6.0 yrs.

*Based on non-grouped data.

Type of Dwelling

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Townhouse	3.5%	7.3%	15.8%	8.9%
Single family home	79.6%	66.7%	52.5%	66.3%
Condominium	11.3%	17.1%	9.4%	12.4%
Apartment	5.6%	4.9%	15.1%	8.7%
Manufactured or mobile home	0.0%	1.6%	3.6%	1.7%
Duplex	0.0%	2.4%	3.6%	2.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

Do you own your home or do you rent?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Owns/has mortgage	88.7%	91.9%	74.1%	84.7%
Rents	11.3%	8.1%	25.9%	15.3%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

Zip Code of Residence

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
23451	16.9%	25.2%	25.2%	22.3%
23452	22.5%	22.8%	9.4%	18.1%
23453	10.6%	14.6%	5.8%	10.1%
23454	32.4%	23.6%	59.0%	38.9%
23456	17.6%	13.0%	0.7%	10.4%
23462	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

Do you have any children under the age of 18 living in your household?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Yes	39.4%	39.0%	30.2%	36.1%
No	60.6%	61.0%	69.8%	63.9%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

Age of Respondent

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
18 to 25	7.0%	7.3%	9.4%	7.9%
26 to 34	19.0%	6.5%	16.5%	14.4%
35 to 44	20.4%	24.4%	21.6%	22.0%
45 to 54	19.0%	26.0%	18.7%	21.0%
55 to 64	14.8%	19.5%	15.8%	16.6%
65 or older	19.7%	16.3%	18.0%	18.1%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
AVERAGES:				
*Mean	47.3 yrs.	49.0 yrs.	46.8 yrs.	47.6 yrs.
Median	46.9 yrs.	49.5 yrs.	46.3 yrs.	47.7 yrs.

* Category mid-point interpolation was used for this calculation. A value of 70 was used for the category "65 or older."

Are you or is anyone in your household active duty military?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Yes	16.9%	8.9%	16.5%	14.4%
No	83.1%	91.1%	83.5%	85.6%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

Were you or any other members of your household <u>previously</u> in the military (a veteran)?

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Yes	34.5%	43.9%	29.5%	35.6%
No	65.5%	56.1%	70.5%	64.4%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

Ethnic Origin

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
White (Caucasian)	87.3%	82.1%	79.1%	82.9%
African American	8.5%	10.6%	11.5%	10.1%
Filipino American	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.8%	2.4%	2.9%	2.7%
Hispanic	0.0%	2.4%	4.3%	2.2%
Other	1.4%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

Yearly Household Income

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Under $20,000	2.8%	6.5%	10.8%	6.7%
$20,000 to $39,999	16.9%	13.8%	29.5%	20.3%
$40,000 to $59,999	29.6%	31.7%	27.3%	29.5%
$60,000 to $79,999	10.6%	18.7%	12.9%	13.9%
$80,000 to $99,999	16.2%	13.8%	6.5%	12.1%
$100,000 to $149,999	12.0%	8.1%	7.2%	9.2%
$150,000 or more	6.3%	4.9%	0.0%	3.7%
Refused	5.6%	2.4%	5.8%	4.7%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404
AVERAGES:				
*Mean	$71,604	$66,383	$51,298	$63,068
Median	$58,571 (n=134)	$57,948 (n=120)	$45,000 (n=131)	$54,033 (n=385)

* Category mid-point interpolation was used for this calculation. A value of $18,000 was used for the category "Under $20,000," and $162,000 was used for "$150,000 or more."

Gender of Respondent

	Zone 65	Zone 70	Zone 75+	Total
Male	47.2%	38.2%	37.4%	41.1%
Female	52.8%	61.8%	62.6%	58.9%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	n=142	n=123	n=139	n=404

APPENDIX

City of Virginia Beach - AICUZ Zone Household Survey

Hello, I'm _____ with Continental Research. We're conducting a community survey for the City of Virginia Beach today. (If needed... your phone number was randomly selected from within your zip code area.) *[INTV: Alternate male/female head of household.]*

Screening Questions

1) You are you a resident of Virginia Beach?
1- Yes
2- No **(Politely Terminate Interview)**

2) Are you at least 18 years of age?
1- Yes
2- No **(Politely Terminate Interview)**

3) Indicate Zone (per City records): ☐ 65 ☐ 70 ☐ 75+ **(Check Quotas)**

Thinking about living in the City of Virginia Beach... are you Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with _____?

		VS	S	D	VD	D/K
4)	The overall quality of life in the City of Virginia Beach	4	3	2	1	7

5) **(If Q4 = 2 or 1)** What is the most important thing that could be done to make you a more satisfied resident?

_____

_____

		VS	S	D	VD	D/K
6)	Are you Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in your neighborhood?	4	3	2	1	7

7) **(If Q6 = 2 or 1)** What, in particular, makes you dissatisfied with the quality of life in your neighborhood?

_____

_____

8) How many years have you lived in the neighborhood you live in now? ___ ___

		VS	S	D	VD	D/K
9)	Overall, are you Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, or Very Dissatisfied with the decision to live in that neighborhood?	4	3	2	1	7

10) **(If Q9 = 2 or 1)** Why, in particular, are you dissatisfied with the decision to live in that neighborhood?

_____

_____

11) If you were making the decision again today, would you choose to live there?

1- Yes **(Skip to Q13)** 2- No

12) **(If Q11 = No)** Why wouldn't you choose to live there?

_____

_____

13) Some people find certain things to be very bothersome, while others do not. On a 1 to 10 scale, where 10 is Extremely Bothersome and a 1 is Not Bothersome, how would you rate the amount of traffic when you drive near your home?

Not Bothersome 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely Bothersome

14) On a 1 to 10 scale, where 10 is Extremely Bothersome and a 1 is Not Bothersome, how would you rate jet noise during the daytime hours near your home?

Not Bothersome 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely Bothersome

15) On our 1 to 10 scale, where 10 is Extremely Bothersome and a 1 is Not Bothersome, how would you rate jet noise near your home between 10 o'clock at night and 7 a.m.?

Not Bothersome 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely Bothersome

16) On a 1 to 10 scale, where 10 is Extremely Bothersome and a 1 is Not Bothersome, how would you rate other noise from neighbors or vehicular traffic near your home?

Not Bothersome 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely Bothersome

17) Have you or other adults in your home ever phoned the NAS Oceana Noise Complaint Line (433-2162) or used their on-line complaint form to report jet noise that is too loud?

1- Yes 2- No **(Skip to Q19)**

18) **(If Q17 = Yes)** About how many times in the past 12 months? _____

19) **(Ask ONLY when Q14 or Q15 is greater than 2...)**

When jets fly in the vicinity of your home, is the sound most bothersome to your household:

1- When you are inside your home, or
2- When you are outdoors?

7- Could not decide, both are equally bothersome

20) Do you live in: **(Read Choices)**

1- A townhouse
2- A single family home
3- A condominium
4- An apartment
5- A manufactured or mobile home, or

Another type of dwelling? _____

21) Do you own your home or do you rent?

1- Owns/has mortgage 2- Rents

22) What Zip Code are you in? 2 3 ___ ___ ___

23) In order to make sure my Zip Code quotas are correct, is your residence at (confirm street):

□ Yes □ No (Terminate Interview and Destroy)

24) Do you have any children under the age of 18 living in your household?

1- Yes 2- No

25) And, which age group fits you? **(Read Choices)**

1- 18 to 25
2- 26 to 34
3- 35 to 44
4- 45 to 54
5- 55 to 64
6- 65 or older

26) Are you or is anyone in your household active duty military?

1- Yes 2- No

27) Were you or any other members of your household previously in the military (a veteran)?

1- Yes 2- No

28) To be sure we interview all groups of people, which racial or ethnic group best represents you? **(Read Choices)**

1- White (Caucasian)
2- African American
3- Filipino American
4- Asian or Pacific Islander
5- Hispanic, or
7- Other

29) Last of all, which LETTER includes your total yearly household income? Just stop me when I say the right letter.

1- **A** Under $20,000
2- **B** $20,000 to $39,999
3- **C** $40,000 to $59,999
4- **D** $60,000 to $79,999
5- **E** $80,000 to $99,999
6- **F** $100,000 to $149,999
7- **G** $150,000 or more

30) **Gender**: 1- Male 2- Female

CLOSING:

Thanks for sharing your time with me today.

We'll be reporting the results of this survey to the City in about 6 weeks.

Item V-I.7.

ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS ***ITEM # 53943***

*The following registered to speak in **SUPPORT:***

Bobby Rountree, 1750 Tomcat Boulevard, Phone: 433-2553, NAS Oceana Planning Policy Department Director, AICUZ Member - JLUS Policy Committee, represented Captain Keeley, Commanding Officer - NAS Oceana. Oceana is actively lobbying for encroachment partnering funds for their FY 2006 Operating Budget to support the City through its Agricultural Reserve Program (ARP) and Conservation groups to preserve open space as well as provide a return on investment to property owners who are affected by some of the JLUS recommendations and at the same time providing a buffer for NAS Oceana.

*The following registered in **OPPOSITION:***

Reverend Tom Conant, 1405 Powder Ridge Court, Phone; 471-8886, Pastor of Christian Chapel Assembly of God. Since April 13, 2004, their application has been deferred pending completion of the Joint Land Use Plan (JLUS). The Lynnhaven Presbyterian Church application presented during the same City Council Session was approved. Reverend Conant requested reconsideration of the Deferral. A copy of Reverent Conant's statement is hereby made a part of the record.

Alvin Chandler Calvert, 2801 Rose Garden Way, Phone: 438-6182, long standing member of Christian Chapel Assembly of God. The average attendance for Sunday services is 210 (spread out over 2 services). Interest rates and building costs are increasing.

Tim Roscher, Phone: 474-1875, represented Christian Chapel Assembly of God Representatives of the Church have met with Captain Keeley, Mr. Rountree and his staff to determine the Navy's opposition. On the Church's application, nursery and classrooms were listed, which the Navy had interpreted as operating a daycare center and school. This is not the case. The nursery is only for housing the small children during Sunday services and the classrooms are just for Sunday school. The Church has been given a verbal approval by the Navy, if the Conditional Use is more specifically detailed.

*Upon motion by Councilman Reeve, seconded by Councilman Maddox, City Council **ADOPTED:***

*Resolutions re **Joint Land Use (JLUS)***

a. ***EXTEND** Interim Guidelines governing applications re development in Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ)*

b. ***ACCEPT** the final **Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)** and **DIRECT** the City Manager to provide Ordinances to implement their **recommendations***

*The City Staff was directed to come back with recommendations re **Christian Assembly of God** Conditional Use Permit and its status.*

Item V-I.7.

ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS ITEM # 53943 (Continued)

Voting: 11-0

Council Members Voting Aye:

Harry E. Diezel, Robert M. Dyer, Vice Mayor Louis R. Jones, Reba S. McClanan, Richard A. Maddox, Mayor Meyera E. Oberndorf, Jim Reeve, Peter W. Schmidt, Ron A. Villanueva, Rosemary Wilson and James L. Wood

Council Members Voting Nay:

None

Council Members Absent:

None

A RESOLUTION EXTENDING THE INTERIM GUIDELINES GOVERNING APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT IN AIR INSTALLATIONS COMPATIBLE USE ZONES (AICUZ)

WHEREAS, on February 10, 2004, the City Council adopted Interim Guidelines Governing Applications for Development in Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) (the "Guidelines), which had been developed by the Task Force on Land Use in Air Installations Compatible Use Zones and recommended to the City Council by the Task Force on February 3, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the said Guidelines were amended on March 23, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the Guidelines provided, in pertinent part, that certain applications for discretionary approvals should be deferred by the Planning Commission or City Council, as the case may be, pending completion of the Joint Land Use Study; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Land Use Study has been completed; and

WHEREAS, the City is in the process of developing the AICUZ Overlay Ordinance, which, among other things, will provide rules regarding decisions by the City Council on land use applications coming before it; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that the AICUZ Overlay District Ordinance will be brought before the City Council in the Fall of 2005; and

WHEREAS, because the same reasons for deferring action on applications within the purview of the Guidelines pending completion of the Joint Land Use Study remain applicable pending adoption of the AICUZ Overlay District Ordinance, the City Council deems it appropriate and in the public interest, pending adoption of the AICUZ Overlay District Ordinance, to continue to treat discretionary land use applications in the same manner as is set forth in the Guidelines;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the Interim Guidelines Governing Applications for Development in Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) are hereby amended so as to extend the period during which they are operative, as follows:

Amended Interim Guidelines Governing Applications for Development in Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ)

1. Purpose.

The City of Virginia Beach has agreed to engage with the Navy in a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) to resolve conflicts between development and jet aircraft operations

near NAS Oceana. This agreement necessitates a careful balance between the City's commitment to act in a timely manner on land use proposals in the affected area and the City's commitment to partner with the Navy to carefully and comprehensively work toward a mutually acceptable land use solution. It is reasonably anticipated that the JLUS effort will take at least six (6) months and perhaps a year to complete, such that this passage of time will work against the interests of those citizens seeking quick resolution to their land use issues. Accordingly, the City Council of the City of Virginia Beach sets forth these interim guidelines intended to move forward, for resolution on their merits, those rezoning and conditional use permit requests that are impacted by the AICUZ program but whose impact is not deemed detrimental to the desired balance to be struck through the JLUS effort.

2. Application.

(a) These guidelines govern the procedural aspects of discretionary development applications (i.e., applications for rezonings, conditional zonings and conditional use permits requiring hearing by the City Council and Planning Commission) pertaining to property located wholly or

partially within an Air Installations Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ)

(b) These guidelines do not apply to the review of subdivision plats, site plans or other forms of review of proposed developments not requiring the approval of the City Council; to applications for discretionary approvals of land uses not deemed incompatible under Table 2 (Suggested Land Use Compatibility in Noise Zones) or Table 3 (Suggested Land Use Compatibility in Accident Potential Zones) of the Department of the Navy's AICUZ Program Procedures and Guidelines for Department of the Navy Air Installations (OPNAV Instruction 11010.36B); or to applications for discretionary approvals on property entirely outside of an AICUZ area.

3. Guidelines.

(a) Infill development on tracts or parcels of less than ten (10) acres, where all of the following conditions are present should be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council in the normal course and should be decided on the merits of the application: (1) the existing zoning is unreasonable; (2) the requested action would give rise to development substantially similar to that on surrounding properties; and (3) the requested use is the least

intensive necessary to achieve consistency with the surrounding properties

(b) Development proposals for property wholly or partially located in AICUZ areas and not meeting the criteria set forth in subsection (3) (a) above should be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council in the normal course and should be decided on the merits of the application where all of the following conditions are present: (1) the property is not located, wholly or partially, within an Accident Potential Zone; (2) the development proposal represents the lowest reasonable density or intensity for the property, given its location and surrounding land uses; (3) the property is not located, wholly or partially, within a noise zone greater than 70 dB Ldn (except where the uses proposed are deemed compatible with their location in such noise zone pursuant to Section 221.1 of the City Zoning Ordinance); and (4) all appropriate noise attenuation measures specified by Section 221.1 of the City Zoning Ordinance are provided.

(c) All other applications should be deferred by the Planning Commission or City Council, as the case may be, pending ~~completion~~ adoption of the ~~Joint Land Use Study~~ AICUZ Overlay Ordinance.

Adopted by the Council of the City of Virginia Beach, Virginia, on the 10th day of May, 2005.

CA-9605
OID\Land Use\ordres\AICUZ\extendinterimguidelinesres.doc
R-1
May 3, 2005

APPROVED AS TO CONTEBNT:

5-3-05
Planning Department

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY:

City Attorney's Office

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE FINAL HAMPTON ROADS JOINT LAND USE STUDY AND DIRECTING THE CITY STAFF TO BRING FORWARD ORDINANCES IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS THEREOF

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 3031, adopted on January 6, 2004, the City Council committed to participate in a Joint Land Use Study, the purpose of which was to provide recommendations regarding land use policy to reduce the impacts associated with military air operations; and

WHEREAS, the said Resolution also provided that the City shall implement such recommendations of the Study as are appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Land Use Study has been completed and presented to the City Council, and a public hearing on the final Study was held on May 3, 2005;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the City Council hereby accepts the Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study dated April, 2005 and directs the City Staff to bring forward to the City Council all appropriate ordinances implementing the recommendations thereof pertaining to the City of Virginia Beach, including, but not limited to, the preparation of a draft AICUZ Overlay Ordinance to be presented to the City Council for its consideration.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the City Council hereby expresses its gratitude to the United States Navy, the Cities of Norfolk and Chesapeake, the members of the Policy Committee and Technical Committee (Working Group), the Office of Economic Adjustment, the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, members of the public who attended public hearings and meetings on the Study, and all others whose efforts contributed to the completion of the Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study.

Adopted by the Council of the City of Virginia Beach, Virginia, on the 10th day of May, 2005.

CA-9608
OID\Land Use\ordres\AICUZ\FinalJLUSres.doc
R-1
May 4, 2005

APPROVED AS TO CONTEBNT:

5-4-05
Planning Department

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY:

William M. Macaluso
City Attorney's Office

City of Virginia Beach

September 17, 2002

Mr. Fred Pierson (Code BD32FP)
Commander, Atlantic Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1510 Gilbert Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23511-2000

RE: Comments by the City of Virginia Beach on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Introduction of the F/A-18 E/F Super Hornet aircraft on the East Coast of the U.S

Dear Mr. Pierson:

Please find attached the comments by the staff of the City of Virginia Beach on the DEIS for the East Coast Super Hornet Aircraft. We would like to congratulate you and the members of your team for a job exceptionally well done. Please recognize that if we do have concerns and questions about the information included in this document, it in no way means that we have any doubt whatsoever of your professionalism and technical ability. The city will provide the majority of its comments on the two alternatives favored by the
1 Navy, i.e., ALT 4A – six fleet squadrons and the Fleet Replacement Squadron (FRS) to NAS Oceana and four squadrons to MCAS Cherry Point, and ALT 6 – eight fleet squadrons and the Fleet Replacement Squadron to NAS Oceana and two fleet squadrons to MCAS Cherry Point. We will also comment on ALT 1, which would place ten fleet squadrons and the FRS, i.e., all of the East Coast Super Hornet aircraft stationed at Virginia Beach.

Also, another point that we want to make is that we believe that an additional
2 outlying field should be a base requirement for this federal action. The outlying field will provide flexibility of the Navy for training in Field Carrier Landing Practice (FCLP) and will provide substantial relief to the area around the Fentress Outlying Landing Field (OLF). We also fully understand that the additional outlying field will supplement Fentress OLF

Title: CVB P1 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-1	Comment noted; no response required.
CVB-2	Although NALF Fentress meets all the operational requirements to support the FCLP operations of the Super Hornet squadrons, construction and operation of an additional OLF is being considered to provide for operational flexibility and to mitigate the noise impacts under ALT 1, 4B, and 6. An additional OLF provides operational flexibility through increased availability of FCLP training periods particularly important during surge operations, when more than one carrier air wing and an FRS must simultaneously prepare for carrier operations, or when one site becomes unusable due to maintenance or weather. A second OLF increases the number of available FCLP periods earlier in evening, thus reducing the number of late night operations at both OLFs as well as the home bases. In addition, although NALF Fentress is and will continue to be used by aircraft from NAS Oceana for FCLP, training there is less than optimal because of residential growth around the airfield. A new OLF located at any of the OLF sites would provide a training environment free from residential growth.

Chesapeake Public Schools
School Administration Building
Post Office Box 16496
Chesapeake, Virginia 23328

September 27, 2002

Commander, Atlantic Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Attention: Mr. Fred Pierson (Code BD32FP)
1510 Gilbert St.
Norfolk, VA 23511

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Introduction of F/A-18 E/F (Super Hornet) Aircraft to the East Coast of the United States

Dear Mr. Pierson:

Butts Road Intermediate School, one of the Chesapeake Public Schools, is located in close proximity to NALF Fentress in Chesapeake, Virginia. The purpose of this letter is to provide our comments relating to the Draft EIS.

1 Chesapeake Public Schools is opposed to any option that would negatively impact operations at Butts Road Intermediate School. These negative impacts include (1) any increase in noise above current levels, (2) expansion of the crash potential zones in the direction of the school, or (3) any increase in flight operations at NALF Fentress.

If you need further information, feel free to contact the Planning and Development Department at (757) 547-0580.

Sincerely,

J. Paige Stutz
Program Administrator for Planning and Development

H-1-965

Title:	CPS
Grouping:	Local Agency
Location:	City of Chesapeake,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CPS-1	Please see Section 4.2 for the discussion of noise impacts to Butts Road Intermediate School under all of the siting alternatives.

and not replace it. Furthermore, we believe that the Washington County alternative is the
3 only alternative that should be considered. It has the least environmental degradation effects; fewer endangered species and seems to be the site that most easily could be constructed

With the above conditions in mind, we will analyze the document point-by-point below:

- Page 1-5; Section 1.1; Purpose and Need: The document states that by the end of 2010, Super Hornet fleet squadrons will operate in the Atlantic Fleet. Each fleet squadron will consist of 12 or 14 aircraft - the EIS uses 13 for each squadron. Will
4 the Navy be buying equal numbers of E/F Aircraft to average out to 13 per squadron? Furthermore, we would be interested in information on a year-by-year
5 evaluation of base loading at NAS Oceana under the three alternatives mentioned previously that would include an analysis of F-14 Aircraft leaving the inventory, the projected "buy" of Super Hornet Aircraft and the retirement of the older C/D Aircraft. This analysis is included in the Appendix only for ALT 1.

- Page 2-2; Section 2.1.1; Operational Criteria for Homebasing Site. There is no
6 discussion of quality of life issues for the Naval personnel and their families in the document. Certainly, the operational criteria are important and quantifiable; however, many of the quality of life issues are equally important and very quantifiable. We strongly believe that housing availability, higher educational opportunities, spousal employment opportunities, cultural activities and other criteria
7 should be evaluated in the EIS. Also, the cost of Permanent Change of Station (PCS) does not seem to be evaluated for any of other than the NAS Oceana alternatives. A PCS would be required at the end of every tour for sailors and their families at either Cherry Point or Beaufort. It is very likely that sailors stationed at NAS Oceana would be able to have follow-on tours at either NAS Oceana or other Naval facilities within the area. Besides the dollar cost of the PCS, these are also very trying on families. Also, Hampton Roads is a preferred basing site for families with children with special needs. The availability of this type of care and facilities in the other sites should be evaluated.

- Page 2-6; Section 2.1.1.1; Location and Layout Criteria - Multiple Runways. According to the DEIS, the preferred runway configuration is one that features an
8 additional runway parallel to the primary runway with the minimum required length for the primary runway of 9000 feet. From our understanding of the layout of Cherry Point, it does not have a primary runway 9000 feet in length. Also, neither Cherry Point nor Beaufort has parallel runways. It appears that at Cherry Point some of the area that is overlapped between their two main runways is considered as part of the

Title: CVB P2 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-3	Comment noted; no response required.
CVB-4	Each fleet squadron will consist of 12 aircraft. This is a reduction from the number of aircraft shown in the DEIS. The associated text and analysis have been revised.
CVB-5	An analysis of aircraft emissions during the transition years is presented in Section 4.4 and the Air Quality Analysis for NAS Oceana (Appendix E) for ALT 1. The Navy would be required to offset aircraft emissions for any year of the transition where the projected emissions exceed the baseline emissions above the de minimis level in order to demonstrate conformity with the State Implementation Plan. Revisions to the Hornet and Super Hornet squadron sizes and training syllabus have resulted in a reduction in projected emissions shown in the DEIS under all alternatives. Emissions of VOCs and NO would decrease under all alternatives. The Navy has included the transition plan for introduction of the Super Hornet squadrons into the Atlantic Fleet in Section 1 of the FEIS. However, with the exception of projected aircraft emissions, an analysis of the interim years for aircraft or personnel loading under each of the siting alternatives is not included in the EIS because the "worst-case" analysis of the environmental consequences of the proposed action would occur when the transition is complete.
CVB-6	Quality of life is a subjective determination based on personal experiences and preferences. Some of the community characteristics that affect quality of life include population density; educational, recreational, and cultural opportunities; housing characteristics; and access to community and health care services. The preferences and values attributed to these characteristics will vary by the individual as well as the form in which these characteristics are presented in the community. Therefore, the EIS makes no judgement on quality of life.
CVB-7	Permanent change of station is addressed as part of the lifecycle cost analysis included in Section 2 of the EIS. The lifecycle cost analysis has been clarified in the FEIS and includes a narrative explaining the analysis.
CVB-8	The runways at MCAS Cherry Point and MCAS Beaufort can support Super Hornet operations. As the analysis in the EIS states, the preferred runway configuration features the additional runway parallel to the primary runway. The minimum required length for a

primary runway is 9,000 feet and at least 6,500 feet for the secondary runway. MCAS Cherry Point has two sets of offset runways for arrival and departure of air traffic: runways 5/23 L/R and 32/14 L/R. These runways range in length from 8,190 feet to 8,980 feet. In addition to the active runways, MCAS Cherry Point has four vertical short takeoff and landing (VSTOL) pads used for vertical takeoffs and landings. MCAS Beaufort has two runways for arrival and departure of air traffic. These runways are designed for high-performance aircraft. The primary runway (5/23) is 12,200 feet long and equipped with arresting gear and lighted simulated carrier decks and approach lighting. Runway 32/14 is 8,000 feet long and equipped with arresting gear and unlighted simulated carrier decks. This runway does not have approach lighting. Both runways at MCAS Beaufort can support Super Hornet operations.

length for the runway when in fact this is taxi area. Also, there are no high-speed
9 taxiways at Cherry Point or Beaufort unlike the situation at NAS Oceana. We believe that because of this shortcoming, Cherry Point MCAS should not have made it past the initial screening point. We will not repeat this comment in the sections on the individual alternatives, but believe this is a very important consideration.

Page 2-7; Section 2.1.1.2: Operational Readiness Criteria - Unrestricted Tempo of Operations: The fourth bullet in this item states that "Stations that are predominantly used by helicopter, land-based propeller driven or transport aircraft are not suitable for Super Hornet homebasing because of dissimilar aircraft performances and flight operation. Again, we believe that Cherry Point, especially,
10 should have been dropped from consideration because of the high number of dissimilar aircraft-AV8s, C-130s and helicopters utilized by the Marines. The AV8s oftentimes land like helicopters and a C-130 with a relatively slow approach speed and pattern speed are, from our understanding, completely incompatible with the operational characteristics of the Super Hornet Aircraft. This comment will not be repeated in the individual sections dealing with the alternatives; however, we believe that, as previously stated, Cherry Point should be dropped from consideration because of this very critical shortcoming.

Page 2-11; Section 2.1.2.2: Secondary Screening Process: Very telling comment
11 is "Only NAS Oceana was found to meet all the location, layout and operational readiness criteria." The sentence following is one that we object to because we do not believe that Cherry Point MCAS or Beaufort meet three of the four criteria

Page 2-17; Section 2.1.3.1: NAS Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia: NAS Oceana is the fighter attack base on the east coast for the Navy. Only eight dissimilar aircraft are stationed at NAS Oceana (two helicopters and six T-34 trainers), thus completely minimizing dissimilar aircraft or conflicts. Also, the 8000-foot runway at NAS Oceana, parallel to the 12,000-foot runway, has already had an evaluation
12 accomplished for suitability for extension to 12,000 feet, well beyond the 9,000-foot minimum required by the Super Hornet Aircraft. If the 9,000-foot minimum runway length is indeed a criterion, then discussion should be given to extending that 8,000-foot runway to at least 9,000 feet.

Page 2-35; Section 2.3.1.1. Aircraft Operational Support Facilities – Primary
13 Runway: A restatement of the minimum primary runway length required for Super Hornet Aircraft is 9,000 feet.

Page 2-41; Section 2.3.2.1. NAS Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia - Table 2-6: As
14 mentioned previously, the city believes an additional OLF is a requirement. We also

H-1-969

Title: CVB P03 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-09	Both MCAS Cherry Point and MCAS Beaufort have runways and taxiways capable of supporting the Super Hornet aircraft.
CVB-10	Operational restrictions that the Navy considers incompatible with Super Hornet aircraft operations are: operations conducted concurrently with existing training command operations (i.e., primary flight training bases); dissimilar airframe operations (i.e., tactical jets at a primarily helicopter or maritime patrol base); and frequent shutdown of normal operations for special purpose operations (i.e., test and evaluation missions, VIP flights). Because MCAS Cherry Point meets all of these stated requirements, the Navy considers the station a viable alternative.
CVB-11	Comment noted; no response required.
CVB-12	The minimum required length for a primary runway for the Super Hornet aircraft is 9,000 feet. NAS Oceana has a primary runway that is 12,000 feet in length, thereby meeting the requirement.
CVB-13	Comment noted; no response required.
CVB-14	Since the DEIS was published, the Navy has refined its land aquisition strategy and projected costs (see Sections 2 and 12 of the FEIS). Based on the refined strategy and revised noise contours, the Navy estimates the average cost of an OLF to be approximately $186.5 million.

believe that the Washington County OLF should be the preferred alternative because it is 50-miles closer to NAS Oceana (70 miles from NAS Oceana). We would be interested in knowing if cost estimates were developed for each of the outlying landing field options. The total estimated for the outlying field of $289 million may be overstating the preferred field cost.

15 Page 2-45; Section 2.3.2.2: MCAS Cherry Point, Havelock, North Carolina - Table 2-7: There are currently 147 dissimilar aircraft located at MCAS Cherry Point. This is between one-third and one-half of the total base loading depending on the alternatives. We would like to reiterate the argument made previously on dissimilar aircraft.

16 We would also be interested in whether an evaluation was done on the impact of the V22 Aircraft that will likely be homebased at New River MCAS that we understand will receive their depot level maintenance at Cherry Point which would add to the loading of dissimilar aircraft. Also, because MCAS Cherry Point is a heavy lift point for the Marine Corps, an evaluation of transient aircraft and the amount of their operations would be helpful.

17 Page 2-46; Section 2.3.2.2: MCAS Cherry Point, Havelock, North Carolina - Table 2-8: An in-depth evaluation of the impact on the predominantly rural counties around MCAS Cherry Point of up to 5000 additional military personnel is needed. This should include quality of life issues such as those mentioned previously, commute times, impact on the local road network, and the creation of unnecessary urban sprawl.

18 Page 2-49; Section 2.3.2.2: MCAS Cherry Point, Havelock, North Carolina - Table 2-9: It will be helpful if the cost for new construction, etc. for all alternatives could be shown on one presentation.

19 Page 2-51; Section 2.3.2.2: MCAS Cherry Point, Havelock, North Carolina - Table 2-10 - Items 4325 and 4326: The explanation seems to be for berms for fuel tanks. This should likely be shown in cubic yards rather than gallons. We understand the word berm to describe dikes around fuel tanks.

20 Page 2-52; Section 2.3.2.2: MCAS Cherry Point, Havelock, North Carolina: The one-hour driving time at MCAS Cherry Point to support housing was utilized for evaluation of sites for military housing. Was this one-hour driving time also utilized for those families who would choose not to utilize military housing?

21 Page 2-61; Section 2.4.2: Secondary Site Screening/Alternatives Development - Table 2-15: Under counties within Candidate Areas, Surry County is misspelled.

H-1-970

Title: CVB P4 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-15	Please see response to CVB-10.
CVB-16	Cumulative impacts to MCAS Cherry Point based on the introduction of the V-22 to MCAS New River are insignificant. The projected number of V-22 operations that would occur at MCAS Cherry Point was evaluated in the NASMOD Study for all of the siting alternatives. However, due to the small number of projected V-22 operations at MCAS Cherry Point, they were grouped with all transient helicopter operations. The depot-level maintenance that would be conducted at MCAS Cherry Point would not generate any routine V-22 operations. Projected V-22 operations would occur primarily at MCAS New River, MCALF Bogue, and MCALF Atlantic.
CVB-17	An analysis of the environmental and socioeconomic impacts to the counties surrounding MCAS Cherry Point is provided in Section 6 of the EIS. This analysis focuses on Carteret and Craven counties, where nearly 95% of the personnel stationed at MCAS Cherry Point currently reside. Among other issues, the analysis evaluates the impact of the proposed siting alternatives on land use, population and housing, infrastructure, transportation, and community services. Quality of life is a subjective determination based on personal experiences and preferences. Some of the community characteristics that affect quality of life include population density; educational, recreational, and cultural opportunities; housing characteristics; and access to community and health care services. The preferences and values attributed to these characteristics will vary by the individual as well as the form in which these characteristics are presented in the community.
CVB-18	Estimated construction costs by alternative are summarized in Table 2-19 of the EIS.
CVB-19	The use of gallons for fuel tank containment capacity is an acceptable standard unit of measure for this purpose.
CVB-20	Based on the existing settlement patterns of individuals currently stationed at MCAS Cherry Point and living off station, military and civilian personnel and their dependents transitioning to MCAS Cherry Point under the various siting alternatives are expected to reside primarily in Craven and Carteret counties. Therefore, the analysis in the EIS evaluated housing availability primarily in these two counties. As stated in the EIS, the demand for housing in Craven and Carteret counties is expected to exceed the current

22 Page 2-65; Section 2.7.1: Preferred Homebasing Alternatives - Table 2-16. A better explanation of the lifecycle cost analysis is required. Also the evaluation of tax losses, etc. later in the document are given in year 2000 dollars. Was this
23 lifecycle cost analysis given in 2010 dollars? Is this a discrepancy or is this accounted for through the net present value process?

24 Page 3-3 (top of page); Section 3.1 Airfield Operations: Is more accurate information available on the annual operations of the NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress than those derived from the model? It is our understanding the NAS Oceana and Fentress both maintain accurate day-to-day counts of operations. This information would be helpful.

25 Page 3-11; Section 3.2: Noise - Figure 3.3: The city has very fundamental concerns about the methodology used by the Navy to develop the modeled 2000 noise contours for use as the base condition. City Council, at the request of the Navy, in 1994 received authority from Virginia General Assembly to establish an airport zoning ordinance. At that time, we incorporated the then valid 1978 AICUZ map developed for NAS Oceana. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the east coast placement of F/18 C/D Aircraft was completed in 1998. The city formally adopted, as part of the zoning ordinance and referenced it in our Comprehensive Plan, the ARS2 scenario from the 1999 EIS as slightly modified through the ROD. That map has been utilized by the city for zoning decisions, by residents for real estate purchase purposes and many other uses. The 2000 modeled noise contours are a completely artificial construct with no basis in the popular perception. Utilization of this artificial concept as the basis for consideration and evaluation in this EIS is completely unfounded and is arbitrary and capricious. All comparisons should be made between the ARS2 1999 AICUZ map as provided to the city by the Navy and formally adopted. Any utilization of the 2000-modeled contours is, in our opinion, completely invalid and exceptionally flawed analysis.

26 Page 3-13; Section 3.2: Noise - Table 3-2: This table showing the off-station area and estimated population combines NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress. This should be shown as two separate tables for each facility.

27 Page 3-14; Section 3.2: Noise - Table 3-3: As mentioned previously, the modeled 2000 noise contours are completely invalid. The noise contour from the 1999 AICUZ map should be utilized for any comparison.

28 Page 3-23; Section 3.3.2: Regional Land Use. The designation of the area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress as a transition area is erroneous.

Title: CVB P5 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-22	A revised lifecycle cost analysis is included in Section 2 of the EIS. The lifecycle cost analysis has been clarified in the FEIS and includes a narrative explaining the analysis.
CVB-23	The analysis of the estimated tax losses/gains under each of the siting alternatives is not included in the lifecycle cost analysis in Section 2. The lifecycle cost analysis is a calculation of the total costs of the project to the DoD over a 30-year period; it does not include costs or benefits associated with implementation of any of the siting alternatives to the surrounding communities. Lifecycle cost analysis is provided in 2008 dollars. The lifecycle cost analysis has been clarified in the FEIS.
CVB-24	Operations were modeled for NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress using the Naval Aviation Simulation Model (NASMOD), which simulates an "average" operational year based on a set of assumptions derived from various inputs, including number and type of aircraft, squadron training syllabus, other airspace users, designated flight tracks, air traffic control procedures, and schedules. NASMOD has proven to be an accurate predictor of airfield operations. Because of the need for consistency in comparing "average" operations between the baseline year and outlying years, the use of modeled airfield operations is the accepted norm for environmental and land use planning.
CVB-25	The noise study for the realignment of F/A-18 aircraft from NAS Cecil Field, Florida, to NAS Oceana was used to predict the noise exposure associated with the F/A-18 squadrons before the decision was made and implemented to base the majority of the squadrons at NAS Oceana. The projected noise contours and APZs were the best available information, given the assumptions of how the aircraft would be flown if it were based at NAS Oceana. The noise model incorporates a number of parameters that affect the noise contours, including the location of the flight tracks and the flight profiles (power and speed settings and altitudes) along each flight track. These parameters can be specific to operational procedures employed at a particular airfield. As discussed in Section 3.2, NAS Oceana changed some of the operational procedures assumed during the initial model after the F/A-18 squadrons were based at NAS Oceana.
CVB-26	The model, NOISEMAP, calculates a noise contour by modeling the number and type of operations for each type of aircraft along the flight tracks for each airfield. For NAS Oceana and NALF

	availability of housing; however, given that the transition period for homebasing squadrons is expected to occur over eight years, both the public and private housing markets are expected to meet the increased demand over time.
CVB-21	The text in the FEIS has been revised to incorporate your comment.

The 1997 Comprehensive Plan of Virginia Beach identifies three major geographic areas – the urban service area, the transition area and the rural service area. NAS Oceana is located totally within the urban service area. Approximately 2 miles south of the base is the 11,000-acre transition area. Limited urban development is allowed in this area only under certain conditions relating to density, open space and developmental quality. The urban service boundary and the Transition Area is separated by the 'Green Line' which has served to define the northern urban area of the city from the partial urban and rural areas to the south. The Green Line has been an element of the city's comprehensive planning policy since 1979. South of the Transition Area, below Indian River Road, is the rural service area within which no urban facilities are planned or programmed. (City of Virginia Beach, 1997)

29 Page 3-26; Section 3.3.3.1: AICUZ Program: As mentioned previously, the city had been utilizing, prior to the publication of this DEIS, the ROD on the F/A-18 location which took place in 1998. Our AICUZ map was established in 1978. We have now been presented - *de novo* - that there are actually new APZs in effect for Fentress and NAS Oceana. We have great concerns about the fact that we are being informed that APZs have been in effect for which the city received no notification. An explanation of the impact of these new APZs should be provided as soon as possible. Furthermore, we would be interested if the change in APZs is due from the desire to alleviate noise impacts around NAS Oceana or are they due to the reality of F/18 operations at NAS Oceana compared to what was projected to be the case when the 1999 ARS2 scenario was developed. This is an exceptionally troubling development that reflects poorly on the partnership between the city and the United States Navy. An explanation of the theoretical probability of an aircraft crash within the different APZs would be helpful.

30 Page 3-32; Section 3.3.3.2: Regional Shore Infrastructure Plan (RSIP): The RSIP was expected for release in April 2002. Has this plan been completed and released?

31 Page 3-33; Section 3.3.3.4: Comprehensive Plans: The anticipated completion period for the Virginia Beach Comprehensive Plan is expected to be Spring 2003. (Pauls 2001)

32 Page 3-34; Section 3.3.3-5: Zoning Ordinances: It is noted on pages 14, 216 and 217 of the adopted 1997 Comprehensive Plan Policy Document that a link exists between the Navy's AICUZ program and the purpose of promoting public health, safety and welfare. The Plan also refers to the AICUZ noise and accident potential classifications noting that regulatory provisions have been designed to address these issues.

H-1-974

Title: CVB P6 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-29	Please see response to CVB-25.
CVB-30	The Mid-Atlantic Region Overview Regional Shore Infrastructure Plan was completed in August 2002. The FEIS has been updated to reflect the completion date.
CVB-31	The text in the FEIS has been revised to incorporate your comment.
CVB-32	The text in the FEIS has been revised to incorporate your comment.

	Fentress, this modeling includes the interfacility flight tracks between the two facilities. Given the mix of aircraft and flight profiles (power and speed settings and altitude) in the existing environment, the noise exposure does not extend the length of the interfacility flight tracks. However, under several of the siting alternatives, the noise exposure does extend the length of the interfacility flight tracks. Therefore, in order to compare the off-station land area and estimated population within existing and projected noise contours under all of the siting alternatives, these data are presented together for NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress.
CVB-27	Please see response to CVB-25.
CVB-28	The text in the FEIS has been revised to incorporate your comment.

33 Page 3-36; Section 3.3.4: Land-Use Compatibility Assessment: We again question the evaluation of land-use compatibility using the modeled 2000 noise contours. This is an exceptionally important issue that should be evaluated and we again strongly request that the 1999 ARS2 contour be utilized for the base.

34 Page 3-50; Section 3.4: Air Quality: There have been recent court cases that may have an effect on air quality conformity. We are not certain that those have been addressed in the DEIS.

35 Page 3-57; Section 3.4.2: Existing Emission: NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress: The explanation in the EEIS as to why the 2000 Air Emissions Summary, used in the baseline in the DEIS, differs from the 2000 attainment inventory developed by DEQ. Has the science improved and/or has the requirements changed, etc.?

36 Page 3-59; Section 3.5.1.1: Population - Table 3-14: The table should show a 2010 projected population for Virginia Beach to be 460,257 with a corresponding percent growth of 8% for the decade. This is in line with our anticipated and more modest growth potential of approximately 1500 new dwellings each year over the next 10 years.

37 Page 3-59; Section 3.5.1.2: Housing: This discussion of the relatively low number of family housing units in the region, providing for only 8% of the total Navy personnel, should be evaluated against the considerable increase in population at MCAS Cherry Point or Beaufort under other alternatives. Will there be a defacto requirement to live in Navy housing at other bases due to the lack of suitable off-station private sector housing opportunities? How successful has the Navy been in receiving appropriations to provide such housing?

38 Page 3-61; Section 3.5.2: Regional Economy - Table 3-18: The salary expenditures shown for NAS Oceana are considerably less than that shown on the NAS Oceana Web site. Nor do the other expenditures, such as procurement, etc., match that on the Web site. Please explain these discrepancies.
39

40 Page 3-63; Section 3.5.4: Education - Table 3-20: The 2002 enrollment data is available for both cities. This up-to-date information should be utilized

41 Page 3-64; Section 3-6: Infrastructure and Utilities: No additional public infrastructure is needed under any scenario at NAS Oceana. Was an in-depth evaluation completed for the other scenarios? Is sufficient sewer capacity available, for instance at MCAS Cherry Point, to support the military housing division or would this be an environmentally unacceptable septic tank sewer system?

Title:	CVB P7 OF 13
Grouping:	Local Agency
Location:	City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-33	Please see response to CVB-25.
CVB-34	Recent court cases have been evaluated for applicability to this EIS, including the latest decision related to new USEPA standards for ozone, PM10, and PM 2.5.
CVB-35	Baseline and projected emissions were estimated using the latest available data on aircraft emissions and procedures. Recent research has provided estimating methods and emission factors that are more accurate and specific than the methods and factors used in the 1990s to determine baseline emissions. While baseline emissions for the F/A-18 C/D cited in this EIS are higher than the emissions for the F/A-18 C/D cited in the EIS for Realignment of F/A-18 Aircraft and Operational Functions from NAS Cecil Field, Florida to other East Coast Installations, this difference is a result of improved estimating methodology, not a result of an increase in activity or aircraft.
CVB-36	For consistency, the Navy has cited the U.S. Bureau of the Census for population data in the vicinity of each of the homebasing and OLF site alternatives.
CVB-37	The Navy or Marine Corps conducts a periodic Family Housing Market Analysis for all facilities where military personnel are stationed in order to assess the availability and affordability of off-station housing. Proposed housing for each of the siting alternatives is based on an assessment of this analysis. As discussed in Section 2 of the EIS, additional family housing would be required if all or a majority of the Super Hornet squadrons are stationed at MCAS Cherry Point, and additional family housing would be required under all of the siting alternatives at MCAS Beaufort. The Navy will need to request funding from Congress under all of the siting alternatives.
CVB-38	The Navy used an average salary per number of personnel at NAS Oceana to determine existing base payroll expenditures. This allowed a direct comparison and determination of the change between existing and projected payroll expenditures under each of the siting alternatives. The calculations were based on the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) "Average Basic Pay Allowance" for civilians and military personnel for fiscal year 2000. In addition, the Navy used an average pay grade for civilians (GS-9/5) and an average rank for officers (O-4) and enlisted (E-5)

	personnel. The FEIS has been amended to include a discussion of the methodology used to calculate base payroll expenditures. In addition, the average salary for military personnel has been adjusted to include the Basic Allowance for Housing and Basic Allowance for Subsistence compensation.
CVB-39	Detailed information on base expenditures for NAS Oceana was not available at the time the EIS was prepared. Therefore, in order to collect the data, the NAS Oceana comptroller conducted an on-base survey. Individual department representatives at NAS Oceana were asked to supply information on annual expenditures under the following categories: (1) procurement, (2) construction, (3) utilities, (4) contract services, (5) travel/training, and (6) other. Individual department representatives also estimated the percent purchased locally, statewide, and nationally.
CVB-40	The EIS analysis was prepared using the latest data available at the time of preparation. The Navy recognizes that data are continually updated. However, the information presented is sufficient for decision makers to accurately assess the impacts from each siting alternative.
CVB-41	A discussion of the infrastructure and utility requirements for each siting alternative at MCAS Cherry Point and MCAS Beaufort is provided in Sections 6.6. and 8.6, respectively. The Navy has assumed that the wastewater disposal service for the proposed off-station military housing sites near MCAS Cherry Point would be provided by the City of Havelock, based on the location of these sites.

42 Page 3-72; Section 3.9.3: Threatened and Endangered Species: Any references to the Loggerhead sea turtle should be dropped from consideration. Just as there is a statement made later about coastal primary sand dunes not being on NAS Oceana, the Loggerhead turtle is an ocean going species and has never been found west of the Atlantic Ocean border, which is several miles to the east of NAS Oceana.

43 Page 3-77; Section 3.9.4: Species of Concern - Table 3-23: The Dismal Swamp Southeastern Shrew is no longer a State threatened species.

44 Page 4-12; Section 4.2: Noise: Once again, the NAS Oceana and Fentress populations impacted by noise have been lumped together. These should be segregated. The same request goes for Table 4.10 and Table 4.11.

45 Page 4-30; Section 4.2: Noise: A comparison between the 1999 ARS2 and any of the alternatives is the only rational and relevant comparison on the number of people impacted by noise.

46 Page 4-32; Section 4.2: Noise – Table 4-12: As mentioned previously, the more appropriate comparison is to the average noise levels projected under the 1999 ARS2 scenario. We believe that the Virginia Beach School Board has information available on the interior noise level for each of the schools mentioned in these tables.

47

48 Page 4-57; Section 4.3.3.4: Comprehensive Plans: The Navy recognizes the AICUZ program currently being used by the two municipalities for planning purposes, which contain the projected 1999 noise zones and APZs from the ROD on the F/A 18 Aircraft that were relocated from Cecil Field. Furthermore on page 4-58, the Navy acknowledges in Table 4-25 that the area within the projected noise zone for Alt 1, even without an outlying field is less than the area within the projected 1999 noise zone currently used by the City of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake. In Table 4-25, once again the areas being impacted at NAS Oceana and Fentress should be segregated.

49 Page 4-59; Section 4.3.3.6: Federal Consistency with Coastal Zone Management: There is a discussion of primary sand dune management program. As mentioned previously, no sand dunes exist because this is not a coastal area, so therefore no endangered sea turtles

Title: CVB P8 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-42	The EIS acknowledges that the presence of the loggerhead sea turtle has not been identified at NAS Oceana. However, the USFWS reported federally threatened species occuring in the vicinity of NAS Oceana.
CVB-43	Although the Dismal Swamp Southeastern Shrew has been delisted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and is no longer considered a federal protected species, the Virginia Natural Heritage Program lists this species as a state threatened species.
CVB-44	Please see response to CVB-26.
CVB-45	Please see response to CVB-25.
CVB-46	Please see response to CVB-25.
CVB-47	The Navy has presented the DNL and Leq for representative schools currently located within or projected to be within the greater than 65 DNL noise zones under any of the siting alternatives. In addition, the Navy has presented the SEL associated with the five aircraft events that contribute the most to the DNL and Leq at each of these schools. To determine the interior noise level for each of these schools under each of the siting alternatives and compare it to existing interior noise levels is beyond the scope of the EIS.
CVB-48	Please see response to CVB-26
CVB-49	Please see response to CVB-42.

50 Page 4-66; Section 4.4: Air Quality: The city will defer to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality and the Hampton Roads Metropolitan Planning Organization for comments on the issue of air quality.

51 Page 4-82; Section 4.5.1: Population and Housing: In order to be consistent with the population figures shown in Table 3-14 on page 3-59, the first paragraph and fourth sentence on this page should reflect a projected Virginia Beach population growth of 8% per decade, not 10% as is presented in this draft.

52 Page 4-83; Section 4.5.1: Population and Housing: The quote, "In addition, most of the personnel who are relocating are military personnel and their dependents, many of whom currently reside in Navy family housing or CBQ," is contrary to the earlier statement that approximately 4% of the Navy personnel in the area live in Navy housing.

53 Page 4-86; Section 4.5.2: Regional Economy – Table 4-44: We, again, question the assumption utilized for salaries for the personnel stationed at NAS Oceana. The numbers used in the document seemed to be very much at odds with those used on the NAS Oceana website. We are under the impression that the document may have used average salaries rather than average compensation. Since very few military personnel receive base salary only; the allowances in non-cash and cash in their compensation considerably increases their income.

54 Page 4-89; Section 4.5.3: Taxes and Revenues: We assume the impacts are based on 2010 using year 2000 dollars. Also, there is a comment on Page 4-90 that the loss of tax revenue is not anticipated to significantly impact local tax revenue. Most of the losses are attributed to the loss of property tax revenue. Please be advised that under ALT 2, for instance, the $29 million in estimated local tax losses is equivalent, in 2000 terms, to almost 15 cents on Virginia Beach's tax rate of $1.22. In fact, this $29 million is a considerable portion of the city's locally derived tax base. Also, on Page 4-90 we call to question the fact that "...many of the military personnel, especially enlisted personnel, currently reside in military housing." The document states earlier that a relatively low proportion of the personnel live in military housing.

55 Page 4-92; Section 4.5.5: Impacts on Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Minority): Once again, we believe that the Navy has done a disservice by utilizing the 2000 noise contours as a base to compare any other scenarios. The 2000 contours, as stated repeatedly in this document, are an artificial construct – they are unknown to residents of Virginia Beach. No one has made real estate purchases, location decisions, or any other life decisions based on the 2000 base

Title: CVB P9 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-50	Comment noted; no response required.
CVB-51	The U.S. Bureau of the Census estimates a population growth of 10% between 2000 and 2010, although the population growth was 8% between 1990 and 2000.
CVB-52	The EIS has been modified to more accurately reflect the number of military personnel residing in Navy family or CBQ housing.
CVB-53	Please see response to CVB-38.
CVB-54	The local per capita tax contribution is derived from the 2000 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for both the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake. The estimated change in tax revenue is presented in 2000 dollars, as a direct calculation of local per capita tax contribution multiplied by the total change in population under each of the siting alternatives. Although an estimated loss of $29 million in tax revenue would impact the city's budget, it was not considered a significant impact because it would represent only 2.6% of the total revenues received by the City of Virginia Beach (or 4.2% of local tax revenue). The EIS has been amended to include an assessment of the local tax revenue loss as well as total revenue tax loss.
CVB-55	Please see response to CVB-25.

noise contours because they are unknown to the populace. Using the 2000 contours greatly increases the environmental justice issue unnecessarily for the Navy.

56 Page 4-99; Section 4.5.5: Impacts on Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Low-Income): We believe that the 2000 census data for income is available. This would be related in the census tract and the Figure 4-15 should be updated to 2000 census tracts as well as Table 4-49 with the percentage of low-income households in this census tract.

57 Page 5-1: The city would like to go on record as making a general comment about the alternatives involving MCAS Cherry Point and Beaufort. The movement of large numbers of Navy personnel and their families into localities grossly unequipped to handle, through the provision of public infrastructure, thousands of additional persons over a relatively short time is an unwise choice for the military and the nation. Not only will the natural environment suffer through direct impacts on the military bases through the various scenarios; the environment off base will also be heavily affected. The scenarios that would have numerous aircraft moved to MCAS Cherry Point or Beaufort would be exceptionally sprawl developing in what is predominantly rural communities. This is an unwise public policy for the federal government to be promoting.

58 Page 5.3; Section 5.1: Airfield Operations – Table 5-1: The modeled annual operations at MCAS Cherry Point show no operations for C-141 aircraft. Please explain why C-141 aircraft impacts, modeled in the air quality analysis found in Appendix F1--Air Quality Analysis for MCAS Cherry Point and Beaufort, are not shown. Would this not cause another operational conflict between these slower aircraft and the Super Hornets at Cherry Point?

59 Page 5-10; Section 5.2: Noise – Table 5-3: We noticed that there are several schools in the Cherry Point area that have relatively high noise impacts. Are these schools air conditioned so that the noise can be attenuated to a desirable level inside the classrooms?

60 Page 5.55; Section 5.6.2. Wastewater System: It appears that the Havelock wastewater treatment plant has a design capacity of 2.25 MGD and a current flow of 1.3 MGD. The permit only allows for discharge of 1.9 MGD of treated effluent. Will this treatment facility be adequate for the increased sewage loads and will a new NPDES permit be required?

Title: CVB P10 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-56	The text in the FEIS has been revised to incorporate your comment.
CVB-57	Table 2-19 presents a summary of beneficial and negative environmental and socioeconomic impacts under each of the homebasing alternatives.
CVB-58	Modeled annual operations for C-141 aircraft are included under transient fixed-wing aircraft in Table 5-1 for existing operations and Tables 6-4 and 6-5 for projected operations. A list of the transient fixed-wing aircraft modeled for MCAS Cherry Point is noted in footnote b to Table 5-1. Because they are considered transient aircraft, the C-141's operations would not restrict Super Hornet flight operations under any of the siting alternatives at MCAS Cherry Point.
CVB-59	Outdoor noise data for each school are presented without consideration of specific sound attenuation measures. To determine whether air conditioning is present at each of these schools is beyond the scope of the EIS.
CVB-60	Potential impacts to on- and off-station infrastructure and utilities for the siting alternatives at MCAS Cherry are presented in Section 6.6. The projected increase in population would increase the demand for wastewater treatment services throughout the region proportionately to the existing geographic distribution of the population stationed or working at MCAS Cherry Point. As stated in Section 6.6, wastewater discharge under the single-siting alternative (ALT 2) would be distributed as follows: City of Havelock, 0.26 MGD; Craven County, 0.52 MGD; and Carteret County, 0.24 MGD. A projected 0.26 MGD increase in wastewater for the City of Havelock would not exceed available treatment capacity.

61 Page 5-59; Section 5.7.1: Fire, Emergency, and Security Services: While NAS Oceana has excellent on-base and city fire and rescue services available, and mutual aid agreements with all our neighboring localities, there is no analysis done on whether the existing fire and emergency security services at MCAS Cherry Point will be adequate.

62 Page 5-61; Section 5.7.2: Medical Services: NAS Oceana has a tremendous amount of medical services available from both the military and private sector. No analysis was done as to whether the existing and planned medical services at Cherry Point would be sufficient for the increase in population under any of the scenarios.

63 Page 5-61; Section 5.8: Transportation: Since no evaluation has been done on Cherry Point traffic since 1994, we request an analysis be done on adequacy of the road network. Concern is also warranted over the capacity of the off-base road network, especially around the new military housing sites; US Route 70 State Route 101.

64 Page 5-70; Section 5.11.2: Threatened and Endangered Species: There seems to be a rather large number of threatened and endangered species that might be vulnerable to additional development around MCAS Cherry Point.

65 Page 6-3; Section 6: Environmental Consequences: MCAS Cherry Point – Table 6-1: As mentioned previously, an analysis of the emissions of the C-141 aircraft is included in the air quality evaluation in the Appendix. Why is this type of aircraft not shown on this table?

66 Page 7-1, Section 7: Affected Environment: MCAS Beaufort: We repeat the argument about the federal government encouraging sprawl development.

67 Pages 10-1 through 11-56; Section 10: Environmental Consequences: Military Training Areas – Section 11: Affected Environment: OLFs: The city wants to restate its concern over the outlying field issue. We believe that an outlying field is very important with any of the Navy's preferred options and also with Option 1. We believe that of the two alternatives under consideration, the Washington County (Site C) is the best. The Washington County site will affect loss of the natural environment. It is much closer to NAS Oceana than the other alternative – the Craven County site. The approximately 50 nautical mile difference would provide fundamentally more training opportunities for the pilots during FCLPs than the Craven County site. These two considerations alone should eliminate the Craven

H-1-980

Title: CVB P11 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-61	The effects of an increase in personnel at MCAS Cherry Point on fire, emergency, and security services were presented in Section 6.7.1. The Navy evaluated the effect of the projected increase in population on the ratio of service providers to 1,000 residents. The EIS states that a small number of additional firefighters and security personnel may be necessary to ensure current protection standards are maintained.
CVB-62	The effects of an increase in personnel at MCAS Cherry Point on medical services were presented in Section 6.7.2. To accommodate the increase in personnel, a medical and dental clinic would be constructed under ALT 2, 3, 4A, 5A, and 5B. The increase in civilian personnel is not expected to significantly impact the provision of medical services to existing members of the community.
CVB-63	Available traffic data from 2000 were incorporated into the traffic analysis (see Section 6.8). An analysis for the housing sites was also conducted. Traffic impacts were projected to occur as a result of the intersections along Route 70 and the housing sites not being signalized. In addition, the back gate may experience congestion because the housing site residents would likely use this gate to access the station.
CVB-64	An analysis of the impacts to threatened and endangered species is presented in Section 6.11.2. Although the list of species potentially occurring at MCAS Cherry Point contains 10 federal threatened and endangered species, the analysis concludes that the construction projects would have no effect on these species.
CVB-65	Please see response to CVB-58.
CVB-66	Comment noted; no response required.
CVB-67	Comment noted; no response required.

County site. There are also substantially increased environmental impacts at Craven County.

68 Page 14-6; Section 14.1: Other Considerations – Analysis of Minority Populations: We want to reiterate our concern about the inappropriate evaluation done of the environmental justice consideration. Use of an artificial construct of the 2000 base map, instead of the existing AICUZ map, is a very inappropriate process.

The following are comments on the Appendices for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the introduction of the F/18 Super Hornet Aircraft on the East Coast.

69 Page B-3; Section B.1: Basics of Sound: This is perhaps one of the best explanations of sound impacts we have seen. The authors are to be congratulated.

70 Page E-16; Section 1.1: Introduction – Proposed Action: This information on which F-18 squadrons would be relocated and which F-14 squadrons would go to the West Coast and possibly transition back to the East Coast should be repeated in the main body of the DEIS. The same is true of the Table E-1-1 on Page E-19 showing the transition of plans for NAS Oceana and NALF under Fentress under ALT 1.

71 Page E-29; Section 2.2. The General Conformity Rule: In the main DEIS document there is a mention of *de minimis* levels without an explanation. The Table E-2-2 should be included in the main DEIS.

72 Page E-49; Section 4: Demonstration of Conformity with the Virginia SIP: The approximately one page of discussion of the demonstration with the Virginia SIP should be included in the main EIS document.

73 Page G-3: The Population Density Comparisons: The chart showing density around NAS Oceana 1990 compared to 2000 seems to be incorrect. The area to the east of NAS Oceana under 2000 is shown to have fewer people than in 1990 over a very wide area. Also the area in the 2:00 quadrant of the 2000 charts seem to show fewer people than in 1990.

0081

Title: CVB P12 OF 13

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB-68	Please see response to CVB-25.
CVB-69	Comment noted; no response required.
CVB-70	The Navy has included the transition plan for introduction of the Super Hornet squadrons into the Atlantic Fleet in Section 1 of the FEIS. However, with the exception of projected aircraft emissions, an analysis of the interim years for aircraft or personnel loading under each of the siting alternatives is not included in the EIS because the "worst-case" analysis of the environmental consequences of the proposed action would occur when the transition has been complete.
CVB-71	The text in the FEIS has been revised to incorporate your comment.
CVB-72	Demonstration of conformity with the Virginia SIP is presented in the FEIS in Section 4.4. Because revisions to operations and aircraft numbers now result in a decrease in emissions of VOCs and NO, demonstration of comformity is no longer required.
CVB-73	The chart shows that population within a 5-mile radius of NAS Oceana has grown from 169,912 in 1990 to 187,048 in 2000.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this document.

Sincerely,

James K. Spore
City Manager

JKS/clb

cc: The Honorable Members of Council
The Honorable Members of the Congressional Delegation
The Super Hornet Commission

Title:	CVB P13 OF 13
Grouping:	Local Agency
Location:	City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER RESPONSE

City of Virginia Beach

October 3, 2002

Mr. Fred Pierson (Code BD32FP)
Commander, Atlantic Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
1510 Gilbert Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23511-2099

RE: Supplemental Comments on the Economic Impacts in the Navy's Super Hornets Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Pierson

Please accept these additional comments on the economic impacts and infrastructure in the Navy's Super Hornet's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

- **The Multiplier**

1 The economic impacts described in the DEIS appear to understate the impact of Alternatives 4A and 6. For example, the employment multiplier implicit in the numbers provided in the DEIS is 1.064 for Alternative 4A and 1.063 for Alternative 6. In other words, the DEIS results suggest that the loss of each one hundred jobs at Oceana will produce an additional loss of just six other jobs in the study area. This result understates the true impact of the alternatives on several counts. First, Implan's military employment multiplier for the study area is 1.43, a number considerably higher than the Navy's multiplier of 1.06. Second, professional literature on the subject of military impacts has frequently used multipliers in the range of 1.3 to 1.5, again higher than the multiplier used by the Navy. Finally, a simulation done at the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, using the REMI model calibrated for the nine communities of South Hampton Roads

H-1-983

Title: CVB1 P1 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB1-1	The multiplier used to calculate economic impacts to the region was not as indicated in the table. IMPLAN was used to calculate the indirect and induced impacts to employment, while the known direct (that differed from the information obtained from the model) was substituted into the table. The assumption was to use known data available whenever possible. This table and associated impacts of personnel and payroll were changed in the FEIS. Please refer to Sections 4.5, 6.5, and 8.5 for details of these changes. The changes included the incorporation of a payroll markup above the "Average Basic Pay Allowance" for two payroll items that would have a direct impact on the local economy - Basic Allowance for Housing and Basic Allowance for Subsistence. Also, IMPLAN was run using the input of change in employment to determine other employment impacts in order to maintain comparisons between like units.

(Chesapeake, Franklin, Isle of Wight County, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Southampton County, Suffolk, Surry County, and Virginia Beach), produced an employment multiplier of 1.58 for the first year or the year in which the jobs were lost and a multiplier of 1.12 by the tenth year. The multiplier dropped over the course of the simulation because, among other things, wages declined in response to the decline in demand in the regional economy and this set in motion various forces that help the economy to recover from the loss of military personnel. This simulation examined the loss of military personnel only and ignored the loss of base to business spending which is normally found in association with a large reduction in military personnel. Since the multiplier on federal civilian jobs is generally higher than for military jobs because federal civilian workers are higher paid, the REMI simulation produced a somewhat conservative multiplier. Had the loss of base to business spending and the loss of federal civilian workers been included in the analysis, the REMI multipliers, already significantly above the Navy's multiplier, would have been even higher.

In order to further compare the results from the REMI model with those described in the Navy's DEIS, two REMI simulations were run which were designed to reflect, as much as possible, the assumptions used in the Navy's Implan work. These simulations looked at the period from 2004 to 2012 making the assumption that the loss of aircraft would occur over the interval from 2004 to 2008. The number of jobs lost at Oceana was assumed to be equivalent to the number of jobs described in the DEIS. Furthermore, while the types of jobs lost by contractors were not disclosed in the DEIS, the assumption was made that the contractors were performing miscellaneous business and professional services. The reductions in base expenditures were also assumed to occur in the area of business and professional services. Any errors in the classification of contractor jobs or base expenditures within the model were not believed to have a significant impact on the running of the REMI scenarios since both of these direct effects are small when compared to the impact of the loss of the spending of military and federal civilian personnel in the regional economy.

The results of the REMI simulations are instructive. In the case of Alternative 6, the HRPDC/REMI analysis projected the loss of 4,341 jobs as compared to the 2,705 jobs projected to be lost by the Navy's DEIS. In the case of Alternative 4A, the HRPDC/REMI analysis projected the loss of 5,547 jobs as compared to the 3,462 jobs projected to be lost in the DEIS. In both simulations, the HRPDC/REMI projections exceeded those of the DEIS by slightly over sixty percent.

The REMI simulations differed even more with the results of the DEIS in the case of disposable income. The HRPDC/REMI results predicted the

Title: CVB1 P2 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER RESPONSE

loss of $165 million in disposable income in Alternative 6 as compared to $53 million in the DEIS. In similar fashion, the HRPDC/REMI analysis produced a loss of $211 million in disposable income to the study area in Alternative 4A as compared to $69 million in the DEIS. The REMI results exceeded the Implan results by more than three hundred percent for both alternatives. It appears that the use of very
2 low multipliers has caused the DEIS to understate the economic impact of losing aircraft at Oceana.

❖ **The Use of Implan**

A further difficulty with the Navy's economic impact estimates is that the DEIS work employed Implan for its work and Implan is most probably an inappropriate vehicle to use for making an impact assessment given the
3 nature of Alternatives 4A and 6. The difficulty is that Implan estimates short term impacts only. Furthermore, and related to the model's short term nature, is the fact that the model is not dynamic and can not look at impacts over time. This is a problem for the Navy's analysis since, under either of the Navy's alternatives, the reduction in activity at Oceana will occur over a 5 to 6 year period as opposed to being lost at a point in time. Implan does point in time analyses very well but does dynamic analyses only with difficulty, if at all. The DEIS needs to make its economic impact calculations reflect the dynamics of losing aircraft and personnel from Oceana.

❖ **Assumed Payroll for Personnel**

A further difficulty with the economic impact estimates is that the DEIS appears to assume unusually low wages for military and federal civilian
4 personnel associated with the Super Hornet squadrons. For example, under Alternative 4A, Oceana is projected to lose 3,462 employees with a direct loss of payroll of just $81.3 million. This suggests that those workers make just $23,483 annually. Similarly, the DEIS suggests that under Alternative 6, Oceana will lose 2,705 personnel with a direct loss of $62.3 million in payroll which suggests that each worker makes only $23,031 annually. Those payroll figures appear to be at wide variance with other information on wages and salaries available to HRPDC. For example, figures released by the Navy in its annual report entitled "The Navy in Hampton Roads" indicate that the average Navy person receives $36,624 annually while the average federal civilian worker employed by the Navy earns $56,750. These numbers exceed the numbers used in the DEIS by a wide margin. The DEIS needs to be more clear as to the source of its payroll data as well as what is included in those figures. A review of the appropriateness of the low payroll per worker numbers appears to be in order.

Title: CVB1 P3 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB1-2	The socioeconomic analysis for each of the siting alternatives at NAS Oceana, MCAS Cherry Point, and MCAS Beaufort has been modified in the FEIS. In the FEIS, the direct effects of the projected change in personnel have been modeled using IMPLAN. In the DEIS, the direct effects were limited to the projected change in personnel under each of the siting alternatives when, in fact, the direct effects would be higher when modeled. In addition, the average salary for military personnel has been adjusted to include the Basic Allowance for Housing and Basic Allowance for Subsistence compensation. As presented in Sections 4.5, 6.5, and 8.5, these modifications result in a higher multiplier for the projected change of personnel on regional employment and disposable income, regardless of whether the effects are gains or losses to the regional economy.
CVB1-3	The Navy evaluated the pros and cons of various economic modeling packages when the DEIS was being prepared. IMPLAN was the preferred economic modeling package because it is based on interactive economic modeling software; data from a particular region can be used to estimate the direct, indirect, and induced impact to that economy resulting from a specific action. In addition, the IMPLAN model draws from more data sources (e.g., U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the U.S. Geological Survey) compared to many other economic models. Industry data are available for 528 sectors in all states and counties in the United States, which could be applied to the various study areas included in the EIS.
CVB1-4	The Navy used an average salary per number of personnel at NAS Oceana to determine existing base payroll expenditures. This allowed a direct comparison and determination of the change between existing and projected payroll expenditures under each of the siting alternatives. The calculations were based on the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) "Average Basic Pay Allowance" for civilians and military personnel for fiscal year 2000. In addition, the Navy used an average pay grade for civilians (GS-9/5) and an average rank for officers (O-4) and enlisted (E-5) personnel. The FEIS has been amended to include a discussion of the methodology used to calculate base payroll expenditures. In addition, the average salary for military personnel has been adjusted to include the Basic Allowance for Housing and Basic Allowance for Subsistence compensation.

- **5.6.1 Water Supply**

5 Page 5-53: The available capacity for MCAS Cherry Point Water Treatment Plant is only 1million gallons per day (mgd), not 1 to 3 mgd because summertime peaks will return every summer.

6 Page 5-54: After upgrade, the Havelock Water System will have a 2.8 mgd capacity vs. an ***average*** demand of 1.3 mgd. The 1.3 mgd average water demand will have a summertime peak of up to approximately 2 mgd. Therefore, available capacity is only about 0.8 mgd.

7 Page 5-54: Seasonal water demand factors have not been identified for the Craven County Water System. Also, Craven's apparent exemption from some, or all, of the 75% water use reduction mandate for the Black Creek Aquifer is not documented. The Central Coastal Plain Capacity Use Area (North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources) regulations require a 75% reduction in water use.

- **5.6.2 Wastewater**

8 Page 5-55: The MCAS Cherry Point Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) available capacity of 0.92 mgd does not take into account summer peaks or rainy day infiltration and inflow (I&I). The available capacity is less than identified.

9 The observation also applies to the Havelock WWTP (2.25 max capacity vs. 1.3 average inflow).

- **6.6.1 Water Supply**

10 Page 6-75: The per capita water demand estimates do not reflect seasonal peaking (a problem with many of the numbers in this section of the EIS)

11 Page 6-67, Table 6-28: In reviewing Alternative 2, seasonal peaking factors were not included, and, therefore, the available capacity is less than identified

- **6.6.2 Wastewater**

12 Page 6-77: The assumption that wastewater flow is 90% of water demand is only valid for annual averages. During rainy times, the wastewater flows are greater than the average water demand. Also, the

H-1-986

Title: CVB1 P4 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB1-05	The text in the FEIS has been revised to incorporate your comment.
CVB1-06	Data from the City of Havelock shows that water usage increases to an average of 1.55 MGD during the summertime months. Capacity values have been revised to account for seasonal variations.
CVB1-07	After a review of water use data, seasonal water demands in Craven County have been estimated to be 1.9 MDG by Craven County personnel. Capacity values in the FEIS were revised to reflect seasonal usage. In order to comply with the water use reductions from the Black Creek aquifer, Craven County has been investigating water withdrawal from other aquifers to supplement their existing sources.
CVB1-08	Wastewater capacity values at MCAS Cherry Point have been revised in the FEIS to account for periods of higher flow.
CVB1-09	Capacity values at the City of Havelock WWTP have been revised in the FEIS to account for seasonal high flows.
CVB1-10	The values used in estimating water consumption in the DEIS were average daily values. This value (90 gallons per capita per day) can also be used to estimate the seasonal peak of water consumption. Reference materials exist that support the use of this number.
CVB1-11	The values in Table 6-31 have been revised in the FEIS to include seasonal peak flows.
CVB1-12	The assumption of 90% water return to sewer is consistent in estimating annual averages. For estimating potential infiltration, it has been stated that the sewer service to the proposed housing units would need to be constructed and therefore would be made of new materials. The estimated infiltration in new sewer systems is marginal and has been assumed to be zero. Also, the calculation of wastewater flows has been revised in the FEIS to calculate 90% of the seasonal peak flows.

water demands would be subject to a seasonal increase and that would also cause a seasonal increase in the wastewater flows

13 Page 6-77, Table 6-29: The same observation with respect to Table 6-28. For Alternative 2, the available capacity is less because seasonal and infiltration and inflow (I&I) flows have been ignored

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment

Sincerely,

James K. Spore
City Manager

JKS/clb
cc: The Honorable Members of Council
The Super Hornet Commission

H-1-987

Title:	CVB1 P5 OF 5
Grouping:	Local Agency
Location:	City of Virginia Beach, VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB1-13	The system capacities listed in Table 6-32 have been modified in the FEIS to reflect seasonal flows.

02-0472

City of Virginia Beach

OPTIONAL FORM 99 (7-90)

FAX TRANSMITTAL | # of pages ▸ 2

To Charlie Wilkes	From Ray Greene
Dept./Agency LANTDIV	Phone # 433-3158
Fax # 322-4194	Fax # 433-2380

NSN 7540-01-317-7368 5099-101 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

MAYOR MEYERA E. OBERNDORF

MUNICIPAL CENTER BUILDING 1 2401 COURTHOUSE DRIVE VIRGINIA BEACH, VA 23456-9000 (757) 426-4261 FAX (757) 426-5669

August 15, 2002

Admiral David Architzel
Commander, Navy Regional Mid-Atlantic
6506 Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, Virginia 23508-1273

Dear Admiral Architzel:

City staff has reviewed the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the East Coast Super Hornet aircraft. It was a professionally written and complete document; however, we do have major concerns over some of the information contained in the report.

1 *The Navy, as part of its base scenario, has created new Accident Potential Zones (APZs) around Oceana Naval Air Station. These are different zones than those known to the public in Virginia Beach through the adoption of our Aircraft Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) map that is part of our Zoning Ordinance and is used as a decision making document on an everyday basis. This map was developed by the Navy and has been carefully and extensively utilized by city government and our citizens for several years.*

2 *We understand that as part of the inverse condemnation lawsuit, the Navy interviewed fleet pilots on how they flew the F/A-18 C&D aircraft at Oceana, taking into account revised procedures promulgated by the Commander at Oceana to reduce noise impacts. This data produced the new noise and APZ-2 zones in the DEIS (2000 Base). It is our understanding that the flight patterns, etc. that were developed for the 1999 EIS on the east coast placement of Hornet aircraft, using the experience at Cecil Field, produced our adopted APZ and noise zones that are now different than what the Navy indicates is the 2000 base. These new APZs now cover, under APZ-2, the Brookwood and Plaza Elementary Schools and the Virginia Marine Science Museum.*

Furthermore, the new noise zones, although smaller than those in our adopted AICUZ map, misleadingly depict that, in any basing alternative at Oceana, theoretically more people will be impacted by a higher noise zone than at present. We do not believe that these new noise

H-1-988

Title: CVB2 P1 OF 2

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB2-1	The noise study conducted for the EIS for Realignment of F/A-18 Aircraft and Operational Functions from NAS Cecil Field, Florida, to Other East Coast Installations was used to predict the noise exposure associated with the F/A-18 squadrons before the decision was made and implemented to base the majority of the squadrons at NAS Oceana. The projected noise contours and APZs were the best available information, given the assumptions of how the aircraft would be flown if it were based at NAS Oceana. The noise model incorporates a number of parameters that affect the noise contours, including the location of the flight tracks and the flight profiles (power and speed settings and altitudes) along each flight track. These parameters can be specific to operational procedures employed at a particular airfield. As discussed in Section 3.2, NAS Oceana changed some of the operational procedures assumed during the initial modeling study after the F/A-18 squadrons were based at NAS Oceana.
CVB2-2	The modeled 2000 APZs that were presented in the DEIS are based on average annual airfield operations for 2000, as calculated using NASMOD. These APZs differ from the projected 1999 APZs modeled in the Final EIS for the Realignment of F/A-18 Aircraft and Operational Functions from NAS Cecil Field, Florida, to other East Coast Installations. While the total flight operations were similar in both models, nearly two years of actual Hornet operations at NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress were used to update the modeling assumptions used in 1999 for input into the 2000 modeling effort. Specifically, new noise abatement procedures shifted some flight tracks and changed utilization of others. Pattern geometry was modified to reflect actual flight operations. These modifications, in turn, resulted in changes to the 2000 APZs for NAS Oceana. The APZs for NALF Fentress remain unchanged. The revised modeled 2000 APZs are presented in Figure 3-7 in the FEIS. As shown, Brookwood and Plaza Elementary Schools and the Virginia Marine Science Museum are not located within the modeled 2000 APZs.

Admiral David Architzel
August 13, 2002
Page Two

3 zones are an appropriate comparison because of the fact that our AICUZ map has been used since September 1993 and is the map known by our citizens and business persons. As mentioned previously, it is used on a daily basis as a decision making document for investments in land use.

4 I respectfully request that we have an opportunity to meet either here or in Washington with whoever you believe is appropriate for this discussion. I cannot over-emphasize my concern over these developments. For our residents to find out the two schools, the VMSM, and other facilities are in an APZ by having to review the DEIS is inconsistent with the partnership we have worked so long and hard to establish.

I hope we can get together to discuss this issue as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Meyera E. Oberndorf

Meyera E. Oberndorf
Mayor

MEO/RRV/kma

cc: Honorable Members of City Council
James K. Spore, City Manager

H-1-989

Title: CVB2 P2 OF 2

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB2-3	The EIS acknowledges in Section 4.3 that the city's comprehensive planning and zoning processes would be less affected by the increase in off-station land area within the projected noise zones and APZs if all or a majority of the Super Hornet squadrons were stationed at NAS Oceana, because of the greater land area within the projected 1999 noise zones and APZs adopted by the City of Virginia Beach as opposed to the modeled 2000 noise zones and APZs. However, the modeled 2000 noize zones and APZs more accurately portray the minimal acceptable areas where land use controls are needed to promote compatible development.
CVB2-4	As stated in the EIS, the Navy will continue to work with the City of Virginia Beach to plan for compatible land use development within the projected noise zones and APZs under the selected alternative.

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING ALTERNATIVE 1, AS SET FORTH IN THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF F/A-18 E/F (SUPER HORNET) AIRCRAFT TO THE EAST COAST OF THE UNITED STATES, WITH AN OUTLYING LANDING FIELD, AS THE CITY COUNCIL'S PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

WHEREAS, NAS Oceana is the site of the East Coast Master Jet Base at which all of the Navy's F-14 Tomcats and the majority of east coast F/A-18 C/D Hornet aircraft are currently based;

WHEREAS, the City of Virginia Beach has always taken great pride in being the location at which the Navy's East Coast jet aircraft are based;

WHEREAS, the City of Virginia Beach recognizes the Navy, and in particular, the men and women who have been stationed at NAS Oceana, as outstanding corporate and individual citizens who are honored and vital to our community;

WHEREAS, the Navy intends to replace all of the F-14 Tomcats with F/A-18 E/F Super Hornet aircraft, and to that end, has prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to evaluate the home basing alternatives for the F/A 18 E/F Super Hornet aircraft;

WHEREAS, the aforesaid DEIS considers eight home basing alternatives, among them Alternative 1, under which all ten fleet squadrons and the Fleet Replacement Squadron (FRS) would be stationed at NAS Oceana;

WHEREAS, the history of cooperation between the City of

Title: CVB3 P1 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-1	Comment noted; no response required.

secure; the Navy's sensitivity to the impacts of its operations upon the residents of the City, as shown by the construction of a hush house and adjustment of flight operations so as to lessen the noise impacts upon populated areas; the City's steadfast and unwavering support of the Navy and NAS Oceana; the City's adoption of construction standards requiring noise attenuation in buildings and structures most likely to be impacted by jet noise; the City's adoption of the Navy's Air Installation Compatible Uses Zone (AICUZ) Map and of ordinances and zoning regulations implementing measures to reduce the adverse impacts of jet noise; and the City's adoption of an ordinance requiring disclosure in proposed real estate transactions of the location of property in Noise and Accident Potential Zones;

WHEREAS, the implementation of Alternative 1 by home basing all of the East Coast Super Hornet squadrons at NAS Oceana, with an Outlying Landing Field (OLF) at a location to be determined by the Navy, would provide the best economic benefits to the City and the Hampton Roads region, would allow the taxpayers of the United States to avoid the expenditure of millions of dollars for the construction of necessary facilities at other potential home bases; and would allow the naval and civilian personnel assigned to the Super Hornet squadrons, and their families, to enjoy the high quality of life offered in the City and region;

WHEREAS, the Navy has indicated its willingness to enhance the level of cooperation and coordination between it and the City; and

2

3

H-1-991

Title: CVB3 P2 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-2	Although the single-siting alternative at NAS Oceana (ALT 1) has the lowest one-time (new construction) costs and 30-year lifecycle costs compared to other alternatives, the dual-siting alternatives distribute the beneficial as well as the adverse impacts of homebasing to more than one community. Table 2-19 provides a comparison of the costs and the environmental consequences of each of the homebasing alternatives.
CVB3-3	Quality of life is a subjective determination based on personal experiences and preferences. Some of the community characteristics that affect quality of life include population density; educational, recreational, and cultural opportunities; housing characteristics; and access to community and health care services. The preferences and values attributed to these characteristics will vary by the individual as well as the form in which these characteristics are presented in the community. Therefore, the EIS makes no judgement on quality of life.

has been utilized to date, presents an important opportunity for avoiding conflicts and adverse impacts on both the Navy and the citizens of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the Secretary of the Navy is requested to select Alternative 1 from the DEIS on the East Coast placement of the Super Hornet aircraft if an additional fully capable Outlying Landing Field (OLF) is constructed. The goal of the new (OLF) being to reduce the impacts at Fentress and Oceana from all operations to those of Alternative 4A in the DEIS. Alternative 1 would place 10 fleet squadrons and the Fleet Replacement Squadron at Oceana Naval Air Station; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the Navy is encouraged to re-examine options within Virginia for an OLF and if unsuccessful, the Washington County, North Carolina site should be developed no later than 2008. The fully capable site shall include refueling capabilities so that the majority of Field Carrier Landing Practice (FCLP) and other operations could take place there.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

1. That the City Manager shall establish a Naval Relations Task Force (hereinafter the "Task Force"), which shall regularly and as frequently as is necessary or appropriate, meet with senior representatives of the Navy for purposes of

4

5

H-1-992

Title: CVB3 P3 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-4	The initial OLF siting study encompassed the geographical area within an approximately 50-nautical-mile (NM) radius of NAS Oceana. Sites in Virginia did not meet the environmental and operational criteria.
CVB3-5	*The Navy will continue to work with the City of Virginia Beach to* plan for compatible land use development within the projected noise zones and APZs for the selected alternative.

fostering enhanced relations between the Navy and the City of Virginia Beach;

2. The Task Force shall consist of the City Manager and designated staff. The mayor and a council member designated by the City Council will serve as liaisons between the City Council, the Task Force and the Navy;

3. That the City Manager shall report the issues considered by the Task Force and its findings and recommendations regarding such issues to the City Council regularly as needed; and

4. That the City Council shall give careful and mature consideration to such findings and recommendations and shall, to the extent practicable and appropriate, endeavor to implement them in such manner as will best accommodate the respective needs of the Navy and citizens of the City.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That it being the sense of the City Council that the opportunity for close cooperation between the City and the Navy would be enhanced by the Navy's establishment of a similar body having duties and responsibilities which are reciprocal and complementary to those of the Task Force to be established by the City Manager, the United States Navy is hereby respectfully asked to establish a body similar in nature to the Task Force, and should include individuals in the Navy command structure that have authority over aircraft operations, and charge it with working collaboratively with the Task Force to minimize impacts

6

H-1-993

Title: CVB3 P4 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-6	The Navy will continue to work with the City of Virginia Beach to plan for compatible land use development within the projected noise zones and APZs under the selected alternative.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the Navy is requested to utilize the 1999 AICUZ map adopted by the City Council in 1998 for comparison purposes rather than the "2000 Base Map" in the DEIS.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy and to each of the City's elected representatives to the United States Congress.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Virginia Beach, Virginia on this 1st day of October, 2002.

CA-8634
lioncode/hornetmaddox2.res.wpd
R-3
October 1, 2002

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY OF AN RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA, ON OCTOBER 1, 2002.

Ruth Hodges Smith, MMC
City Clerk

H-1-994

Title:	CVB3 P5 OF 5
Grouping:	Local Agency
Location:	City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-7	The noise study for the realignment of F/A-18 aircraft from NAS Cecil Field, Florida, to NAS Oceana was used to predict the noise exposure associated with the F/A-18 squadrons before the decision was made and implemented to base the majority of squadrons at NAS Oceana. The projected noise contours and APZs were the best available information, given the assumptions of how the aircraft would be flown if it were based at NAS Oceana. The noise model incorporates a number of parameters that affect the noise contours, including the location of the flight tracks and the flight profiles (power and speed settings and altitudes) along each flight track. These parameters can be specific to operational procedures employed at a particular airfield. As discussed in Section 3.2, NAS Oceana changed some of the operational procedures assumed during the initial noise modeling study after the F/A-18 squadrons were based at NAS Oceana.

D20472

City of Virginia Beach

MAYORA B. OBERNDORF
MAYOR

FAX TRANSMITTAL | # of pages ▸ 2

To Charlie Walker	From Ray Greene
Dept./Agency LANTDIV	Phone # 433-3158
Fax # 322-4194	Fax # 433-2380

MUNICIPAL CENTER
BUILDING 1
2401 COURTHOUSE DRIVE
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA 23456-9002
(757) 426-4301
FAX (757) 426-5669

August 13, 2004

Admiral David Archuel
Commander, Navy Regional Mid-Atlantic
6506 Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, Virginia 23508-1273

Dear Admiral Archuel:

City staff has reviewed the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the East Coast Super Hornet aircraft. It was a professionally written and complete document, however, we do have major concerns over some of the information contained in the report.

1 *The Navy, as part of its base scenario, has created new Accident Potential Zones (APZs) around Oceana Naval Air Station. These are different zones than those known to the public in Virginia Beach through the adoption of our Aircraft Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) map that is part of our Zoning Ordinance and is used as a decision making document on an everyday basis. This map was developed by the Navy and has been carefully and extensively utilized by city government and our citizens for several years.*

2 *We understand that as part of the Inverse condemnation lawsuit, the Navy interviewed fleet pilots on how they flew the F/A-18 C&D aircraft at Oceana, taking into account revised procedures promulgated by the Commander at Oceana to reduce noise impacts. This data produced the new noise and APZ-2 zones in the DEIS (2000 Base). It is our understanding that the flight patterns, etc. that were developed for the 1999 EIS on the east coast placement of Hornet aircraft, using the experience at Cecil Field, produced our adopted APZ and noise zones that are now different than what the Navy indicates in the 2000 base. These new APZs now cover, under APZ-2, the Brookwood and Plaza Elementary Schools and the Virginia Marine Science Museum.*

Furthermore, the new noise zones, although smaller than those in our adopted AICUZ map, misleadingly depict that, in any basing alternative at Oceana, theoretically more people will be impacted by a higher noise zone than at present. We do not believe that these new noise

Title: CVB2 P1 OF 2

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB2-1	The noise study conducted for the EIS for Realignment of F/A-18 Aircraft and Operational Functions from NAS Cecil Field, Florida, to Other East Coast Installations was used to predict the noise exposure associated with the F/A-18 squadrons before the decision was made and implemented to base the majority of the squadrons at NAS Oceana. The projected noise contours and APZs were the best available information, given the assumptions of how the aircraft would be flown if it were based at NAS Oceana. The noise model incorporates a number of parameters that affect the noise contours, including the location of the flight tracks and the flight profiles (power and speed settings and altitudes) along each flight track. These parameters can be specific to operational procedures employed at a particular airfield. As discussed in Section 3.2, NAS Oceana changed some of the operational procedures assumed during the initial modeling study after the F/A-18 squadrons were based at NAS Oceana.
CVB2-2	The modeled 2000 APZs that were presented in the DEIS are based on average annual airfield operations for 2000, as calculated using NASMOD. These APZs differ from the projected 1999 APZs modeled in the Final EIS for the Realignment of F/A-18 Aircraft and Operational Functions from NAS Cecil Field, Florida, to other East Coast Installations. While the total flight operations were similar in both models, nearly two years of actual Hornet operations at NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress were used to update the modeling assumptions used in 1999 for input into the 2000 modeling effort. Specifically, new noise abatement procedures shifted some flight tracks and changed utilization of others. Pattern geometry was modified to reflect actual flight operations. These modifications, in turn, resulted in changes to the 2000 APZs for NAS Oceana. The APZs for NALF Fentress remain unchanged. The revised modeled 2000 APZs are presented in Figure 3-7 in the FEIS. As shown, Brookwood and Plaza Elementary Schools and the Virginia Marine Science Museum are not located within the modeled 2000 APZs.

3 zones as an appropriate comparison because of the fact that our AICUZ map has been used since September 1998 and is the map known by our citizens and business persons. As mentioned previously, it is used on a daily basis as a decision making document for investments in land use.

4 I respectfully request that we have an opportunity to meet either here or in Washington with whoever you believe is appropriate for this discussion. I cannot over-emphasize my concern over these developments. For our residents to find out the two schools, the VMSM, and other facilities are in an APZ by having to review the DEIS is inconsistent with the partnership we have worked so long and hard to establish.

I hope we can get together to discuss this issue as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Meyera E. Oberndorf

Meyera E. Oberndorf
Mayor

MEO:RRM:kma

cc: Honorable Members of City Council
James K. Spore, City Manager

Title: CVB2 P2 OF 2

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB2-3	The EIS acknowledges in Section 4.3 that the city's comprehensive planning and zoning processes would be less affected by the increase in off-station land area within the projected noise zones and APZs if all or a majority of the Super Hornet squadrons were stationed at NAS Oceana, because of the greater land area within the projected 1999 noise zones and APZs adopted by the City of Virginia Beach as opposed to the modeled 2000 noise zones and APZs. However, the modeled 2000 noize zones and APZs more accurately portray the minimal acceptable areas where land use controls are needed to promote compatible development.
CVB2-4	As stated in the EIS, the Navy will continue to work with the City of Virginia Beach to plan for compatible land use development within the projected noise zones and APZs under the selected alternative.

1 A RESOLUTION ENDORSING ALTERNATIVE 1, AS SET FORTH IN
2 THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
3 INTRODUCTION OF F/A-18 E/F (SUPER HORNET) AIRCRAFT TO
4 THE EAST COAST OF THE UNITED STATES, WITH AN OUTLYING
5 LANDING FIELD, AS THE CITY COUNCIL'S PREFERRED
6 ALTERNATIVE
7
8
9 WHEREAS, NAS Oceana is the site of the East Coast Master
10 Jet Base at which all of the Navy's F-14 Tomcats and the
11 majority of east coast F/A-18 C/D Hornet aircraft are currently
12 based;
13 WHEREAS, the City of Virginia Beach has always taken great
14 pride in being the location at which the Navy's East Coast jet
15 aircraft are based;
16 WHEREAS, the City of Virginia Beach recognizes the Navy,
17 and in particular, the men and women who have been stationed at
18 NAS Oceana, as outstanding corporate and individual citizens who
19 are honored and vital to our community;
20 WHEREAS, the Navy intends to replace all of the F-14
21 Tomcats with F/A-18 E/F Super Hornet aircraft, and to that end,
22 has prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to
23 evaluate the home basing alternatives for the F/A 18 E/F Super
24 Hornet aircraft;
25 WHEREAS, the aforesaid DEIS considers eight home basing
26 alternatives, among them Alternative 1, under which all ten
27 fleet squadrons and the Fleet Replacement Squadron (FRS) would
28 be stationed at NAS Oceana;
29 WHEREAS, the history of cooperation between the City of

1

Title: CVB3 P1 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-1	Comment noted; no response required.

secure; the Navy's sensitivity to the impacts of its operations upon the residents of the City, as shown by the construction of a hush house and adjustment of flight operations so as to lessen the noise impacts upon populated areas; the City's steadfast and unwavering support of the Navy and NAS Oceana; the City's adoption of construction standards requiring noise attenuation in buildings and structures most likely to be impacted by jet noise; the City's adoption of the Navy's Air Installation Compatible Uses Zone (AICUZ) Map and of ordinances and zoning regulations implementing measures to reduce the adverse impacts of jet noise; and the City's adoption of an ordinance requiring disclosure in proposed real estate transactions of the location of property in Noise and Accident Potential Zones;

WHEREAS, the implementation of Alternative 1 by home basing all of the East Coast Super Hornet squadrons at NAS Oceana, with an Outlying Landing Field (OLF) at a location to be determined by the Navy, would provide the best economic benefits to the City and the Hampton Roads region, would allow the taxpayers of the United States to avoid the expenditure of millions of dollars for the construction of necessary facilities at other potential home bases; and would allow the naval and civilian personnel assigned to the Super Hornet squadrons, and their families, to enjoy the high quality of life offered in the City and region;

WHEREAS, the Navy has indicated its willingness to enhance the level of cooperation and coordination between it and the City; and

Title: CVB3 P2 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-2	Although the single-siting alternative at NAS Oceana (ALT 1) has the lowest one-time (new construction) costs and 30-year lifecycle costs compared to other alternatives, the dual-siting alternatives distribute the beneficial as well as the adverse impacts of homebasing to more than one community. Table 2-19 provides a comparison of the costs and the environmental consequences of each of the homebasing alternatives.
CVB3-3	Quality of life is a subjective determination based on personal experiences and preferences. Some of the community characteristics that affect quality of life include population density; educational, recreational, and cultural opportunities; housing characteristics; and access to community and health care services. The preferences and values attributed to these characteristics will vary by the individual as well as the form in which these characteristics are presented in the community. Therefore, the EIS makes no judgement on quality of life.

has been utilized to date, presents an important opportunity for avoiding conflicts and adverse impacts on both the Navy and the citizens of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the Secretary of the Navy is requested to select Alternative 1 from the DEIS on the East Coast placement of the Super Hornet aircraft if an additional fully capable Outlying Landing Field (OLF) is constructed. The goal of the new (OLF) being to reduce the impacts at Pentress and Oceana from all operations to those of Alternative 4A in the DEIS. Alternative 1 would place 10 fleet squadrons and the Fleet Replacement Squadron at Oceana Naval Air Station; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the Navy is encouraged to re-examine options within Virginia for an OLF and if unsuccessful, the Washington County, North Carolina site should be developed no later than 2008. The fully capable site shall include refueling capabilities so that the majority of Field Carrier Landing Practice (FCLP) and other operations could take place there.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

1. That the City Manager shall establish a Naval Relations Task Force (hereinafter the "Task Force"), which shall regularly and as frequently as is necessary or appropriate, meet with senior representatives of the Navy for purposes of

Title:	CVB3 P3 OF 5
Grouping:	Local Agency
Location:	City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-4	The initial OLF siting study encompassed the geographical area within an approximately 50-nautical-mile (NM) radius of NAS Oceana. Sites in Virginia did not meet the environmental and operational criteria.
CVB3-5	The Navy will continue to work with the City of Virginia Beach to plan for compatible land use development within the projected noise zones and APZs for the selected alternative.

fostering enhanced relations between the Navy and the City of Virginia Beach;

2. The Task Force shall consist of the City Manager and designated staff. The mayor and a council member designated by the City Council will serve as liaisons between the City Council, the Task Force and the Navy;

3. That the City Manager shall report the issues considered by the Task Force and its findings and recommendations regarding such issues to the City Council regularly as needed; and

4. That the City Council shall give careful and mature consideration to such findings and recommendations and shall, to the extent practicable and appropriate, endeavor to implement them in such manner as will best accommodate the respective needs of the Navy and citizens of the City.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That it being the sense of the City Council that the opportunity for close cooperation between the City and the Navy would be enhanced by the Navy's establishment of a similar body having duties and responsibilities which are reciprocal and complementary to those of the Task Force to be established by the City Manager, the United States Navy is hereby respectfully asked to establish a body similar in nature to the Task Force, and should include individuals in the Navy command structure that have authority over aircraft operations, and charge it with working collaboratively with the Task Force to minimize impacts

6

Title: CVB3 P4 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-6	The Navy will continue to work with the City of Virginia Beach to plan for compatible land use development within the projected noise zones and APZs under the selected alternative.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the Navy is requested to utilize the 1999 AICUZ Map adopted by the City Council in 1998 for comparison purposes rather than the "2000 Base Map" in the DEIS. 7

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy and to each of the City's elected representatives to the United States Congress.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Virginia Beach, Virginia on this 1st day of October, 2002.

CA-8634
Noncode/hornetmaddox2.res.wpd
R-3
October 1, 2002

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY OF AN RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA, ON OCTOBER 1, 2002

Ruth Hodges Smith, MMC
City Clerk

Title: CVB3 P5 OF 5

Grouping: Local Agency

Location: City of Virginia Beach,VA

NUMBER	RESPONSE
CVB3-7	The noise study for the realignment of F/A-18 aircraft from NAS Cecil Field, Florida, to NAS Oceana was used to predict the noise exposure associated with the F/A-18 squadrons before the decision was made and implemented to base the majority of squadrons at NAS Oceana. The projected noise contours and APZs were the best available information, given the assumptions of how the aircraft would be flown if it were based at NAS Oceana. The noise model incorporates a number of parameters that affect the noise contours, including the location of the flight tracks and the flight profiles (power and speed settings and altitudes) along each flight track. These parameters can be specific to operational procedures employed at a particular airfield. As discussed in Section 3.2, NAS Oceana changed some of the operational procedures assumed during the initial noise modeling study after the F/A-18 squadrons were based at NAS Oceana.

NAS OCEANA CONTROLLED AIR SPACE

Area	1990 Census Population	2000 Census Population	2004 Population (Estimated)	People Per Square Mile (2000)	Change	Percent of Increase
48532 (Acres) 75.8 Sq. Miles	176,692	193,643 16,951	196,741	224	16,951	9%

INTER-FACILITY TRAFFIC AREA

Area	1990 Census Population	200 Census Population
5389 (Acres) 8.4 Sq. Miles	4419	3939

Chronology of the City of Virginia Beach Efforts to Reduce Encroachment

August 23, 1994

City Council adopts an "Airport Zoning Program" consisting of the Airport Noise Attenuation and Safety Ordinance (AICUZ Ordinance) and amendments to the City Zoning Ordinance (CZO), Site Plan Ordinance, and Subdivision Ordinance. Noise zones were created surrounding NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress. Regulations requiring disclosure and noise attenuation measures became effective on January 1, 1995.

The Program includes use of a "Land Use Compatibility Table," provided by the Navy, which indicates what uses are 'Compatible', 'Conditionally Compatible' (need sound attenuation, for example), and are 'Not Compatible.' These uses, in terms of those that are conditional uses in the CZO, are listed in Section 221.1 of the CZO.

November 1997

In November of 1997, the City of Virginia Beach adopted its Comprehensive Plan, which expresses to the community the reasonable expectations that will govern development in the city. This plan was arrived at after extensive input from all segments of the community, including the Navy.

September 22, 1998

City Council adopts amendments to the AICUZ Ordinance and CZO. On May 18, 1998, the Secretary of the Navy issued a Record of Decision and General Conformity Determination for Realignment of F/A-18 Aircraft and Operational Functions from Naval Air Stations (NAS) Cecil Field, Florida, to other East Coast Installations. Alternative Realignment Scenario 2 was implemented by the Navy. Alternative Realignment Scenario 2 called for nine F/A-18 fleet squadrons and the Fleet Replacement Squadron (156 aircraft and 3,700 military and civilian personnel) to be realigned to NAS Oceana.

In response to this realignment, the City proposed minor changes to existing codes pertaining to Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ). The changes had the following results:

1. Renters, as well as lessees and purchasers of property in an airport noise zone or accident potential zone, must be made aware of the associated noise levels and hazards of living in such zones. The term "renters" is used so as to include persons renting under other than a formal written lease.

2. The noise zones were renamed as follows:

Old Name	New Name
High Noise Zone 3	Greater than 75 dB Ldn
Medium Noise Zone 2	70 - 75 dB Ldn
Moderate Noise Zone M	65 - 70 dB Ldn
Low Noise Zone 1	Less than 65 dB Ldn

The new names were in keeping with national standards and match designations used by neighboring cities. Use of these uniform designations was requested by the Navy and made compliance easier for realtors in the region.

After September 22, 1998, the City, at the urging of the Navy, amended its zoning ordinance to include Section 221.1, "Special standards for certain conditional uses located within airport noise and aircraft accident potential zones." This amendment prohibits certain uses altogether in certain affected areas, and places restrictions on certain other uses in other identified areas. Where the decibel reading is anticipated to be between 65 and 75 dB, a full range of residential uses is allowed, but sound attenuation measures are required in the construction of the units.

1999

Changes are made to the Navy's AICUZ Map reflective of the 1998 realignment. The City, however, maintains the pre-1999 AICUZ on the Zoning Map, with the concurrence of NAS Oceana, as additional changes were seen as possibly forthcoming due to the introduction of F/A-18 E/F Super Hornets to NAS Oceana. The decision is made to postpone changes to the Zoning Map until a decision is reached regarding the EIS for the Super Hornets and the Navy, based on the final decision, can develop new zones.

2001

Navy uses what becomes the "2000 Base Map" in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the east coast placement of the F/A-18 E/F Super Hornet in the adverse condemnation lawsuit. This is "current" impact including new APZs.

July 2002

The Navy issued the draft EIS for East Coast placement of the Super Hornet aircraft. A Base 2000 map was used for comparison for all Alternatives. This Base Map showed new and modified APZs and greatly reduced noise impacts from the city's official map.

December 2002

Chief of Naval Operations promulgated new AICUZ Program Guidelines in the OPNAV Instruction 11010.36B.

February 2003

In 2002, the City embarked on a refinement of land use plans for the Transition Area. A report known as the TATAC report was arrived at with wide community involvement and review. When the Council adopted this plan in February 2003, it reiterated the suitability of low-density residential land use patterns for this area.

June 2003

The AICUZ Office at NAS Oceana met with staff of the Planning Department to inform them of the new Department of Defense Instruction (OPNAVINST 11010.36B, issued on December 19, 2002). According to the representatives from the AICUZ Office, the new

Instruction applies to all of the military branches and is direction from the Pentagon, not from NAS Oceana itself.

The new Instruction includes changes to the Land Use Compatibility Table (pages 16 to 20 in the attached), such that a number of uses previously 'Compatible' or 'Conditionally Compatible' are no longer so. For example, residential uses, which previously were 'Conditionally Compatible' in the 70 to 75 AICUZ and 'Compatible' in the 65 to 70 AICUZ, are no viewed as being 'Compatible'. Thus, residential use in the area of the City of Virginia Beach covered by an AICUZ is now 'Not Compatible'.

The representatives of NAS Oceana informed the staff that they would be applying the new Land Use Compatibility Table to rezoning and conditional use permit applications effective immediately, consistent with the DOD Instruction. They note that letters will be provided on applications to which they are opposed.

The representatives of NAS Oceana also request a meeting with the Planning Commission to inform them of the new Instruction. That meeting was held on June 27, 2003.

With the July Planning Commission Public Hearing, letters opposing applications (based on the new DOD Instruction) were received from NAS Oceana. All such letters were and are now included with the staff report.

<u>September 2003</u>

The Acting Secretary of the Navy released the Record of Decision (ROD) on the Super Hornet EIS, dated September 4, 2003, to the public in the Federal Register/Vol. 68, No. 175 on September 10, 2003 approving Alternate 6. This alternate has a map with considerable smaller impacts and changed APZs in comparison to the current City map.

LAND USE COMPATIBILITY WITH AICUZ (pre-2002 and post-2002)
Y = Compatible (use appropriate) Y* = [pre-2002 and post-2002 DOD Instruction] Conditionally Compatible (use may be appropriate with noise attenuation; or under certain circumstances, the use may be compatible) N* = [post 2002 DOD Instruction] Generally Incompatible N = Incompatible (use not compatible)

(AICUZ post-2002 DOD Instruction)	NOISE ZONE 1		NOISE ZONE 2				NOISE ZONE 3	
(AICUZ pre-2002 DOD Instruction)	Less than 65 dB Ldn		65 to 70		70 to 75		Greater than 75	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Outdoor Amphitheaters (incompatible over 60 L_{dn})	N	Y*	N	N	N	N	N	N
Nature and Wildlife Preserves	Y	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N	N
Livestock Farming	Y	Y	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N
Neighborhood Parks and Playgrounds	Y	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N
Schools, Preschools, Libraries	Y	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N
Residential: Single Family, Multiple-Family, Mobile Homes, Retirement Homes, Intermediate Care Facilities, and Nursing Homes	Y	Y (to 55) Y* (55 – 64)	Y*	N [1] (see Notes below)	Y*	N [1]	N	N
Hotels and other Transient Lodging	Y	Y*	Y*	N [1]	Y*	N [1]	Y*	N [1] (to 79) N (79 and up)
Hospitals	Y	Y (to 55) Y* (55 – 64)	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Indoor Areas, Churches	Y	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y*	N

(AICUZ post-2002 DOD Instruction)	NOISE ZONE 1		NOISE ZONE 2				NOISE ZONE 3	
(AICUZ pre-2002 DOD Instruction)	Less than 65 dB Ldn		65 to 70		70 to 75		Greater than 75	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Office Buildings: Business, Education, Professional and Personal Services, R&D Offices and Laboratories	Y	Y	Y*	Y	Y*	Y*	N	Y* (to 79) N (79 and up)
Water Recreation Facilities, Riding Stables, Regional Parks and Athletic Fields, Outdoor Spectator Sports, Golf Courses	Y	Y*	Y	Y*	Y*	Y*	N	N
Commercial/Retail, Shopping Centers, Restaurants, Movie Theaters	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y* (to 79) N (79 and up)
Commercial/Wholesale, Industrial, Manufacturing (industries with vibration-sensitive equipment may be incompatible)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y*	Y*	Y* (up to 84) N (85 and up)
Agriculture (except residences and livestock) and Fishing	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y (to 79) Y* (79 and up)
Extractive Industry (Mining)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

NOTE *(from the 2002 DOD Instruction):*

[1] (a) Although local conditions regarding the need for housing may require residential use in these Zones, residential use is discouraged in DNL 65 – 69 and strongly discouraged in DNL 70 – 74. The absence of viable alternative development options should be determined and an evaluation should be conducted locally prior to local approvals indicating that a demonstrated community need for the residential use would not be met if development were prohibited in these Zones.

(b) Where the community determined that these uses must be allowed, measures to achieve an outdoor to indoor Noise Level Reduction (NLR) of at least 25 DB in DNL 65 – 69 and NLR of 30 dB in DNL 70 – 74 should be incorporated into building codes and be in individual approvals; for transient housing a NLR of at least 35 dB should be incorporated in DNL 75 – 79.

THELMA D. DRAKE
2ND DISTRICT, VIRGINIA

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROJECTION FORCES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND OCEANS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WORKFORCE PROTECTIONS

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–4602

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1208 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225–4215

DISTRICT OFFICES:
4772 EUCLID ROAD
SUITE E
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA 23462
(757) 497–6859

23386 FRONT STREET
ACCOMAC, VA 23301
(757) 787–7836

www.drake.house.gov

July 14, 2005

The Future of Oceana Naval Air Station
Agenda

The Honorable Thelma D. Drake Member of Congress (VA-2)	Welcome & Introductory Remarks
The Honorable Meyera E. Oberndorf Mayor of Virginia Beach	Quality of Life
Bob Matthias Assistant to the City Manager, Virginia Beach	Joint Land Use Study
Adm. Richard Dunleavy (Ret.) & Adm. Joseph W. Prueher (Ret.)	General Comments & Wrap-up
All	Q & A

Additional Guests

The Honorable John Warner
United States Senator (VA)

The Honorable Owen B. Pickett
Former Member of Congress (VA)

Art Collins
Executive Director, Hampton Roads Planning Commission

David G. Dickson
Executive Director, Virginia Commission on Military Bases

"Service men and women and their families love Virginia Beach and love being stationed here, and as the BRAC Commission is well aware, the Navy recruits sailors and retains families."

Retired Admirals' Letter to BRAC Commission (July 5, 2005)

IMPLEMENTATION OF FINAL HAMPTON ROADS JOINT LAND USE STUDY

The Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study ("JLUS") represents continuing coordination between the Navy and jurisdictions in the Hampton Roads area in developing sound land use policies to enable the presence of military operations in the area (full copy attached).

Air Operations around NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress are complex and interrelated. Air Operations at the Master Jet Base and the transition area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress are vital to the success of the Navy mission and will be protected by the Jurisdictions.

Concern that recent economic growth around NAS Oceana has led to encroachment is unfounded. The encroachment issue has arisen recently not as the result of new growth around NAS Oceana, but as the result of a Navy regulatory change in 2002. The OPNAV Instruction dated 19 December 2002 resulted in thousands of existing homes being declared incompatible with existing air operations. The OPNAV instruction altered permitted uses, but did not change the noise generated by NAS Oceana or the number of people affected.

Concern that continued economic growth around NAS Oceana will lead to additional encroachment is also unfounded. Virginia Beach is close to full "build-out" and the area around NAS Oceana is technically "built-out" already. The City's population increased by .8 percent a year in the 1990's and .4 percent a year since 2000. Zoning entitlements around NAS Oceana have remained virtually unchanged. In fact, the number of new houses constructed in the NAS Oceana controlled airspace has declined every year since 1999 and for 2004 (188 units) was the lowest it has been since 1985.

Starting with the adoption of an "Airport Zoning Program in 1994, the City of Virginia Beach has focused on protecting the military mission at NAS Oceana. These efforts included a "Land Use Compatibility Table," and a protective Comprehensive Plan and culminated in the new JLUS.

After much time, effort, thought and compromise, the JLUS was completed in April 2005 and has been adopted by the Jurisdictions. The JLUS is the culmination of a decades worth of effort to come to grips with concerns about encroachment and is only now being implemented. In fact, because the JLUS is less than 90 days old, almost all of the discussion and concern about encroachment has been generated without any consideration as to how the JLUS will be implemented or how it will address and ameliorate encroachment around NAS Oceana. Even though the JLUS is now the seminal planning land use document for property surrounding NAS Oceana, it was not considered as part of the Navy deliberative process and no mention of it is made in any of the Data Calls.

The JLUS made a comprehensive set of detailed recommendations that balanced:

1. the feasibility of implementation;
2. the ability to sustain the economic health of the region and protect individual property rights;
3. the protection of the critical missions performed by NAS Oceana, NALF Fentress, Chambers Field and adjacent military facilities; and
4. the protection of the health, safety, welfare and overall quality of life of those who live and work in the Hampton Roads Region.

Those Detailed Recommendations are to be implemented by the Hampton Roads Region generally, the Navy, the City of Norfolk, the City of Chesapeake and the City of Virginia Beach and involve specific recommendations utilizing eight basic approaches:

1. Coordination/Organization;
2. Communications/Information;
3. Sound Attenuation;
4. Real Estate Disclosure;
5. Planning and Public Policy;
6. Land Use Regulation;
7. Acquisition; and
8. Military Operations.

With regard to Virginia Beach specifically, the JLUS contains:

1. a "Statement of Understanding between the City of Virginia Beach and the U.S. Navy" that provides "... a complete and detailed description of AICUZ related understandings and actions by both parties..." and
2. a "... summary of proposed City actions..." that include purchases of impacted properties and the creation of an avigation easement program.

Following the adoption of the JLUS, NAS Oceana has begun implementation of the JLUS Recommendations as well and on 23 June 2005 requested "Encroachment Partnering Funds" from Commander Navy Installations pursuant to section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, to commence implementation ("Partnering Funds Request" attached.).

The JLUS is a good plan, it will protect the missions at NAS Oceana and I urge you to study it even though the Navy, DOD and the jurisdictions have only begun implementation. In fact, just this week, after NAS Oceana's commanding officer voiced concerns about encroachment in a proposed housing subdivision near NALF Fentress, the City of Chesapeake denied the developer's request to rezone the land.

Post-Joint Land Use Study Action Items

July 13, 2005

Action Items	Due
POLICIES / GUIDELINES	
1. Revise Comprehensive Plan to refer to:	
a. Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area (related to AICUZ Overlay District)	August
b. Other areas in City affected by 65dB+ (related to AICUZ Overlay District)	August
c. Oceanfront Areas related to (AICUZ Overlay District & Oceanfront CZO amendments)	October
2. Revise Oceanfront Resort Area Concept Plan	October
3. Prepare Design Guidelines for Atlantic/Pacific, Oceanfront and Rudee Loop Areas	October
4. Prepare Old Beach and, if agreed to, Lakewood Neighborhood Design Guidelines	October
CZO AMENDMENTS	
5. Revise RT-1 and RT-2 provisions for Atlantic/Pacific Area, Oceanfront and Rudee Loop Areas	October
6. Revise RT-3 provisions for Old Beach District Center Area	October
7. Revise various CZO provisions for Old Beach and, if agreed to, Lakewood Neighborhoods	October

Action Item	Due
8. Prepare AICUZ Overlay Ordinance a. Transition Area (Interfacility Traffic Area) b. Oceanfront Areas c. Other areas affected by 65dB + d. Incorporate Avigation Easements into rezoning process e. Revise the AICUZ / CUP Chart in the CZO to conform to AICUZ Overlay Ordinance	August
9. Revise Appendix I, Airport Noise Attenuation and Safety Ordinance	August
OTHER WORK PROGRAMS / ACTIONS	
10. Extend deadline of Interim Development Guidelines	(Done)
11. Review and comment on draft 1999 AICUZ Map Update	July
12. Contact Virginia Real Estate Board to implement provisions of noise disclosure law	December
13. Amend the USBC to incorporate noise attenuation provision for non-residential uses	. (to be done by October)
14. Create City web link to address AICUZ / JLUS	June
15. Assist Navy to conduct FAA briefing on possible use of 'FAR Part 150' elements	August
16. Establish process to allow Navy review of all 'by right' development applications	June
17. Ensure planning department staff advises developers/property owners to contact Navy when incompatibility may occur – Prepare memo for Director's signature	June

Action Item	Due
18. Ensure that Navy is part of the School Board's Site Selection review process	June
19. Establish process to ensure Navy input regarding transportation CIP and construction planning	July
20. Conduct staff training session on noise attenuation practices	. (to be done by July)
21. Create a public education program regarding safety and restrictions in AICUZ areas	August
22. Plan & coordinate federal, state and/or local funding for conservation / acquisition per JLUS	(1st phase done by Oct. 05)
23. Participate in development of a regional committee on military affairs through HRPDC	August

July 5, 2005

Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street
Suite 600
Arlington, Virginia 22202

Dear Commissioner:

We, the undersigned (Enclosure 1), heartily agree with the Secretary of Defense's decision to not include Naval Air Station Oceana (NASO) as a candidate for closure in the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. We have flown every tactical aircraft in the inventory of the United States Navy for more than 40 years; have flown off of every aircraft carrier in that inventory, and have fought every war that this nation has been involved in since World War II. We have been stationed at virtually every one of our Navy's bases both in CONUS and abroad. We have lead innumerable major commands, ships and battlegroups. We have dealt with the needs of hundreds of thousands of sailors over our collective careers and know the services' needs for recruitment and, more importantly, retention. Our experience also gives us great insight into the military value of bases, threats of encroachment and interaction with elected officials at the local level.

Because of the above listed experience, we believe very strongly that NASO is and will continue long into the future to be the best site for the Navy's East Coast Master Jet Base. We have provided (Enclosure 2) a Point Paper that will support our argument; however, we believe that the strongest reasons for keeping NASO as the Master Jet Base for the East Coast for the Navy come down to three central issues:

- Opposition to NASO
- Encroachment
- Support for NASO

The opposition to continuation of NASO as a Master Jet Base is confined to a very small, we repeat, very small number of individuals. The one organized group who say they do not favor closing NASO, but merely realigning the assets is the Citizens Concerned About Jet Noise (CCAJN). Although they claim to have membership of over 5,000, the truth is that their "membership" is likely a fraction of that. This means that in the City of Virginia Beach, with its approximately 441,000 residents and the City of Chesapeake, where Fentress Auxiliary Landing Field is located, with its 210,000 residents, less than one tenth of one percent of the citizenry is actively opposed to NASO operations.

Even more telling is the scientifically valid survey done by the City of Virginia Beach, using an independent contractor (Continental Research), of not just citizens living throughout the city, but in a statistically representative number of households within various noise zones covered under the Aircraft Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) map. Of those who were asked whether jet noise was a reason they were unhappy with their decision to select where they live, a total of only

1.5% responded yes. This included zero responses from those in the 65db or lower zone, 1.6% in the 65 to 70db zone, and 2.9% in the 70 to 75db zone. Also, the average rating on a scale of 1 to 10 of whether jet noise was bothersome between 10:00 PM at night and 7:00 AM was 3.57. This compares to, on the same scale, a 2.76 response for traffic noise. The entire survey is included as Enclosure 3.

With respect to the issue of encroachment we take particular exception to the response provided by the Secretary of the Navy in a letter from Anne Rathmell Davis to the Chairman of the BRAC Commission in response to questions asked at the May 17, 2005 hearing that read, *"Under the assumption that future growth in the vicinity of Virginia Beach could impact NAS Oceana's mission as the East Coast's Master Jet Base . . ."* – a bit of history is in order.

NASO began as a several hundred-acre landing field in the World War II era and has now grown to over 5,331 acres within the fence and an additional 3,680 acres in restrictive easements outside the main fence. It also includes the 2,560 acres Fentress Auxiliary Landing Field in Chesapeake, Virginia, and an additional 8,780 acres of restricted easements. This landing field is located approximately 7 miles from NASO. Over this time, the City of Virginia Beach has grown from a small town and surrounding county, which merged in 1963, and now is home to a population of approximately 441,000 people. Most of the land around Oceana was zoned for residential and other uses in the sixties, seventies and early eighties. There have been very few major rezonings in and around NASO since then, even in the important Interfacility Traffic Area between NASO and Fentress.

The City, in an effort to support NASO, went to the Virginia General Assembly in 1994 to receive enabling authority. They City then adopted an Airport Zoning Ordinance in August of 1994 and promptly instituted its provisions. This allows the City to better plan for development around NASO and to require noise attenuation where appropriate.

Since the Airport Zoning Ordinance was put in place, there have been very few upzonings in the area adjacent to NASO. In fact, there were several downzonings of allowed density. One must put in perspective that Virginia is a very strong property rights state and once property is vested with zoning, regardless of how many years the zoning has been in place, the City must either allow development to go forward or buy the property rights. One must also keep in mind, when the City adopted its Airport Zoning Ordinance residential development was allowed by the OPNAV Instruction 11010.36A in the 65-75 db range as long as appropriate noise attenuation was included in the construction. This includes approximately 12,000 developed acres around NASO on which approximately 92,000 people currently live along with 8,000 undeveloped acres. This was based on the 1999 AICUZ (Air Installation Compatible Use Zone) map that was adopted by the City at the request of the Navy.

When the Navy revised the OPNAV Instruction, on 19 December 2002, the residences within the area between 65-74 db became incompatible and are now considered to be encroaching on NASO. The Navy's alteration of the noise contours in the revised OPNAV Instruction did not change the noise generated or the number of people adversely affected. It is a definitional change, not an alteration of the physical reality.

In order to address the revised OPNAV Instruction, the City Council has, in concert with the cities of Norfolk and Chesapeake, the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, and the Office of Economic Adjustment, recently completed an extensive Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) to address the revised OPNAV Instruction. The specifics of the JLUS recommendations and how they will be incorporated into the City's zoning ordinance and other development ordinances are included in Enclosure 4. The City of Chesapeake has also adopted similar changes to its zoning and other development ordinances to incorporate the recommendations of the JLUS.

The Interfacility Traffic Area that is a defined area between NASO and Fentress Auxiliary Field in Chesapeake caused specific concerns for the Navy. These concerns are covered at length in the Joint Land Use Study and the recommendations were adopted by both City Councils. City Council in Virginia Beach is aggressively and forthrightly addressing the encroachment issues created by the revised OPNAV Instruction as they addressed encroachment under the previous OPNAV Instruction. Options to acquire and reserve significant areas of the Interfacility Traffic Area are underway in cooperation with the Navy and other agencies.

We also want to bring to the Commission's attention the great support that Virginia Beach has provided to NASO. That support is best itemized through the aforementioned Point Paper, which outlines the many millions of dollars the City has spent on relocating schools identified in the previous BRAC rounds; building a first class highway network around NASO in just the last 10 years; providing a world class education system and a high quality living environment for the service men and women and their families. Virginia Beach has the lowest crime rate of any city its size in the nation, the lowest residential tax rate, by far, of any city in the Hampton Roads region of 1.5 million people, and also has the best performing school system in the region.

It is pointed out repeatedly in the Point Paper that the quality of life for service men and women and their families in Virginia Beach is unexcelled. Tremendous job opportunities for spousal and family employment, higher education opportunities, great medical care, including the half billion dollar Portsmouth Naval Medical Center, a tremendous support network for military families with children with special needs, miles of beaches, public parks and other attributes too numerous to mention all contribute to the unequaled quality of life to service members and their families. Because of the extensive Hampton Roads military establishments, our military members enjoy the opportunity to rotate, sea-to-shore and shore-to-sea duty, providing family stability and conserving Navy PCS funds.

Service men and women and their families love Virginia Beach and love being stationed here, and as the BRAC Commission is well aware, the Navy recruits sailors and retains families.

In closing we would also like to state that Virginia Beach's and NASO location adjacent to the city of Norfolk, where the majority of the east coast aircraft carriers are stationed, is also very advantageous for military families. Personnel, before deployments, can stay with their family, even as they load the carriers and other ships during the day and stay with their loved ones up until the morning of departure. Returning from cruise, they can immediately be home and spend time with their family and then worry about unloading the ship and returning assets to the tremendous infrastructure at Naval Air Station Oceana. Locating tactical air and other assets away from Naval Air Station Oceana would mean military personnel would - a week before and a week after every deployment - be forced to leave their families to move support gear and other assets to the carriers, in essence adding two weeks or so to every deployment. This can only have a deleterious effect on retention.

We are sure you are also aware of the National Command Authority activity supported by Naval Air Station Oceana. The support of those operators must be given a high priority in any discussion the Commission may have on the future of Naval Air Station Oceana.

We believe Naval Air Station Oceana is, and should continue in the long term to be, the heart of Naval Aviation on the east coast. This is the position that the Secretary of Defense has taken and we strongly endorse his decision for the above-mentioned reasons as well as the multiple other reasons that we have included.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/

RRM/clb

Enclosures (4)
Signature Page
Point Paper
AICUZ Zone Household Survey
Joint Land Use Study Timeline

c: Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense
Admiral Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations
The Honorable John W. Warner
The Honorable George Allen
The Honorable Thelma D. Drake
The Honorable Governor Mark R. Warner
The Honorable Mayor and Members of City Council
Mr. James K. Spore, City Manager, City of Virginia Beach

Base Realignment and Closure Commission
July 5, 2005
Enclosure 1

Signature Page

/s/
Vice Admiral Richard Allen, Retired

Admiral Roy F. Hoffmann, Retired

Admiral Harold J. Bernsen, Retired

Rear Admiral George Jessen, Retired

/s/
Rear Admiral Martin Carmody, Retired

Admiral Frederick J. Metz, Retired

/s/
Admiral Edward W. Clexton, Retired

/s/
Rear Admiral Lafayette F. Norton, Retired

/s/
Admiral Ralph Cousins, Retired

/s/
Vice Admiral Jimmy Pappas, Retired

Admiral Joseph Dantone, Retired

Admiral Gerald L. Riendeau, Retired

Admiral Richard Dunleavy, Retired

/s/
Admiral David R. Ruble, Retired

Admiral Francis L. Filipiak, Retired

Rear Admiral Lindell Rutherford, Retired

Admiral William R. Flanagan, Retired

Admiral James R. Sanderson, Retired

/s/
Admiral Mark Gemmill, Retired

Admiral Rodney K. Squibb, Retired

/s/
Rear Admiral Karen A. Harmeyer, Retired

Rear Admiral James Taylor, Retired

Admiral Raynor A. K. Taylor, Retired

Admiral Richard Ustick, Retired

Admiral Thomas M. Ward, Retired

Signature

HENRY C. GIFFIN III
Print Name

Signature

LARRY C. BAUCOM
Print Name

/s/
Signature

Rear Admiral Earl P. Yates. Retired
Print Name

/s/
Signature

Rear Admiral Paul Sutherland, Retired
Print Name

/s/
Signature

Rear Admiral Phillip O. Geib, Retired
Print Name

Signature

Print Name

Signature

Print Name

Signature

Print Name

Signature

Print Name

Signature

Print Name

Point Paper
Regarding Naval Air Station Oceana

- The City of Virginia Beach has invested $202 million in transportation improvements around NAS Oceana during the last 10 years. This includes: Dam Neck Road, the intersection of London Bridge Road and Great Neck Road, Oceana Boulevard, and the currently approved Birdneck Road project. The Southeastern Parkway and Greenbelt (SEPG) will hopefully be constructed within the next eight years, which will provide interstate access from NAS Oceana to I-64 in Chesapeake. NAS Oceana already has excellent access to I-264.

- The City relocated two elementary schools from the APZ following the 1993 BRAC round. The City currently has 87 schools serving the citizens of Virginia Beach. This includes 56 elementary schools, 14 middle schools, and 11 high schools. Ninety-nine percent of our schools required to participate in the Standards of Learning met the accreditation requirements and eighty-three percent met the requirements of the No Child Left Behind program.

- The cities of Virginia Beach, Norfolk, and Chesapeake along with the Navy and the U. S. Office of Economic Adjustment completed a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) to accommodate the realities of the OPNAV Instruction 11010.36B issued in December 2002. This instruction changed the status of 92,162 people living around NAS Oceana from compatible to non-compatible.

- The City of Virginia Beach has joint service agreements with NAS Oceana for fire, police, EMS and other services.

- The City of Virginia Beach has recently made accommodations for greater U.S. Navy participation in the city's capital improvement roadway program and related project planning meetings. In addition to reviewing discretionary development proposals, a process that has been on-going for many years, arrangements have recently been made to enable the Navy to review all "by-right" development applications"

- The City of Virginia Beach is "Navy friendly." For example, the Mayor traveled to San Diego when the F/14 aircraft was directed to be single sited at NAS Oceana. The Base Commander stated that the current Mayor of San Diego had never been on his base, let alone a Mayor from 2,800 miles away. She also traveled to Bayonne, New Jersey, when the Military Sea Lift Command was relocated to Virginia Beach and to Cecil Field when those assets were realigned to NAS Oceana after the 1995 BRAC.

- The City has a long history of assisting the Navy in security issues - a relationship that has only become stronger since 9/11.

- Oceana has the unrestricted use of a massive training area off the coast of Virginia/North Carolina that they solely control. This is a fully instrumented course for air combat and other maneuvers. There are also many bombing and other training areas available close by.

- During the F/A-18 E/F (Superhornet) Environmental Impact Statement process, the Navy asserted that no Air Force or Navy Air Base east of the Mississippi met the training or aircraft requirements.

- During the 1995 BRAC, NAS Oceana was ranked the #1 Navy/Marine Corps air station in military value.

- The population of Virginia Beach has only increased by approximately 30,000 residents spread over the City's 310 square miles since 1995.

- The City of Virginia Beach is close to complete build-out. The area around Oceana is technically completely built-out. The City's population increased by .8 percent a year in the 90's and .4 percent a year since 2000 (Weldon Cooper Center statistics).

- The City has a long history of working with the Navy on issues of encroachment, transportation, etc.

- Virginia Beach is served by two full service hospitals located within the city limits, as well as three full service hospitals in the adjoining city of Norfolk and one in neighboring Chesapeake. There are also numerous surgical centers and drop-in general practitioners offices. The region has a teaching hospital at Sentara Norfolk General which partners with the Eastern Virginia Medical School to provide world-class medical care. The Naval Hospital Center, Portsmouth, has recently completed a several hundred million dollar expansion and modernization program to support the region's military installation clinics.

- In addition to NAS Oceana, Dam Neck Annex, Fort Story Army installation, and Little Creek Amphibious Base are also located in Virginia Beach. Virginia Beach is adjacent to the City of Norfolk, which is the home of the largest naval sea power port in the world. This co-location allows sailors to load and unload before and after deployments and still remain at home.

- The City of Virginia Beach has the lowest real estate tax rate of any large city in Virginia.

- Personnel stationed at NAS Oceana volunteer in our civic leagues, emergency medical services program, in our schools, scout troops, etc.

- The Mayors of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake have asked our congressional delegation for appropriations to help purchase land rights in the interfacility area.

- Virginia Beach supports many families with exceptional family members and works to meet the needs of these families through the Community Services Board and our school system.

- Virginia Beach and the surrounding communities provide an excellent quality of life for military families and, as a result, retention is high for military personnel based in the region. This saves the Navy money by keeping highly (and expensively trained) personnel.

- The proximity of NASO to the training ranges and carriers provides a great savings in fuel costs over all other alternates.

Timeline

Joint Land Use Study

April 25, 2005

08/23/94	City amends Zoning Ordinance to include AICUZ provisions
12/19/02	Operational Navigation Instructions (OPNAV) released by Department of Defense
02/25/03	City Council Adopts TATAC Recommendations
04/2003	OPNAV Instructions Briefing to City Council
12/02/03	Virginia Beach Comprehensive Plan Adopted
12/09/03	City Council Establishes AICUZ Task Force
01/06/04	City Commits to participate on Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)
06/04 - 12/04	JLUS Meetings, Workshops and Open Houses held
01/03/05	AICUZ Task Force Public Meeting (24 points presented and recommended to City Council)
01/04/05	City Council receives briefing- recommendations from AICUZ Task Force
01/18/05	City Council Public Hearing on JLUS
01/25/05	Eminent Domain in Accident Potential Zones removed from JLUS study
02/08/05	Voluntary Purchase of Property in Accident Potential Zones removed from JLUS study
01/31/05	Public Town Hall meeting (Advanced Technology Center)
02/02/05	Public Town Hall meeting (VB Fire Training Academy)
02/10/05	JLUS Regional Policy Committee meeting creates Virginia Beach and U.S. Navy Subcommittee
03/10/05	Regional JLUS Policy Committee Meeting agreement on revised timeline through April 7

03/15/05	City Council - JLUS Workshop Briefing
03/17/05	Public Information Forum – 6:30 p.m. at Advanced Technology Center
03/22/05	City Council Public Hearing on JLUS
04/05/05	Council provides direction to the JLUS Policy Committee liaisons
04/07/05	Regional JLUS Policy Committee meeting Provide direction to EDAW to prepare final draft JLUS
04/18/05	Receive final draft JLUS from EDAW
04/21/05	Regional JLUS Policy Committee meeting Vote on JLUS
04/26/05	City Council briefing on JLUS
05/03/05	City Council Public Hearing on JLUS
05/10/05	City Council vote on JLUS
05/24/05	Begin city process affecting Comp Plan and AICUZ overlay ordinance