Vance Air Force Base T-7A Recapitalization Draft EIS
Slide Presentation Script

Slide 1: **Welcome**

Hello and welcome! This recording presents the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or Draft EIS, for T-7A Recapitalization at Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma. Over the next 20 minutes, you will hear an overview of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA process, details about the recapitalization proposal, alternatives considered, a summary of the potential environmental consequences of the proposal, and a discussion of the Air Force's plans to mitigate and manage any adverse impacts.

You will also hear how you can provide comments on the recapitalization proposal and the findings of the Draft EIS. Your input during the public scoping period held last summer and during this public comment period helps the Air Force make the most informed decision possible on this proposal.

Slide 2: **NEPA**

Let's begin by introducing NEPA and explaining why the Air Force has prepared this Environmental Impact Statement or EIS. NEPA is a law that requires federal agencies to analyze and disclose the potential environmental impacts of proposed actions, reasonable alternatives, and a no action alternative, before any action is taken. An EIS is the most detailed analysis prescribed by NEPA and prepared when a proposed action is anticipated to have a significant impact on the environment. The goal of preparing an EIS is to support sound decisions through the assessment of potential environmental impacts, as well as involve the public in the process.

The Air Force is preparing an EIS for T-7A Recapitalization at Vance Air Force Base to comply with NEPA and the NEPA implementation procedures issued by the Department of Defense and the Air Force. The analysis contained within that EIS will be considered before the Air Force decides whether to implement this proposal.

Slide 3: **AETC and Vance AFB Introduction**

Vance Air Force Base is home to the 71st Flying Training Wing of the Air Force's Air Education and Training Command, or AETC. The 71st Flying Training Wing's Mission is "to deliver world-class U.S. pilots, develop resilient Airmen and families, deploy ready Airmen, and demonstrate our "Vance Proud" culture." The element of that mission relevant to this project is pilot training.

At Vance Air Force Base, undergraduate pilot training is completed in several different types of aircraft including the T-38C "Talon." These aircraft have been in use for Air Force pilot training for about 50 years. In that time, the capabilities, performance, and use of aircraft have seen multiple generational advancements. However, the T-38C aircraft are approaching the end of their useful life and student pilots need a more technologically advanced aircraft with which to train.

Slide 4: **T-7A Strategic Basing Initiative**

To provide a training environment suitable for modern fighter aircraft, the Air Force plans to recapitalize AETC's T-38C fleet with T-7A "Red Hawk" aircraft. Program-wide, the Air Force expects to procure approximately 350 T-7A aircraft from Boeing and deliver these aircraft to the five T-38C pilot training installations using a geographically phased replacement plan. These installations are Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph and Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Air Force Bases. The T-7A aircraft would provide AETC with a modern trainer aircraft suitable for preparing pilots to fly fourth- and fifth-generation fighter aircraft.

Slide 5: **Why is Vance AFB Fourth?**

The Acting Secretary of the Air Force selected Vance Air Force Base to be the fourth installation to undergo T-7A recapitalization. Basing the T-7A aircraft at Vance Air Force Base fourth would:

- Result in the least impact on continued pilot production during the transition of the aircraft
- Provide the most efficient cost and student production and management plan, and
- Align with AETC's student pipeline flow for the Undergraduate Pilot Training and Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals curricula.

Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph and Columbus and Laughlin Air Force Bases are the first, second, and third installations, and Sheppard Air Force Base will follow as the fifth installation for T-7A recapitalization.

Slide 6: **Project Location**

The focus of this EIS is recapitalization at Vance Air Force Base. Separate NEPA analysis already has been completed for Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph and Columbus and Laughlin Air Force Bases, and a separate EIS is being prepared for Sheppard Air Force Base.

Vance Air Force Base is in the southwest portion of the city of Enid within Garfield County. The aircraft would be operated in existing training airspace, which is composed of several military operations areas and military training routes.

Slide 7: **Purpose & Need**

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to continue the T-7A strategic basing initiative by recapitalizing Vance Air Force Base. Recapitalization would allow the installation to better train pilots to operate modern fourth- and fifth-generation aircraft.

T-7A recapitalization is needed because current training practices with the older T-38C aircraft fail to adequately prepare pilots for the technological advancements of fourth- and fifth-generation aircraft.

Recapitalizing Vance Air Force Base is needed to allow for enhanced and improved flight and simulator training and ensure pilot training requirements are met.

Slide 8: **Overview of the Proposed Action**

The next few slides will explain the Vance Air Force Base T-7A recapitalization program in detail and discuss the alternatives under consideration.

Recapitalization at Vance Air Force Base entails the following elements:

- Replacement of all 63 T-38C aircraft assigned to Vance Air Force Base with T-7A aircraft.
- Transition of aircraft operations from the T-38C to the T-7A.
- Temporary changes to the number of personnel and dependents in the Vance Air Force Base region because the installation would be training pilots with and maintaining two types of aircraft from 2032 through 2034.
- And, construction of and upgrade to operations, support, and maintenance facilities to support pilot training and aircraft operations and maintenance.

With regard to the construction element, the Air Force is proposing 12 projects. These projects include constructing a new hush house, replacing aircraft shelters and supporting infrastructure, reconfiguring parts of the existing airfield, renovating operations buildings, modifying the doors of an existing hangar, constructing an addition onto an existing building, and renovating the interior of two buildings to provide flight simulator and maintenance training space. In total, the proposed construction projects would disturb less than 1 acre and occur under all three action alternatives. The construction projects are expected to begin in 2028 and 2029 and be complete prior to the arrival of the first T-7A aircraft in 2032.

Slide 9: **Overview of Action Alternatives**

The Air Force analyzed the environmental impacts of three action alternatives in the Draft EIS. The three alternatives are a variation of the number of aircraft and aircraft operations. Alternative 1 would provide up to 68 T-7A aircraft and entail operations at a level sustaining pilot training. Alternative 2 would provide up to 68 T-7A aircraft and entail operations at a level 25 percent greater than Alternative 1. And, Alternative 3 would provide up to 99 T-7A aircraft and entail operations at a level approximately 45 percent greater than Alternative 1. The following slides will provide further details for each of the action alternatives.

As we discuss the three alternatives, you will hear the term “aircraft operation” or just “operation” used frequently. An aircraft operation is an aircraft takeoff, landing, or closed pattern. A closed pattern is more commonly known as a “touch-and-go,” when an aircraft approaches the airfield, momentarily touches its wheels or flies close to the runway, and departs the airfield for additional flight maneuvers. Currently, the

T-38C fleet performs approximately 64,700 annual operations at Vance Air Force Base, which equates to a little more than 1,000 annual operations for each of the 63 T-38C aircraft assigned to the installation.

Slide 10: **Alternative 1**

Alternative 1 addresses the Air Force's anticipated training needs. Up to 68 T-7A aircraft would be delivered to Vance Air Force Base beginning in 2032 and continuing through 2033. These aircraft would replace all 63 T-38C aircraft currently assigned to the installation. As T-7A aircraft are delivered and placed into service, all T-38C aircraft would be withdrawn from service. T-38C withdrawal would begin in 2032 and be complete by the end of 2033.

T-7A operations would begin in 2032 and increase to steady state in 2034. On a per aircraft basis, the T-7A would perform the same number of operations as the current T-38C, but on an installation-wide basis, total annual T-7A operations in 2034 and later would be approximately 5,100 greater than current T-38C operations because five additional aircraft would be assigned to the installation. T-38C operations would begin to decrease in 2032 and conclude by the end of 2033.

Slide 11: **Alternative 2**

Alternative 2 is intended to cover a scenario where the Air Force requires a surge or increase in operations above the current plan.

Like Alternative 1, Vance Air Force Base would receive 68 T-7A aircraft with all aircraft arriving beginning in 2032. T-38C withdrawal would be complete by the end of 2033, T-7A operations would increase to steady state by 2034, and T-38C operations would conclude by the end of 2033.

Unlike Alternative 1, however, Alternative 2 would have T-7A and T-38C aircraft perform annual operations at an operational tempo that is 25 percent greater than Alternative 1. At steady state, total annual T-7A operations would be approximately 22,700 greater than current T-38C operations.

Slide 12: **Alternative 3**

Alternative 3 is intended to provide the Air Force with operational flexibility so that 31 additional T-7A aircraft can be assigned to Vance Air Force Base, if needed. For Alternative 3, the additional 31 T-7A aircraft would be delivered to Vance Air Force Base beginning in 2032, resulting in a total of 99 T-7A aircraft at the installation by 2034. T-7A operations would increase to steady state by 2035, and T-38C operations would conclude by the end of 2033.

On a per aircraft basis, the T-7A would perform the same number of operations as the current T-38C, but on an installation-wide basis, total annual T-7A operations in 2035 and later would be approximately 36,900 greater than current T-38C operations. The additional operations would result because of the additional

aircraft assigned to the installation. Annual T-7A aircraft operations would be approximately 45 percent greater than Alternative 1.

Slide 13: **No Action Alternative**

The Air Force also considered a "No Action Alternative" in the Draft EIS. The No Action Alternative is evaluated to provide a baseline for decision-makers when evaluating the impacts of the Proposed Action.

For the No Action Alternative, the Air Force would not implement T-7A recapitalization at Vance Air Force Base. The installation's existing fleet of T-38C aircraft would continue to be used in their current capacity even though they will reach the end of their service lives within the next decade. The retention and continued use of the T-38C aircraft would not change the number of personnel on Vance Air Force Base. The number and types of T-38C aircraft operations would remain the same, consistent with the current training curriculum and operations. No construction or renovation projects would be undertaken to support the T-7A program at Vance Air Force Base.

It should be noted that T-7A aircraft manufacturing has been contracted. If the No Action Alternative were selected, the Air Force would re-evaluate their T-7A strategic basing decisions and may implement all or a portion of the basing requirements proposed for Vance Air Force Base at an undetermined installation.

Slide 14: **Alternatives Comparison**

This slide summarizes the information we just presented and compares the three action alternatives to each other as well as to current conditions.

As a reminder, there are currently 63 T-38C aircraft assigned to Vance Air Force Base, and annual T-38C operations in 2023 totaled approximately 64,700. If T-7A recapitalization were not implemented, the number of T-38C aircraft and operations would not change.

By comparison, both Alternatives 1 and 2 propose 68 T-7A aircraft, which is five more aircraft than the current number of T-38C. Alternatives 1 and 2 propose approximately 69,800 and 87,300 operations, respectively. The operational tempo, which is the number of operations per aircraft, would not change from existing conditions for Alternative 1, but would increase by approximately 25 percent for Alternative 2 to account for a potential scenario where an increase in operations are needed.

And finally, Alternative 3 proposes 99 T-7A aircraft with operations totaling approximately 101,600. The operational tempo would be identical to existing conditions and Alternative 1, but the total number of operations would be approximately 45 percent greater than Alternative 1 because there would be 31 additional aircraft assigned to Vance Air Force Base.

Slide 15: **Draft EIS Resource Subjects**

The Draft EIS presents the affected environment and potential environmental consequences from the Proposed Action and alternatives, including the No Action Alternative. The Draft EIS is organized in to resource subjects, and those with the potential for significant impacts are analyzed in detail. They are Air Quality, Noise, Land Use, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Safety, and Water Resources. Other resource subjects also were considered but determined not to have a potential for significant impacts. These do not warrant detailed analysis in the Draft EIS and are Airspace, Geological Resources, Infrastructure and Transportation, and Socioeconomics.

The following slides will summarize the notable environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS. For a more detailed evaluation of the potential environmental consequences, please refer to Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS.

Slide 16: **Air Quality**

Air emissions would be produced from construction and operational activities. Construction emissions would be produced in 2028 and 2029 from the use of heavy equipment.

Operational air emissions for all action alternatives would begin in 2030. Operational emissions include those from heating new building space and the net change from the new aircraft operations. The annual net change in air emissions for Alternative 1 would not exceed insignificance indicators for all criteria pollutants.

The annual net change in nitrogen oxides air emissions for Alternatives 2 and 3 would exceed insignificance indicators beginning in the year 2034. However, considering the type and context of aircraft emissions and the generally good air quality of Garfield County, Alternatives 2 and 3 are not expected to contribute to an exceedance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Slide 17: **Noise**

The most useful measure of aircraft noise is the day-night average sound level, expressed as “DNL.” DNL does ***not*** represent an actual measurement of a particular aircraft sound. Instead, DNL averages intermittent noise, such as daily aircraft operations, and measures total sound energy from those events during a 24-hour period. Due to their potential to be particularly bothersome at night, noise events occurring between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. are assessed a 10-decibel addition when calculating DNL. DNL levels are calculated for broad areas surrounding airports, and when plotted onto a map, create contour lines that assist planners to identify noise and land use impacts. In general, aircraft noise above 65 decibels DNL is considered incompatible with residential land use.

Noise from T-7A aircraft operations would increase areas of incompatible land use on and adjacent to the installation and result in significant impacts. The acreage and population within the 65 decibel DNL contour would increase incrementally from current conditions for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. The modeled noise footprints

and calculated changes in acreage and population for each alternative are provided in the EIS and shown on the next few slides.

The Air Force calculated the DNL levels for Vance Air Force Base and plotted the 65, 70, 75, and 80 decibel DNL contour lines for baseline conditions; for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3; and for the No Action Alternative. The baseline condition represents the noise contours developed by the Air Force in a previously prepared aircraft noise study and adopted by local and regional entities into the Vance Air Force Base Joint Land Use Study completed in 2018. Baseline does ***not*** represent the noise conditions the community is currently experiencing. Rather, the No Action noise contours better represent the current noise conditions around Vance Air Force Base and the noise conditions that would continue to occur if T-7A recapitalization was not implemented. The No Action noise contours differ from baseline due to a change in flight patterns enacted subsequently to the 2018 Joint Land Use Study. Both of these sets of noise contours are based on the use of T-38C aircraft at Vance Air Force Base, whereas the noise contours associated with Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are based on the projected use of the new T-7A aircraft.

Slide 18: **Noise (continued)**

For Vance Air Force Base and the surrounding region, the changes in acreage and population for each alternative are summarized on this slide. As shown in this table, the baseline aircraft noise footprint within the 65-decibel-DNL-or-greater contour includes an area of approximately 10,708 acres, including both on- and off-installation noise contour footprints. In actuality, 8,895 acres currently are within the 65-decibel-DNL-or-greater contour, and this area would continue to be exposed to this sound level if no action was taken. By comparison, Alternative 1 would have a total noise footprint of 11,566 acres, Alternative 2 would encompass 13,469 acres, and Alternative 3 would encompass 14,507 acres within the 65-decibel-DNL-and-above contour.

The population within the baseline noise contours of the 65-decibel-DNL, and higher, is calculated as being approximately 535 people on-installation, and up to 299 people off-installation. In actuality, approximately 198 people on-installation and 2,101 people off-installation are within the 65-decibel-DNL-or-greater contour, and these people would continue to be exposed to this sound level if no action was taken. By comparison, Alternative 1 would have a population of 365 on-installation and 3,276 off-installation, Alternative 2 would have a population of 378 on-installation and 3,946 off-installation, and Alternative 3 would have a population of 388 on-installation and 4,470 off-installation. The notable increase in population for all three alternatives and the No Action Alternative results from noise contours extending farther to the north into the more populated areas of the city of Enid. The modeled footprints for each alternative at Vance Air Force Base are shown on the next three slides.

Slide 19: **Noise – Baseline Conditions vs. Alternative 1**

Shown on the slide are two figures. The figure on the left shows the baseline noise footprint, which represent the noise contours from a previously prepared aircraft noise study that have been adopted by local and regional entities into the 2018 Vance Air Force Base Joint Land Use Study. The figure on the right shows the resultant noise footprint for Alternative 1.

Alternative 1 would result in a general expansion of the noise contours to the north and to the west. Along the centerline of Runway 17R/35L, the 65-decibels-DNL contour for Alternative 1 would extend approximately 2.4 miles to the north into more populated areas of the city of Enid. The northernmost extent of the Alternative 1 65-decibels-DNL noise contour would be at approximately Oakwood Country Club. By comparison, the northernmost extent of the baseline noise footprint is approximately Rupe Avenue. To the south, the 65-decibels-DNL noise contour would decrease by approximately 1.8 miles, compared to the extent of the baseline 65-decibels-DNL contour. The 65-decibels-DNL contour on the east side of the installation would be similar to the baseline, with only small changes to the contour. In general, the noise footprint for Alternative 1 is larger than the baseline noise footprint and covers more acreage and population.

Slide 20: **Noise – Baseline Conditions vs Alternative 2**

This slide also shows two figures. The figure on the left has not changed from the previous slide and shows the baseline noise footprint. The figure on the right shows the resultant noise footprint for Alternative 2.

Like Alternative 1, Alternative 2 also would result in a general expansion of the noise contours with the northernmost extent being at approximately Oakwood Country Club. The Alternative 2 65-decibels-DNL contour would extend beyond the baseline 65-decibels-DNL contour by 1.6 miles to the west, 2.5 miles to the north, and about 500 feet to the east. The 65-decibels-DNL contour would decrease about 1.7 miles to the south. In general, the noise footprint for Alternative 2 is larger than both the baseline and Alternative 1 noise footprints and covers more acreage and population.

Slide 21: **Noise – Baseline Conditions vs Alternative 3**

This slide again shows two figures. The figure on the left has not changed from the previous slides and shows the baseline noise footprint. The figure on the right shows the resultant noise footprint for Alternative 3.

Similar to the other action alternatives, Alternative 3 noise contours to the south of the installation would decrease in size, while the noise contours would extend further to the north and west and include more residential area and population. The northernmost extent would be slightly north of Willow Road. Alternative 3 encompasses the greatest acreage and population of all three action alternatives.

Slide 22: **Noise – Baseline Conditions vs. No Action Alternative**

Once again, it is important to recognize that taking no action would also change the noise contours from the baseline noise footprint. As a reminder, the baseline condition represents the noise contours developed by the Air Force in a previously prepared aircraft noise study and adopted by local and regional entities into the Vance Air Force Base Joint Land Use Study completed in 2018. It does ***not*** represent the noise conditions the community is currently experiencing. The No Action noise contours were modeled during preparation of this EIS and more accurately reflect noise conditions occurring now. Differences between the baseline and No Action noise contours result from changes in flight patterns enacted subsequent to the 2018 Joint Land Use Study, and these flight pattern changes are not part of the proposed T-7A recapitalization program.

This slide again shows two figures. The figure on the left has not changed from the previous slides and shows the baseline noise footprint. The figure on the right shows the noise footprint using the T-38C's current flight patterns, which would continue for the No Action Alternative.

The largest difference between the No Action noise contours versus the baseline contours would be to the north and south of Vance Air Force Base. The 65-decibels-DNL noise contour would extend more than 2.5 miles north of the installation boundary and a similar distance south from the installation boundary. The northernmost extent of the No Action noise contour would be approximately Randolph Avenue, while the northernmost extent of the baseline noise footprint is approximately Rupe Avenue. The noise contours east of Vance Air Force Base would remain very similar to the baseline contours; however, to the west, two lobes would extend approximately 2.5 miles from the installation. In general, the No Action noise contours cover slightly fewer acres than the baseline noise contours but include approximately 3 times the population.

Slide 23: **Noise – Conclusions**

The Draft EIS contains a much more detailed analysis of noise impacts than can be presented in these slides. The potential for speech interference, classroom learning interference, sleep disturbance, hearing loss, and damage to structures in nearby locations were analyzed for each alternative in the Draft EIS. Additionally, the Draft EIS contains an analysis of noise impacts from training within special use airspace.

To briefly summarize the findings of the noise analysis, significant impacts on the noise environment are anticipated for each action alternative and the no action alternative because additional land acreage and population would be exposed to higher levels of noise. The next slide discusses impacts on land use from the expanded noise contours.

Slide 24: **Land Use**

As a reminder, aircraft noise above 65 decibels DNL is generally considered incompatible with residential land use. For all three action alternatives and the No Action Alternative, the 65 decibel DNL noise contours would

encompass portions of the city of Enid that are residential. As a result, there would be an increase in incompatible land uses and the number of individuals living within the noise zones. Other newly exposed areas include commercial, undeveloped, and agricultural land uses.

To mitigate noise and land use impacts on residential land uses, the Air Force would continue to partner with local governments. The Air Force is committed to coordinating with Garfield, Grant, and Alfalfa Counties; the cities of Enid and Waukomis; and other local communities to analyze compatible uses surrounding the installation. The Air Force would also update Vance Air Force Base's Air Installation Compatible Use Zone or AICUZ Plan to address any increase of land within the 65 decibel DNL or greater noise contour. The goal of the installation's AICUZ plan is to guide neighboring community development in a manner that protects the installation's flight capabilities as well as public health, safety, and welfare. Recognizing that the operational characteristics of the T-7A aircraft are still in a preliminary stage, adaptive management approaches for addressing noise impacts (e.g., reduced power settings, anticipated afterburner requirements, etc.) may be implemented to reduce the ultimate noise contours and associated land use effects at Vance Air Force Base. The Air Force would continue to evaluate flight characteristics for T-7A training to determine the safest, most efficient, and least intrusive operations considering both mission requirements and airspace effects. Lastly, the Air Force would monitor noise complaint locations and times and potentially adjust flight tracks as determined to be feasible.

Slide 25: **Biological Resources**

Biological resource impacts are evaluated with a specific look at vegetation, wildlife, and special status species. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would not have a significant impact on vegetation. Impacts would involve the temporary or permanent removal of a few trees and some vegetation for construction of new facilities.

The planned facilities would be situated within highly urban areas or on existing impervious surfaces on Vance Air Force Base. Additionally, vegetation surrounding new construction would be restored, to the maximum extent possible, as part of landscaping efforts following construction.

Impacts on wildlife due to construction for all alternatives would also be not significant for the same reasons. Long-term impacts on wildlife from aircraft strikes and noise could occur from aircraft operations. To minimize the potential for bird and bat strikes, the Air Force would update and implement the installation's Bird/Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard Plan, or BASH Plan, to include the proposed aircraft operations at Vance Air Force Base.

The three action alternatives would have no effect on six federally listed or candidate species with potential to occur on Vance Air Force Base. The Air Force consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on project-specific effects under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

Slide 26: **Cultural Resources**

The Air Force determined the buildings that would be impacted under the Proposed Action lack the significance and integrity necessary for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. No other historic-age buildings would be impacted by the Proposed Action.

Some projects would require ground disturbance. These projects are not anticipated to impact archaeological resources at Vance Air Force Base.

The Air Force consulted with the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Officer and Native American tribes with potential interest in the area on issues related to cultural resource management, the unanticipated discovery of human remains and cultural items under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and on project-specific effects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Slide 27: **Other Resources**

Other resource subjects that were analyzed in detail in the Draft EIS include Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Safety, and Water Resources. Each of these resource subjects was determined to have no significant impacts from Alternatives 1, 2, or 3. Further details on these resources are found in the Draft EIS.

Slide 28: **The EIS Timeline**

Now that you've heard the environmental consequences from T-7A recapitalization at Vance Air Force Base, let's summarize the next steps in the NEPA process. We are currently at the Draft EIS stage, which is when the public can provide comments on the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS stage began with the publication of the Notice of Availability for the Draft EIS in the *Federal Register* on August 29, 2025. At that time, the Draft EIS was published onto the project website and a paper copy was placed on reserve at the Enid Public Library. Notification letters were emailed to interested federal, state, and local parties. The Draft EIS public comment period is 45 days in length and will end on October 14, 2025.

Slide 29: **The EIS Timeline (continued)**

After the 45-day public comment period ends, the Air Force will review all comments and consider them in preparing the Final EIS. Substantive comments will be responded to in the Final EIS. The Air Force considers substantive comments to be those that offer information regarding the alternatives or those that offer information relative to the assessment of impacts, or NEPA process. Comments about other unrelated issues will not assist in the decision-making process.

The Final EIS is scheduled to be completed in the first quarter of 2026 and will be used by Air Force deciding officials to determine whether or not to implement this proposal.

Slide 30: **Providing Comments**

So, how can you provide comments? If you would like to provide comments, you can mail or email them to the addresses shown on your screen. You can also provide comments on the project website at (Say: Vance Dot T Dash Seven A N E P A Documents Dot Com). Click on the Provide Comments button and fill out the online comment form. If you'd rather mail your comments, a comment form can be printed from the project website or you may use your own paper. For your comments to receive timely consideration in the Final EIS, please submit them by October 14, 2025.

The Air Force welcomes comments on the Draft EIS. Providing comments allows you to express *your* views and concerns about the alternatives studied in the Draft EIS, the adequacy of the environmental analysis, and any issues related to the NEPA process.

Slide 31: **Thank You**

Thank you for your time and interest in the T-7A Recapitalization at Vance Air Force Base Draft EIS. If you have not already done so, the Air Force encourages you to read the Draft EIS, either online on the project website or in paper format at the Enid Public Library. Thank you for your time today.