

General Comments

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
G-1	No specific location	Bob Taunton	For a 200+ page report the presentation was well done and allowed for easy navigation and quick review.	Thank you.	No change.
G-2	No specific location	Bob Taunton	Add a table of contents and list of tables and figures.	This are typically items provided for the next iteration/submittal.	No change.
G-3	No specific location	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	General Comment: In several places throughout the document the term “in order to” is used where simple “to” would be more grammatically correct. I noticed several punctuation errors that I did not highlight.		Changes made where appropriate throughout the Chapters.
G-4	No specific location	Ryan Cutler, Senior Transportation Planner, Ada County Highway District	The City has been pretty clear about not wanting much commercial development south of the Airport along the future Lake Hazel. They are picturing more industrial uses.	Noted in text.	Pg 3-49 Road improvements and connectors are proposed to coincide with development, preferably industrial , to be fully effective.
G-5	No specific location	Ryan Cutler, Senior Transportation Planner, Ada County Highway District	Another important aspect of the study that was missed is that Gowen Road is no longer being proposed to be closed and relocated. The plan is to now keep it open and have a taxiway go over Gowen Road.	Noted in text. GIS	In conjunction with the Communities in Motion plan and the Boise Airport Expansion Plan, the ACHD and the Boise Airport and conducting conducted a study to determine whether to extend Lake Hazel Road and relocate Gowen Road. The outcome of the study was that Gowen Road -will be closed and relocated but kept open. The new solution will be to have a taxiway go over Gowen Road.
G-6	No specific location	Given Pursley, LLP for Pacific West Land	Sections 1-4 do not contain specific policy recommendations. Nonetheless, PacWest is very concerned that the direction of the JLUS, sprinkled in hundreds of pages of text, charts and graphs, will be to recommend severe restrictions or even prohibition of development of thousands of acres, perhaps tens of thousands of acres, surrounding the OTA, including the property that PacWest owns. PacWest urges a measured approach as the policy recommendations are developed, as it believes military and development objectives are compatible in the vicinity of PacWest's property.	Chpt 5 of the JLUS contains the study's specific recommendations. Chpt 1-4 provide support for Chpt 5. PacWest's concerns are noted.	To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
G-7	No specific location	Given Pursley, LLP for Pacific West Land	PacWest owns approximately 1980 acres (the "PacWest Property") located south of the Orchard interchange approximately three miles from the nearest boundary of the Orchard Range. A map of the PacWest property is attached as Exhibit "A". PacWest purchased this property with the intention to construct a planned community there.	Noted	No change.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			Significant planning has been done, and notwithstanding the current real estate downturn, PacWest's ultimate development plans have not changed.		
G-8	No specific location	Given Pursley, LLP for Pacific West Land	The Orchard interchange area is a fine area for real estate development in the long term. It has easy access to 1-84 in an area where the freeway still has capacity. It is closer to downtown Boise and major employers than many developing areas to the west. Development can occur in the Orchard area without displacing valuable farm land, in contrast to development in much of Ada County. The Orchard area contains much less sensitive wildlife habitat than the Foothills or areas around the Boise River. Land ownership is concentrated in a few owners, making master planning relatively easy. A rail line runs through the area, potentially facilitating future mass transit. We should remember that Ada County is part of one of the fastest growing areas of the United States, and it includes a limited amount of developable land that we will use up faster than we care to believe. It would be a mistake to cut off this potential unnecessarily.		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
G-9	No specific location	Given Pursley, LLP for Pacific West Land	PacWest recognizes the importance of the OTA to Ada County and values its military neighbor. PacWest has even considered marketing its development as housing for military families. At the same time, balancing of interests is critical. Sections 1-4 are scrupulously written in objective language, but the tilt toward restrictions on development is unmistakable. There needs to be a rigorous discussion when it comes time to balance the needs of the military with those of the community and private landowners. It is difficult to justify protection of military interests if that means placing blanket restrictions on large parts of the most logical development land. Fortunately, we believe a more reasonable balance can be achieved.		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
G-10	No specific location	Richard Scheuch	(IN REFERENCE TO DENNIS SCOTT'S COMMENTS) RSAF stands for the "Republic of Singapore Air Force"- not Royal Singapore.	Definition confirmed. Replace definition of RSAF as-needed in each chpt.	This has been addressed throughout the document.
G-11	No specific location	Mir-M. Seyedbagheri	Again, it all looks good, except I suggest you send a copy to the Elmore Cattleman's Association, as they may have input of value to this project.	Noted.	No change made.

Chapter 1

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
1-1	Pg 1-2, section 1.1-	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	Insert “of” after collaborative efforts		Change made
1-2	Pg. 1-5	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Lots of information on the ANG and the C-130s that are gone. No mention of the ARNG Armor Training Center, AH-64 & UH-60 training requirements, Headquarters location for the State Military Division.	This information has been included.	Change already made.
1-3	Pg. 1-5	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Drop “active units” in last sentence. Enabling legislation and MOU preclude active duty units training on OTA. They can train NG and RC and integrate train with but not as a separate AC unit.		Change already made.
1-4	Pg. 1-6	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	MHAFB / MHRC Focus Area The MHAFB / MHRC Focus Area includes land in and around MHAFB, MHRC, and OTA as shown on Figure 1-2. Extending this focus area north to include to include the OTA was based on input from the committees assisting with the development of this JLUS An explanation of the committee input and reasoning would be helpful.		Change already made.
1-5	Pg 1-6, Section 1.3 JLUS Study Area/Focus Areas	Byron Schmidt - Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	“The MHRC includes all of the lands within the Owyhee Military Operations Area (MOA), Jarbidge MOA, and special use airspace R-3202”. This comment implies that only restricted areas (R-3202)are special use airspace, when, in fact, the MOAs are as well by definition. No mention is made of the R-3204 restricted area (Juniper Butte).	See new language.	The MHRC includes all of the lands within the Owyhee Military Operations Area (MOA), Jarbidge MOA, and special use airspace R-3202. The Jarbidge and Owyhee MOAs are located in Owyhee County. The R-3204 (Juniper Butte Range) is located in the Owyhee MOA. The Paradise MOA and Saddle MOA are located in Nevada and Oregon, respectively and are not included as a part of this JLUS, which focuses exclusively on areas in the state of Idaho.
1-6	Figures 1-2 and 1-3	Tom Rasmussen	The OTA is shown on the MHAFB/MHRC figure when it part of the Gowen/OTA Focus Area. Only the northern boundary of the OTA is shown on the Gowen/OTA figure. Also, the OTA isn't shaded as a military operations area. Overall, I don't think the OTA is highlighted/labeled in the proper context.	GIS	New figure to be provided for public draft.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
1-7	Pg. 1-10 Table 1-1 and Table 1-2	Rick Solander – Office of Economic Adjustment	<p>OEA needs to be removed from the Policy Committee as a Participant in Tables 1-1 and 1-2. OEA does not participate in the JLUS or policy approval process.</p> <p>As an alternative, you can footnote the OEA reference in the “Sponsor” section of the tables and mention that OEA serves as an “ex officio/non-voting” member of the Policy and Technical Committees.</p>		Change made
1-8	Chapter 1 – page 11	Ron Swearingen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of participants in the Technical Working Group should include City of Mountain Home (Economic Development Office). 		Change made
1-9	Section 1. Introduction, page 1-12, Gowen Technical Working Group	Tom Rasmussen	The list shows the Idaho National Guard and the Idaho Army National Guard. I would suggest using just Idaho National Guard as is done on the Policy Committee. Otherwise delete the Idaho National Guard and use both Idaho Air National Guard and Idaho Army National Guard.		Idaho Air National Guard and Idaho Army National Guard language used.
1-10	Page 1-12	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	IDFG is not identified as a member of the Technical Working Group for the Gowen Field/OTA focus area. I was under the impression that we were a member of that group as well as the MHAFB group.		IDFG included in Gowen Field TC.
1-11	Throughout Chapter.	Bob Taunton	Comment from Chpt 2 : “ <i>The revised name of the NCA is the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA. Check with BLM (they have taken some heat for not changing the name on their web site).</i> ”		Change made

Chapter 2

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
2-1	Pg. 2-2 Paragraph 5	Bill Richey	Expand 2 nd sentenceThe unit stationed at Mountain Home AFB was the 366 th Wing, an air interdiction composite wing with F-16CJs, F-15Es, C and Ds, B-52Gs and KC-135Rs assigned.		Sentence revised to "The unit stationed at MHAFFB was the 366th Wing, an air interdiction composite wing comprised of F-16CJs, F-15s (E, C, and D models), B-52Gs, and KC-135Rs. "
2-2	Pg. 2-7	Byron Schmidt – Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	[GLOBAL] Its tactical radar provides airspace control support to the unit responsible for managing airspace at the Mountain Home Range Complex. RADAR is an acronym and should be capitalized throughout the JLUS	According to the Museum of Air Traffic Control, "although actually an acronym (and therefore properly capitalized), the word radar has become simply a noun in common usage and is, more often than not, un-capitalized." It is this approach which we have adopted on the JLUS. Therefore, except where capitalization is important to a particular use of the term, we have opted to use lowercase rather than treat RADAR as an acronym. This approach is supported by the use of lowercase in AF websites and official documents.	No change.
2-3	Pg. 2-7	Byron Schmidt – Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	The Middle Marker site is approximately 50 by 70 feet in size and located west of the runway at MHAFFB. Mountain Home approach procedures are NOT supported by a middle marker to either runway, so the statement is incorrect. You may be referring to the TACAN or Glideslope site. I suspect TACAN.	This information was derived from the MHAFFB General Plan. The GP does not clarify what is actually located at the Middle Marker auxiliary facility.	Sentence revised to more closely state what is listed in the MHAFFB General Plan Draft, " There are four outlying facilities: and various communication/radar sites (Grasmere Electronic Combat Site, Rattlesnake Radar Station, Middle Marker, and Seneca Ground Wave Emergency Network Station) with a combined area of 51 acres."
2-4	Pg. 2-10	Byron Schmidt – Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	In addition to Mountain Home AFB, the 366 FW also maintains and operates MHRC, which covers over 9,600 square miles of airspace and training ranges, including 122,000 acres of land used for air-to-ground training. The CURRENT MHRC has an area of 7,414 Square Nautical Miles. The figure of 9,600 is what it MAY be if the Paradise MOA expansion is adopted by the FAA.	1 nm ² = 1.3243 mi ² (http://www.ookingdom.com/metric/factors); therefore, 7,414 nm ² = 9,818 mi ² .	Sentence revised to, "In addition to Mountain Home AFB, the 366 FW also maintains and operates MHRC, which currently covers an area measuring 7,414 square nautical miles (over 9,818,600 square miles) of airspace and training ranges, including 122,000 acres of land used for air-to-ground training."
2-5	Pg. 2-10	Byron Schmidt – Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	The airspace within MHRC is comprised of two restricted areas (R-3202 and R-3204), three MOAs, Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace, and Military Training Routes (MTRs).	Revise as recommended.	Sentence revised to "The airspace within MHRC is comprised of two restricted areas (R-3202 and R-3204), four ^{three} MOAs, Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace, and Military Training Routes (MTRs).

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			This should be four MOAs. Paradise East and West have separate legal descriptions and can be scheduled separately.		
2-6	Section 2.1, Pg. 2-10, 1st paragraph, 3rd sentence	Mountain Home AFB	The sentence is incomplete.	Joint the sentence with the next sentence.	Sentence revised to, "Although it was not included as a specific category, an important component of the economic impact of the base is indirect jobs, <u>which are</u> . That is, jobs created from military related expenditures."
2-7	Study Area Profile, Figure 2-4 Pg.2-15	Tom Rasmussen	This map of Gowen is substandard, especially compared to the map of MHAFB, Figure 2-1. We have very detailed maps available.	GIS	Revised figure to be provided in the public draft.
2-8	Pg. 2-10 Paragraph 6 Last sentence	Bill Richey	ADD ...Bighorn Sheep habitat and recreation.	Revise as recommended.	Sentence revised to, "Other flight restrictions are enacted over the Duck Valley Indian Reservation, as well as seasonally from April to June over selected canyons that support <u>recreation and</u> Bighorn Sheep habitat."
2-9	Pg. 2-12	Byron Schmidt – Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	<p>MHAFB personnel currently schedule four Instrument Routes (IR), which is airspace identified to be flown, to the maximum extent possible, under Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) or instrument mode. Instrument Routes were created through a joint venture with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the DOD. These routes have been mutually developed for the purpose of conducting low altitude, high speed military flight training. These routes are IR293, IR300, IR303, and IR304.</p> <p>Should be "are airspace segments" as the reference is a plural one to routes. (Suggestion)</p> <p>There are 4 routes, but since the initial information gathering, IR293 was transferred and IR313 has come into being. So it should be IR300, IR303, IR304, and IR313.</p>	<p>Revise as recommended.</p> <p>Verify new IR numbers are revised in other sections as-applicable.</p>	<p>Sentences revised to, "MHAFB personnel currently schedule four Instrument Routes (IR), which <u>are</u> airspace <u>segments</u> identified to be flown, . . ."</p> <p>AND</p> <p>"These routes are IR293, IR300, IR303, <u>and</u> IR304, <u>and</u> IR313."</p> <p>Did a search in other sections for IR293, but no occurrences were found.</p>
2-10	Pg. 2-13		Under Title: Other Facilities (2 nd Sentence) Ordinance is misspelled.	In relation to munitions, the proper spelling is as used in the JLUS = 'ordnance'.	No change.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
2-11	Pg. 2-14	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Under Title: Gowen Field... “The State Reserve and National Guard Military-----.” does not sound right. Shouldn't it be “The State National Guard, as well as ---.”	Phrase not found in the document.	No change.
2-12	Pg. 2-14	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Under Title: Overview Gowen Field is the headquarters for ----	Comment not clear as to what the reviewer wants. Sentence is already complete in the section.	No change.
2-13	Pg. 2-14	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Under Title: Overview Bosnia, Afghanistan, and Iraq.	Sentence includes these words.	No change.
2-14	Pg. 2-21	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Under Title: Orchard Training Area ---MOU with BLM, training on the land is authorized until the year 2015. Could be interpreted to mean that there will no longer be training after 2015. Could we insert something to the effect that “with provisions for extensions” in the wording?		Change already made.
2-15	Pg. 2-21	Rick Ward – Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	ORCHARD TRAINING AREA (OTA) Orchard Training Area (OTA) consists of 138,051 acres of training and maneuver area located approximately 13 miles south of Gowen Field. It is located within the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area (NCA), and the majority of the surrounding land is currently unpopulated. A brief sentence stating that the OTA is located on lands managed by the BLM and State of Idaho would be helpful.	Revise sentence as recommended.	Revised sentences to, “Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area (NCA). OTA is located on lands managed by the BLM and the State of Idaho , and the majority of the surrounding land is currently unpopulated.”
2-16	Pg. 2-23	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Under Title: Orchard Training Area Please replace Combat Vehicle Transition Training Team with 1st Armor Training Battalion, 204th Regional Training Regiment. CVTTT is just a small part of the ATB.		Change already made.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
2-17	Page 2-23, Paragraph 2	Tom Rasmussen	<p>States "Operations at the Orchard Training Area differ depending on the season. It is more heavily used during the summer months when temperatures allow for a full range of activities." I would suggest temperature has little bearing on training. The peak training season has more to do with the traditional availability of Guardsmen.</p> <p>Precipitation may have some bearing in maneuver areas.</p> <p>Para 3 uses the term "tank and vehicle training". Suggest using "tracked and wheeled vehicle training".</p> <p>Para 4 states "An ammunition supply point is also located in the northeastern portion of the training area. Both air and ground training operations can occur here". This reads as if air and ground training can occur at the ammunition supply point. It would be less misleading if it read" both air and ground operations can occur on the OTA".</p>		<p>Sentences revised to, "Operations at the Orchard Training Area differ depending on the season. It is more heavily used during the summer months <u>which coincides with the traditional availability of Guardsmen.</u>when temperatures allow for a full range of activities."</p> <p>"The Maneuver Area is approximately 72,750 acres and provides land for <u>tracked</u>tank and <u>wheeled</u> vehicle training."</p> <p>Para 4 sentence moved to second sentence in paragraph to alleviate confusion.</p>
2-18	Page 2-24, Paragraph 1	Tom Rasmussen	<p>States "to connect the MATES with Gowen Field". The rail spur connects the MATES to the nations rail system. There is no rail loading at Gowen.</p>		<p>Sentence revised to, "To<u>In order to</u> be prepared for future missions at the OTA, a new rail spur is under construction to connect the MATES with Gowen Field<u>the nation's rail system</u>."</p>
2-19	Page 2-24 There are also several proposed land acquisitions from the BLM to create buffer areas around the Installation...	Rick Ward – Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	<p>Should this say that there are several proposed land acquisitions <i>by</i> the BLM, or is the Guard proposing to acquire lands from the BLM?</p>	<p>Concept is land swapping rather than land purchase/acquisition.</p> <p>Revise paragraph per conversation with Charlie Chambers, Interagency Liaison, Idaho National Guard on 3/25/10 with Todd.</p>	<p>Paragraph revised to, "To keep up with continuing training operations and to maintain its status as the premier military training area in Idaho (and the U.S.), several construction and improvement projects are scheduled for the OTA. There are also several proposed land acquisitions from the BLM to create buffer areas around the installation, reducing the potential for noise impacts and protecting threatened and endangered species if residential development should occur adjacent or proximate to the training area. Several projects scheduled for the OTA are listed below. There is also a proposal that entails BLM swapping BLM-administered property in areas away from OTA for private lands adjacent to OTA. The goal of this proposal is to create buffer areas around the installation to reduce the potential for noise impacts, protect</p>

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
					threatened and endangered species, and to reduce the possibilities of incompatible uses being located on lands adjacent or proximate to the training area."
2-20	Pg. 2-25	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Under Title: Mobilization and Training Equipment Site (MATES) Delete "IDARNG Units Authorized" and insert "116th BCT". Some of the equipment comes from 116th units in Mt, Or, and Ut. Delete "—diminishing the use of the current tank route".		Change already made.
2-21	Pg. 2-25 Population	Bob Taunton	Recommend that data be updated to 2008, otherwise the report would appear to be dated. COMPASS should be able to provide 2008 data.		Tables and text revised to include 2008 (cities) and 2009 (counties) estimates.
2-22	Pg. 2-25 Population	Bob Taunton	The Boise MSA has a population of over 600,000. I would suggest obtaining the population numbers for this area and illustrating the county and city locations on a regional map. COMPASS can assist. The current graphics do not show the regional context and I believe it would confuse a reader from outside the region. The regional perspective is important. It is also important to distinguish the City of Boise from the Boise region (MSA?) in the narrative.	TEXT and GIS	Text and population data included to provide reader with better understanding of the COMPASS planning area region. Text revised to distinguish the City of Boise from the Boise MSA. Revised figure to be provided for the public draft.
2-23	Pg. 2-25 Population	Bob Taunton	Present the population growth totals and % increases in a table for the cities in Ada County plus unincorporated areas. Boise's growth rate has been slower than other cities and the comparison is important. COMPASS has this information through 2008.		Additional data provided in tabular format with corresponding text analysis.
2-24	Pg. 2-25 Population	Bob Taunton	My research indicates that Mountain Homes growth rate is 3.5%, which is the projected growth rate used by the city.		According to the US Census Bureau, the city had a 2008 population of 12,382 and a 2000 population of 11143. This equates to an annual growth of 0.6% and a total growth of 111%. With a 2007 population of 12,201, the 1-yr growth rate is 1.5%. No change.
2-25	Pg. 2-25, Table 2-9	Bob Taunton	Table 2.9 – many of us in the real estate industry believe the growth projection completed Idaho Economics for COMPASS understates future growth. We could discuss further.		To be discussed at next committee meeting.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
2-26	Pg. 2-25 Table 2-11	Bob Taunton	Table 2-11 is incomplete.	Requested housing data from COMPASS, Toni Tisdale.	Table to be revised once data is received from COMPASS.
2-27	Pg. 2-25 Population	Bob Taunton	<p>The discussion on Housing Value Trends and Economic Conditions should be revised to factor in the recession impacts. Otherwise, a reader may find it difficult to believe the report was prepared in mid-2009. Obviously, housing prices and land prices have fallen dramatically, but the long term trend will not change. Economic development has been impacted (Micron is the poster child).</p> <p>I would suggest some discussion of the federal stimulus program and the potential for green industries, particularly solar and wind.</p>		Text / analysis on this topic to be provided once data is received from subject matter experts contacted by the project team.
2-28	Pg. 2-31	Given Pursley, LLP for Pacific West Land	<p>We have a few specific comments.</p> <p>First, we believe the report is incorrect in stating that 62.7 percent of Ada County is public land (draft at p. 2-31). We believe that over half of the county is public land (see excerpt from draft Blueprint for Good Growth Report, attached as Exhibit "B").</p> <p>Second, the Ada County land use discussion materially omits the fact that Ada County permits planned communities on private properties of 640 acres in size or greater in rural areas of the county. We believe it is extremely important (1) to maintain the flexibility to have planned communities throughout the county, (2) to be clear about the extent of regulations needed to accommodate the OTA, and (3) to ensure that those regulations are not more restrictive than necessary to accommodate the military's use.</p>		<p>Land ownership figures provided by the Idaho Dept of Commerce website (http://commerce.idaho.gov/assets/content/docs/landownership.xls) No change based on this part of comment.</p> <p>Text added to pg. 2-31 regarding Ada County permits.</p>
2-29	Pg. 2-31	Bob Taunton	Second paragraph under Ada County...last sentence. Revise "until 2030" to "through COMPASS's forecast period of 2030".	Revise as recommended.	Sentence revised to, "COMPASS projects that construction, wholesale and retail trade, and service industries will continue to experience significant growth until through COMPASS's forecast period of 2030. "
2-30	Pg. 2-31	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	States that Ada County covers 1,055 square miles of land and 5 square miles of water, page 2-35 states that Boise City encompasses 1,645 square miles. This seem incorrect	Revise land area for Boise City to 63 mi ² per http://quickfacts.census.gov	Revised sentence to include new area.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
2-31	Pg. 2-33 to 2-34	Bob Taunton	Provide a similar map for the Mountain Home area (city and MHAFB).	Figures on pg. 2-33 & 34 are land ownership maps for Gowen Field and for OTA, respectively. Fig 2-8 is MHAFB/MHRC Land Ownership.	New figure to be provided for public draft.
2-32	Pg. 2-36	Ron Swearingen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marathon Cheese Processing Plant should be changed to Marathon Cheese Packaging Plant. 	Revise as recommended.	Change made.
2-33	Pg. 2-39	Bob Taunton	<p>COMPASS is in the process of updating the regional transportation plan (to be approved 2010), which will include a review of CIM (several cities did not follow the plan).</p> <p>COMPASS may be able to give you some updates. It is important to mention the locations of interchanges between Boise and Mountain (Blacks Creek, Orchard/Mayfield and Simco Rd) and those locations will be the focus of new development.</p>	Revise text to include information about CIM update. Toni Tisdale, COMPASS, indicated that this update is relatively minor as budget was not available to conduct a comprehensive update. 3/31/10, TAT	<p>Text revised and added to the Highways discussion to identify the noted interchanges and the possible impact to future development.</p> <p>Text revised under Highway Planning per communications with COMPASS. Revised text: "Currently, the I-84, Orchard to Isaacs Canyon Corridor project directly affects movement in and around Gowen Field/Orchard Training Area. This project is the result of a planning and environmental study that recommended improvements for the corridor, including replacing existing pavement, adding lanes to the interstate from Broadway Avenue Interchange to the Eisenman InterchangeCele Road to Gowen Road, and reconstructing the Orchard and Vista, Broadway, and Gowen interchanges to meet future capacity requirements. The Broadway and Gowen Interchange improvements are not included in GARVEE funding, but they are still planned for improvement in the long range plan."</p>

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
2-34	Pg. 2-40	Bob Taunton	The EAWP project at currently planned facility build out could supply water to approximately 30-40,000 acres (NOT 166,000 acres) of development depending on land uses, densities, existing groundwater availability, and conservation measures. EAWP would be a wholesale water provider and other water providers (including the MHAFB) would deliver water to end users.	Per conversation with Bob Taunton, the SPF Water Engineering project brochure was incorrect in stating 166,000 acres. Revise as recommended.	Sentences revised to, "The project is slated for five phases, with an estimated completion timeline of 8-12 years. The project at the currently planned facility build out could supply water to approximately 30-40,000 acres of development depending on land uses, densities, existing groundwater availability, and conservation measures. EAWP would be a wholesale water provider and other water providers (including the MHAFB) would deliver water to end users. It is estimated that, once complete, the new water supply would support the development of over 166,000 acres of privately owned land for the purposes of serving residential, commercial, and industrial growth. "
2-35	Pg. 2-41, Paragraph 2. line 7, 8, 9 & 10	Bill Richey	10 REVISE ...electricity. The Danskin Mountain Power Plant in Elmore County, a 261 megawatt natural gas plant was dedicated as the Evander Andrews Complex in honor of the first military causality in the US war on terrorism, Operation Enduring Freedom, MSGT Evander Andrews. The Bennett Mountain Power Plant located in Mountain Home is a 164 megawatt natural gas plant. These facilities were built...	Revise as recommended.	Sentences revised as recommended.
2-36	Pg. 2-42	Bob Taunton	The revised name of the NCA is the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA. Check with BLM (they have taken some heat for not changing the name on their web site).	Fig 2-12 Chpt 1 and 4 need changes,	Name revised in the several instances where it appears in the chapter.
2-37	Pg. 2-42 IDAHO BIRDING TRAIL	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	The Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) has recognized the premier environmental resources of southwestern Idaho and is charged with sustaining the state's fish and wildlife and the habitats upon which they depend. Recommend a text change as follows: "...and is charged with preserving, protecting, perpetuating, and managing the state's fish and wildlife resources." This comes directly from IDFG mission statement.	Revise as recommended.	Sentence revised as recommended.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
2-38	Pg. 2-44 Threatened and Endangered Species	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	<p>Recommend a text change as follows:</p> <p>Slickspot peppergrass is an herbaceous annual or biennial plant that typically ranges between four to twelve inches tall, with tiny white flowers. It is located throughout southwestern Idaho in sagebrush steppe habitats at elevations between 2,200 feet and 5,400 feet. Slickspot peppergrass tends to grow in groups of three to more than 20 and is restricted to small areas, similar to vernal pools, known as slickspots (also called mini-playas or natric sites). Slickspots range from less than 1 square meter to about 10 square meters within communities dominated by other plants. These sparsely vegetated microsites are very distinct from the surrounding shrubland vegetation, and are characterized by relatively high concentrations of clay and salt. A large portion of this plant's habitat is located on and around the military installations...</p> <p>This is redundant with the recommendation for Page 3-91. This text should be in at least one of the locations.</p>	Revise as recommended.	Sentences revised as recommended.
2-39	Page 2-48, Last paragraph	Tom Rasmussen	States identified cultural areas are protected by fences. Most cultural sites are actually not protected by fences in order to prevent easy identification by those who would pilfer the sites. I suggest removing the first half of this sentence.	Revise as recommended.	Sentence revised to, " Identified cultural resources on the installation are protected by fences, and P-personnel are educated on the importance of protecting the <u>cultural resources</u> ."

Chapter 3

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
3-1	Table 3-1	Bob Taunton	Table 3-1 – Add the legend for the colors to the beginning of the chart.		Indication in text that legend should be created.
3-2	Pg 3-3	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	Potential Impact-5 th line down should read existing not exiting.		Change made
3-3	Pg. 3-12	Bob Taunton	Will there be a chart that explains the #'s and letters on the red dots? Otherwise it is not very meaningful.	Figure 3-1b and 3-2 are close-ups of the main Figure 3-1a. Add text telling the reader that each issue shown on these maps is listed/described in a table under the respective compat factor.	No change made.
3-4	Pg. 3-18	Bob Taunton	Pg 3-18 – I have heard a rumor that there is a race track proposal, movie studio, amusement park and commercial development that is planned for Kuna-Mora Rd. east of the Black's Creek interchange and the project may involve some BLM property. If this were to happen (i.e. financing being available and land uses approved, the Simco Rd. site would approval would lapse.		The proposed location of the raceway is along Simco Road, to the east of Orchard Training Area. If completed, this project has the potential for many incompatible uses, including increased traffic along Simco Road, night time lighting affecting night vision training at OTA, frequency interference with military operations, and the proximity of the new facilities to areas subject to noise caused by training operations at OTA. The permit for the raceway is conditioned to expire on September 21, 2011 if the raceway is not fully operational, and the applicant cannot show just cause as to why the permit should be extended. As of June 2009, the raceway is not operational. Other sites are being considered for a raceway and if approved the Simco Road project would likely fall through.
3-5	Pg. 3-18	Bob Taunton	Elmore County has zoned a significant amount of land on either side of Simco Rd for heavy industry, light industry and commercial. This should be mapped.	GIS	New figure to be provided for public draft.
3-6	Pg. 3-18	Bob Taunton	Elmore County has zoned a significant amount of land on either side of Simco Rd for heavy industry, light industry and commercial. This should be mapped.	GIS	New figure to be provided for public draft.
3-7	Pg 3-18	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	Industrial Development- 2 nd paragraph, 2 nd line should be is instead of in.		Change made

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
3-8	Pg 3-44 – EAWP	Bob Taunton	<p>Lands that could be served by the project would include lands in the CGWA, GMA and outside those designated areas.</p> <p>The Swan Fall alternative is West of OTA, not north. An extension to Mountain Home would include a pipeline to MHAFB.</p> <p>The alternative south of Mountain Home would also include a supply to the MHAFB.</p> <p>The water storage tanks shown on the graphics would be constructed by other water providers that would take delivery of EAWP water. EAWP storage would be aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) underground.</p>		<p>As discussed in Section 2 of this JLUS, the Elmore-Ada Water Project was formed in August 2007 and is underway to construct new water lines to provide water for undeveloped areas north of MHAFB and east of OTA as well as the Critical Groundwater Areas (CGWA), groundwater management areas (GMA) and outside those designated areas. Much of this land currently lies within critical groundwater management areas, as designated by the Idaho Department of Water. As such, withdrawal of groundwater is limited and is not enough to support large community growth. This has had positive effects for military installations nearby as they do not experience much incompatibility between their operations and local communities due to limited development potential (due to water shortage). However, extension of water lines to the area will promote growth, which could impact military operations.</p> <p>The majority of the water for this project will come from the Snake River. The feasibility study narrowed down three alternative selections for withdrawing and distributing water to its final destination. The three alternative locations for withdrawing water and constructing pipelines are: 1) an area near Swan Falls that would go west of OTA and then to the east near Kuna-Mora Road; 2) the C.J. Strike Reservoir and then north along Simco Road, as well as split to the east along Grand View Road and bring water to MHAFB and continue to the City of Mountain Home; or 3) an area south of the City of Mountain Home that would carry water north to the city, to MHAFB and then northeast along Interstate 84. Each alternative included a pump station and a water treatment plant. Water storage tanks would be located along Interstate 84. EAWP storage would be aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) underground.</p>
3-9	Section 3.2, Pg. 3-45, 5th paragraph, 3rd sentence	Mountain Home AFB	Change the word "no" to "not".		Change made.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
3-10	Pg. 3-48	Bob Taunton	Also along Kuna-Mora is the Bryan's Run PC, which is on hold due to financing. Some are approved. Mapping the PC's in Ada and Elmore County will help explain the scale and location of the PC's.	GIS	New figure to be provided for public draft.
3-11	Pg 3-49	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	"Lake" is missing 9 th row of text from the bottom.		Change made.
3-12	Pg. 3-50	Ron Swearingen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> under the antiterrorism notes The City is currently having meetings with Homeland Security and FBI concerning an incident where the City's Water Telemetry System was somehow accessed by an unknown hacker, deactivating the "Automatic Malfunction Notification". The Air Force personnel from MHAFB are sitting in on the meetings. Maybe this should be part of this section.... 	Issue noted. Not directly tied to military issues.	p. 3-51 Air Force representatives have been proactive by participating in City of Boise efforts to manage terrorism concerns.
3-13	Pgs. 3-52 thru 3-63	Bill Richey	63 Highly recommend that all military agencies noise experts scrutinize the wording of the NOISE section closely since in the end Noise drives most other compatibility issues and is by far the most contentious. The wording in any document will be used over and over.	Review the Noise section closely to ensure wording is correct/accurate.	No change made.
3-14	Section 3.2, Pg.3-55 4th paragraph titled MHAFB/MHRC Focus	Mountain Home AFB	<p>AREA Noise from Air Operations/Overflight: Recommend the last four sentences be revised as follows;</p> <p>During aircraft operations, all of these areas experience slightly increased noise levels. However, in a 2003 study of noise conditions in the MHRC Fidel and Associates concluded "indigenous noise sources [i.e. non-aircraft] generally controlled sound levels about 90-95% of the time." Also, the AF has adopted flight restrictions over Duck Valley Indian Reservation and seasonal flight restrictions over key recreation and natural resource areas to address noise concerns. (end of paragraph)</p>		Based on current available noise contours for AFB, each of the noise contours from 65 DNL to greater than 80 DNL all extend beyond the boundaries of MHAFB. There is a mix of both private and BLM owned land to the west of the base that falls within each noise contour contour and a small amount of private land to the south that falls within the 65 DNL contour. The remaining land to the south of the base is public land owned by the BLM. During aircraft operations, all of these areas experience slightly increased noise levels. However the 2003 AICUZ it was determined that "indigenous noise sources [i.e. non-aircraft] generally controlled sound levels about 90-95% of the time." As a means of mitigating noise the Air Force has imposed flight restrictions over Duck Valley Indian Reservation and seasonal flight restrictions over key recreation and natural resource areas.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
3-15	Section 3-2, Pg. 3-56, 1st paragraph: Recommend the paragraph be revised.	Mountain Home AFB	The last public release of the AICUZ report was 1998. The noise data has been reviewed by ACC every two years since 1998 without major changes in the contours. In 2003, ACC performed a AICUZ study by contract, new noise contours were generated, but the contractor failed to produce the report. Since that time a environmental assessment was conducted for the beddown of the Royal Singapore Air Force (RSAF) and the noise contours have not change substantially from the 2003 study. Future wing missions will not reduce the noise contours and may in fact increase the noise levels. Currently, the primary aircraft flown out of MHAFB include the F-15C/E/SG aircraft. (end of paragraph)	RSAF stands for 'Republic of Singapore Air Force', not 'Royal Singapore Air Force' as listed in the comment. Ensure correct definition is used.	This is somewhat problematic because of the change in missions and aircraft stationed at MHAFB. At the time of the AICUZ report, there were F-16 Fighting Falcons, F-15 Eagles, KC-135 Stratotankers, and B-1 Lancers. Since 2003 an environmental assessment was conducted for the beddown of the Republic of Singapore Air Force (RSAF) indicating the noise contours have not change substantially. Future wing missions will not reduce the noise contours and may in fact increase the noise levels. Currently, the primary aircraft flown out of MHAFB include only the F-15 C/E aircraft.
3-16	Pg. 3-56 Paragraph 1 line 7	Bill Richey	ADD only the F-15 C/E and SG aircraft.		Change made.
3-17	Pg. 3-59 Paragraph 4 Line 2 & 3	Bill Richey	...military training routes and throughout the MHRC but more concentrated near Sailor Creek and Juniper Butte Training ranges and the various...		The main areas of noise generation associated with MHAFB are along the runway where aircraft take off and land, along the military training routes and throughout the MHRC but more concentrated near Sailor Creek and Juniper Butte Training ranges and the various military training routes in the MHRC, and near Saylor Creek and Juniper Butte ranges and the various emitter and no drop sites in MHRC.
3-18	Pg. 3-73	Bob Taunton	Map the AEHI site for the proposed nuke plant.	GIS	New figure to be provided for public draft.
3-19	Pg. 3-72	Byron Schmidt – Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	Table 3-23: The transmission lines associated with alternative energy development should be a red box under "Potential Impact" It is impossible in my mind to have the wind and solar development alternatives be red without also making the transmission lines that would support them red as well. I believe that this is captured in the third paragraph of page 3-73 as well.		Change made.
3-20	Pg 3-78	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	Definition box refers to "Beale AFB".		Change made.
3-21	Pg. 3-89	Bob Taunton	All 3 EAWP alternatives could bring water to MHAFB.		One alternative route All alternatives for these water lines would connect to MHAFB and bring additional water to the facility. More information on the Elmore-Ada Water Project can be found under Compatibility Factor 5, Infrastructure Extensions.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
3-22	Pg. 3-90 Threatened & Endangered Species	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	Recommend a title change to "Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species" or "Sensitive Plants and Wildlife".	"Threatened and Endangered Species" is the common term.	No change
3-23	Pg. 3-90	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	Recommend a text change as follows (USFWS definition under the ESA): An "endangered" species is one that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. A "threatened" species is one that is likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future.		Change made.
3-24	Pg. 3-90	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	The ability of local governments to adequately plan for growth can also be compromised as mitigation measures and habitat protection restrictions may limit land available for development Is this statement relevant to the JLUS? If so, it is unclear and needs further explanation.		Mitigation measures and habitat protection restrictions may limit land available for development and The ability of make it more challenging for local governments to adequately plan for growth can also be compromised as mitigation measures and habitat protection restrictions may limit land available for development.
3-25	Pg. 3-90	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	Due to the size and amount of land included within the focus areas of this JLUS, there are a wide variety of native flora and fauna known to occur throughout the study area. The area under consideration for sensitive species needs to be more clearly stated. It appears that this section refers to just the focus areas, but the language is confusing to make it sound as if the entire study area (as shown in figure 1-1) is being considered. If that is the case, then this section will need a lot of additional work to cover such a large area.	Linguistic change made to clarify.	Due to the size and amount of land included within the focus areas of this JLUS, there are a wide variety of native flora and fauna known to occur throughout the study area.
3-26	Pg. 3-91	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	Recommend: The primary <i>plant</i> species of concern located within the two main focus areas is slickspot peppergrass.		Change made
3-27	Pg. 3-91	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	Recommend a text change as follows: Slickspot peppergrass is a small flowering plant species that can be either annual or biennial. Biennial occurrences do not produce flowers the first year. The flowers produced by this species are small and white. Its habitat is restricted to semiarid sagebrush-steppe ecosystems and it grows primarily in slickspots (also called mini-playas or natric sites). Slickspots range from less than 1 square meter to about 10 square meters within communities dominated by other plants. These sparsely vegetated microsites are very distinct from the		Change made

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			<p>surrounding shrubland vegetation, and are characterized by relatively high concentrations of clay and salt. Slickspot peppergrass is found in concentrations on parts of OTA... This is redundant with the recommendation for Page 2-44. This text should be in at least one of the locations.</p>		
3-28	Pg. 3-91/3-93	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	<p>Although there have not been any recorded federally threatened or endangered species on any lands managed by the Air Force... According to the 2004 to 2008 INRMP for OTA, there are several special status species...</p> <p>These paragraphs (or one introductory paragraph) should be restructured to clearly show that the species listed afterward come from the INRMP's and not directly from the referenced agencies as part of the JLUS. Additionally, these are not likely all encompassing lists, as additional sensitive species may be shown to be present through surveys. Similarly, suitable habitat for sensitive species is available.</p>		<p>Language added on p.3-93</p> <p>This may not be a comprehensive list of sensitive species as future surveys may show additional sensitive species. Similarly, alternative suitable habitat may be identified.</p>
3-29	Pg. 3-92	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	<p>Recommend: ...federally listed as threatened or endangered, listed as species of concern in Idaho by the USFWS, listed by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) as Species of Greatest Conservation Need, or BLM sensitive species.</p>		Change made
3-30	Pg. 3-92 California bighorn sheep are known...	Rick Ward Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game	<p>Should this be listed as a bullet item like the preceding bulleted species?</p>		Change made
3-31	Section 3.4, Pg. 3-100, 3rd paragraph, 7th sentence	Mountain Home AFB	<p>Change the word "prviously" to "previously".</p>		Change made
3-32	Section 3.4, Pg. 3-100, 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence	Mountain Home AFB	<p>Change the word "oulines" to "outlines".</p>		Change made
3-33	Pg. 3-100	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	<p>Multiple typos in the second and third paragraphs.</p>		Change made

Chapter 4

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
4-1	Pg. 4-1	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	Spaces needed between “threefocus” and “withinGowen”.		Change made.
4-2	Pg.4-1, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence	Mountain Home AFB	Change the word "three focus" to "two focus".		Change made.
4-3	Pg. 4-2, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence	Mountain Home AFB	Delete the word "Study" from the sentence since its use is redundant.		Change made.
4-4	Section 4.1, Pg. 4-2, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence	Mountain Home AFB	Delete the phrase "As a "city within a city, Air Force Installation's..." and replace with " Air Force Installations..."		Change made.
4-5	Section 4.1, Pg. 4-5, last paragraph and Pg. 4-6, first paragraph	Mountain Home AFB	The only information that needs to be update at this time in the AICUZ report is the aircraft Type at Mt Home and the addition of the Royal Singapore Air Force.		Over the past 11 years, new aircraft have been assigned or removed from MHAFB and so the report is now outdated. The study is in need of updating to include information about the current aircraft at Mountain Home AFB and the addition of the Republic of Singapore Air Force.
4-6	Pg. 4-7	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	The first sentence of the second paragraph under the heading “Idaho National Guard...” has an extra to.		Change made.
4-7	Pg. 4-10	Charlie Chambers – Joint Installation Command	Under Title: Orchard Training Area... I need to clarify the fire Area of Responsibility and Area of Mutual Support. The map and verbiage do not match my recollection, but I need to research. This document is not regulatory and of those seeing it only about 4 between the BLM and IDARNG would know the difference.	Charlie Chambers approved final language.	The Orchard Training Area (OTA) Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan (IWFMP) was developed to identify firefighting responsibilities on the BLM land used by the IDARNG for training. The IWFMP includes the Cooperative Wildland Fire Protection Agreement between the Idaho Army National Guard and the Bureau of Land Management, which identifies the boundary of the OTA firefighter’s area of responsibility. The agreement provides OTA firefighters with initial attack responsibility for the geographical area within the OTA. Conversely, the area of mutual support is more discretionary and reflects a boundary which extends past the OTA (as shown in Figure 4-1) and can vary according the conditions and circumstances. The OTA Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan (IWFMP) was developed for BLM land on which the training area is located. The area in which OTA firefighters have initial attack

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
					<p>responsibility extends beyond the boundary of OTA based on the Cooperative Wildland Fire Protection Agreement that has been executed between the IDARNG and the BLM, as well as the Annual Operating Plan. The Orchard Training Area INRMP is the document that guides activities within this document in relation to environmental assessment. The goals described in the Wildland Fire Plan are derived from the goals of the INRMP. Included in this document is the Cooperative Wildland Fire Protection Agreement between the Idaho Army National Guard and the Bureau of Land Management. The agreement provides OTA firefighters with initial attack responsibility for the geographical area identified in the agreement, which extends beyond the OTA boundary as shown on Figure 4-1.</p>
4-8	Pg. 4-18	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	<p>Add policy 3.3</p> <p><i>Noise Goals, Objectives and Policies, Objective 2 Prevent and mitigate adverse impacts of excessive noise exposure.</i></p> <p><i>2) All new development and existing structures within the Airport Influence Area must be soundproofed according to the following standards:</i></p> <p><i>a. All new residential development and new schools in Airport Influence Area A, which are affected by average sound levels in the 60-65 DNL and/or aircraft traffic patterns below 1,000 feet, shall be required to provide a sound level reduction of 25 dB.</i></p> <p><i>b. All development within Airport Influence Area B is affected by average sound levels in the 65-70 DNL and/or aircraft traffic patterns below 1,000 feet. Residential development is not allowed. All compatible uses will be required to provide sound insulation in noise sensitive areas of a facility.</i></p> <p><i>c. All development within Airport Influence Area B-1 is affected by average sound levels in the 65-70 DNL and/or aircraft traffic patterns below 1,000 feet. New residential development shall be required to provide a sound level reduction of 30 dB. For</i></p>	Policy included in text.	Change made.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			<p><i>new residential development, the maximum density is three residential units per acre. No new schools are allowed. Office and commercial uses are compatible. All compatible uses shall be required to provide sound insulation in noise sensitive areas of a facility.</i></p> <p><i>d. All development within Airport Influence Area C is affected by average sound levels greater than 70 DNL. The approved Airport Noise Compatibility Plan identifies existing residential uses in this area to undergo sound insulation. Residential uses in this area shall be considered non-conforming and no new residential development is allowed. Non-noise sensitive manufacturing, industrial and commercial uses are allowed. All compatible uses shall be required to provide sound insulation in noise sensitive areas of a facility.</i></p>		
4-9	Pg. 4-24	Bob Taunton	This figure is outdated for city boundaries. Show ALL the current AOI's (contact COMPASS).	GIS	New figure to be provided for public draft.
4-10	Pg. 4-26, Subdivision Ordinance	Jennifer Tomlinson – City of Boise	<p>9-20-06-C-4.h-Any additional information required by a receiving agency for its review</p> <p>The airport comments on all subdivision plats within the Airport Influence Area and requires a plat note as well as an avigation easement for the property stating that the property is located in the Airport Influence Area.</p>	Change made.	<p>The subdivision ordinance describes the manner in which land can be subdivided within the corporate limits of the City of Boise. The subdivision ordinance can be a useful tool in promoting compatibility by regulating size and density of new developments, or specifying the type of infrastructure needed in order for the subdivision of land to take place. The Boise Air Terminal District prohibits comments on all subdivision plats within certain noise zones the Airport Influence Area (AIA) around the airport. If a subdivision request is approved within the AIA the Airport requires a plat note as well as an avigation easement stating that the property is located in the AIA.</p> <p>Deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None noted at this time.
4-11	Pg. 4-28	Bob Taunton	Include the draft Kuna Comp Plan (as was done for Boise).	Plan reviewed and information included.	<p>COMPREHENSIVE PLAN</p> <p>The City of Kuna enacted recently updated its</p>

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
					<p>current comprehensive plan 2009, on September 8, 2003. The City is currently in the process of updating its comprehensive plan, which is scheduled to be complete in 2009. The comprehensive plan update began in April 2008 when a consultant was contracted and a steering committee of private citizens, city council members, and other stakeholders was formed. A Draft comprehensive plan was completed in November 2008 and an open house held in January 2009 to discuss the plan. On May 27, 2009 the planning and zoning commission recommended approval of the plan. It will go before the City Council on July 7, 2009. The updated comprehensive plan will include a future land use plan map, a proposed Area of City Impact, overlay districts and a future planning area. It has also been proposed by city staff to adopt a future acquisition map and a capitol improvement plan during the update process. The plan clearly indicates that the City of Kona is growing and the goals and policies therein discuss how the City plans to manage that growth.</p> <p>The plan clearly identifies how and in what manner the City of Kona expects to grow. For example the Kuna's Area of City Impact (ACI) is reflected in the City's Future Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map to include all land currently within the City's municipal boundary and lands outside the municipality contemplated for future annexation. Additionally the plan prioritizes conservation and open space and such strategies as Conservation Design to minimize infrastructure expenditure and maximize conservation of open space. Some relevant excerpts from the Plan include:</p> <p>PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS</p> <p>Goal 1: Ensure that the City of Kona land use policies, restrictions, conditions and fees do not violate private property rights. Establish an orderly, consistent review process for the City of Kona to evaluate whether proposed actions may result in</p>

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
					<p>private property "takings".</p> <p>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Goal 1: Promote and support a diverse and sustainable economy that will allow more Kuna residents to work in their community.</p> <p>OPEN SPACE</p> <p>Goal 4: Preserve key natural and open spaces, maintain and enhance existing park spaces, create interconnectivity between areas through pathways and promote the development of additional park spaces to meet growing demands.</p> <p>Deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan does not represent the regional context nor does it discuss the impact of the surrounding military operations.
4-12	Pg. 4-30, 4-31 & 4-32	Bill Richey	Is it a stretch to list the City of Mountain Home planning deficiencies when they are 10 miles from MHAFB?	The purpose of this chapter is to explore the utility of each of the jurisdictions' existing planning documents given their relationship to the military installation.	No change made.
4-13	Pg. 4-32	Ron Swearingen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the City of Mountain Home Subdivision Ordinances there is a comment under deficiencies that states, "Plat notes are not required for subdivisions in proximity to MHAFB". There are no City Subdivisions in proximity to MHAFB. Mountain Home City limits are nine miles from MHAFB. The subdivisions in proximity to the Air Base are covered under the Elmore County Zoning Ordinances. 		<p>Deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None found at this time. Plat notes are not required for subdivisions located in proximity to MHAFB.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
4-14	Section 4.2, Pg. 4-37, 3rd paragraph	Mountain Home AFB	The latest Elmore county zoning ordinance adopted May 13, 2009, does not provide for 1 acre lots with single family homes. The zoning requires a lot of record to be able to build a single family house on less than 320 acres.	Correction confirmed and made.	The Air Base Hazard Zone (ABHZ) zone is designated as agriculture and density is restricted to a one-family living unit per three hundred twenty (320) acres or original lot. allows one single family dwelling unit on one acre. The only other land uses allowed include home occupations, fences and agriculture uses. There are twelve other land uses that could be potentially allowed, but will require the approval of a conditional use permit (CUP).
4-15	Pg. 4-37	Tom Rasmussen	Elmore County has language in their zoning ordinance referring to the Army Noise Buffer that requires deed notifications and IDARNG notification of CUP and zoning change proposals. These should be mentioned.	No mention of the Army Noise Buffer in the 5/13/09 Zoning Ordinance.	No change made.
4-16	Pg. 4-41 Paragraph 3	Bill Richey	Need to update paragraph with 124 th Wing, C-130s have departed due to 2005 BRAC.		Authorized aircraft include 17 A-10s and the 124th Wing five C-130s.
4-17	Pg. 4-42, Table 4-1	Bill Richey	Question Don't see a code at the bottom of the table for white or clear blocks??? i.e., Sound attenuation Should all the white be green?		Changes made.
4-18	Pg. 4-43	Bob Taunton	An update to the LRTP is to be adopted in 2010. The Community Choices scenario will likely also be reviewed. See COMPASS.		The current version of Choice was developed in 2005, updates happen as needed and in concert with the LRTP update.
4-19	Pg. 4-47, Paragraph 1	Bill Richey	Bruneau Management Framework Plan I don't see any discussion of or list of deficiency of the No-drop target areas or Emitter sites that are on DOD withdrawn lands or the Grasmere EC Site that is leased from BLM?		does not currently utilize an RMP; instead, they have a Management Framework Plan (MFP) dating to 1983. The planning area includes military lands comprising Mountain Home AFB, DoD withdrawn lands , the DoD-leased Grasmere EC Site and the Saylor Creek AFR. Even though these installations and lands are not identified within the text or maps, the military use of lands and management of lands surrounding these Air Force lands occurs. This JLUS proposes that the Bruneau FO work with Owyhee County, the State of Idaho, Shoshone Paiute Tribes, and the Air Force to ensure the coordination, cooperation, and compatibility of land management and use between BLM, the military, and the public.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
4-20	Pg. 4-52	Bill Richey	Does the JLUS need to include all the EAs and EISs done since the first one listed, 1992.	See the following language in the report : "To date, there have been several EA and EIS documents prepared for the military installations that are a part of this JLUS, including the Air Force in Idaho 1992, the Enhanced Training in Idaho EIS January 1998, Employment of the 2.75-Inch Rocket at Saylor Creek Range Draft 2006, and the MHRC Airspace Expansion EA 2009" On page 4-55	No change made.
4-21	Pg. 4-52	Byron Schmidt – Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	To date, there have been several EA and EIS documents prepared for the military installations that are a part of this JLUS, including the Air Force in Idaho 1992, the Enhanced Training in Idaho EIS January 1998, Employment of the 2.75-Inch Rocket at Saylor Creek Range Draft 2006, and the MHRC Airspace Expansion EA 2009. Do we not want to refer to the EA by its formal name? It should be Paradise MOA Expansion EA, rather than MHRC. I think this would be more accurate. The Expansion EA increases the MHRC so the case could be made for both. I prefer keeping it formal.	Correction made.	To date, there have been several EA and EIS documents prepared for the military installations that are a part of this JLUS, including the Air Force in Idaho 1992, the Enhanced Training in Idaho EIS January 1998, Employment of the 2.75-Inch Rocket at Saylor Creek Range Draft 2006, and the Paradise MOA Expansion EA MHRC Airspace Expansion EA 2009.
4-22	Pg. 4-54	Byron Schmidt – Mountain Home AFB Airspace Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A height of 500 feet AGL at the site of the object. • A height that is 200 feet AGL or above the established airport elevation, whichever is higher, within 3 nautical miles of the established reference point of an airport, excluding heliports, with its longest runway more than 3,200 feet in actual length, and that height increases in the proportion of 100 feet for each additional nautical mile of distance from the airport up to a maximum of 500 feet. • A height within a terminal obstacle clearance area, including an initial approach segment, a departure area, and a circling approach area, which would result in the vertical distance between any point on 	These criteria are taken straight from the law and are used to determine obstructions to air navigation. In addition the law states that there is a requirement to submit a notice of proposed construction if the project exceeds 200 feet among other criteria.	In addition, per Section 77.13, any entity proposing construction or alteration meeting certain criteria, such as exceeding 200 feet or being placed on an airport operated by the armed forces of the U.S., must submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration to the FAA.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			<p>the object and an established minimum instrument flight altitude within that area or segment to be less than the required clearance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A height within an en route obstacle clearance area, including turn and termination areas, of a Federal airway or approved off-airway route, that would increase the minimum obstacle clearance altitude. <p>I think a review of the Part 77 rules is in order. I believe that an obstacle can be anything over 200' regardless of whether or not it is associated with an airport surface area. This criteria requires that the proponent submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration with the FAA by virtue of it's height without regard to location.</p>		
4-23	Throughout Chapter.		There are references to the 'Royal Singapore Air Force' throughout the JLUS. The term should really be 'Republic of Singapore Air Force.		Change made.
4-24	Throughout Chapter.	Bob Taunton	Comment from Chpt 2 : <i>"The revised name of the NCA is the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA. Check with BLM (they have taken some heat for not changing the name on their web site)."</i>		Change made.

Chapter 5

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
5-1	Section 5	Rick Solander – Office of Economic Adjustment	In Chapter 5 there are a handful of references to Idaho seeking funding from OEA as a strategy/action. For example, Strategy 27 says, “State of Idaho shall pursue funding from OEA or other sources (including private funding) to produce an acoustic and vibration study along the Tank Trail.” Would be better to say “shall pursue funding from DoD or” OEA does not want to be called out specifically in this document as it relates to the recommendations and follow-on actions. Other strategies where OEA is called out are Strategies 30, 45, and 47. There could be more so please to a check.		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-2	Section 5	Bill Richey	All strategies -- Recommend annotating with a note stating what agency, department or person is the responsible entity when the State of Idaho is marked under Responsible Entity. 2 hr		Revisions to be provided for public draft.
5-3	Section 5	Idaho Department of Lands	<u>NOTE REGARDING ALL MAPS:</u> Ensure that all abbreviations and acronyms are clearly spelled out for ease of reference.	GIS	Revised figures to be provided for public draft.
5-4	Pg. 5-5	Idaho Department of Lands	<u>Focus Area:</u> “ID = Gowen Field/Orchard Training Area [Idaho National Guard]” It is suggested that the references for the focus areas relate to the physical location or area name rather than the group utilizing the area. Changing “ID” to GF [Gowen Field] or OTA [Orchard Training Area] would be a logical association to the physical location.	Verify for possible global impacts (text / maps)	To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-5	Pg. 5-6	Idaho Department of Lands	<u>Military Influence Area:</u> Military Influence Area [MIA] The initial reaction to “MIA” is “missing in action” for the average person. One of the other labels that Matrix has used may be more appropriate and reduce potential confusion. “Region of Military Influence” would work nicely.		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-6	Pg. 5-8	Bill Richey	Recommend to update Strategy Box at top of these pages to be the same as all the other strategy Boxes and wording explaining same, i.e., see page 21 Table 5-3. MIA1 General, MIA2 MHAFB MIA3 MHRC, MIA4 Gowen Field, MIA 5 Tank Trail, MIA 6 OTA		As noted in the document, this table will be completed (and revised accordingly) following committee review.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
5-7	Pg. 5-10	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Treasure Valley Map:</u></p> <p>Treasure Valley Map – a) see note above; and b) ensure that the text description of the boundaries and the graphic representation show the same thing. For instance, the text description describes this area as extending to the Snake River. The map does not depict that the boundary is stopping north of the Snake River by some distance.</p>	GIS and TEXT	Revised figure to be provided for public draft.
5-8	Pg. 5-11	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Zone B:</u></p> <p>Since Zone B is the only non-geographic zone used it should be name something different so as not to be confused with the other geographic areas as a matter of consistency.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-9	Pg. 5-12	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>MHAFB Map:</u></p> <p>Again the text description and map Legend are not consistent. Since the source of this map is the AICUZ information with the vertical obstruction [FAA] added in should the AICUZ map [although dated] be included as well. Zones A, B and C are discussed on Page 5-11 and the map shows MH-A, MH-B, MH-C – the references should be the same for the reader to easily follow. Are there, or will there be actual physical references [legal descriptions] for these zones? I realize from actually working in a community that was tasked with enforcing the AICUZ use recommendations how difficult it can be to actually implement these zones.</p>	GIS and TEXT	Revised figure to be provided for public draft.
5-10	Pg. 5-15 Figure 5-5	Bill Richey	<p>Red area on chart does not match color of Legend for Gowen Field Boundary. Recommend to update Legend color??</p>	GIS	Revised figure to be provided for public draft.
5-11	Pg. 5-15 Figure 5-5	Bill Richey	<p>Title at Bottom right-hand side of page should read Gowen Field MIA, is missing the word "Field"</p>	GIS	Revised figure to be provided for public draft.
5-12	Pg. 5-16	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Tank Trail: 2-mile wide zone</u></p> <p>The Tank Trail zone is of concern to the Department, since Endowment Trust Land lies completely within a portion of this zone. The main concern is that there is no discussion whatsoever about the possibility of relocating the training facility at Gowen Field to the OTA at some point in the future. The Pleasant Valley Road corridor is only one point of concern. Other critical regional transportation expansions are potentially affected by this 2-mile wide area, namely the Lake Hazel extension as well as continued improvement of the</p>	GIS	Revised figure to be provided for public draft.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			Kuna-Mora Road. A good vetting of the issue still needs to be accomplished. Consider adding an ownership layer to the Tank Trail map as well for additional detail.		
5-13	Pg. 5-18	Bill Richey	Zone B is not shown on Legend at bottom of chart... as noted in box	GIS	Revised figure to be provided for public draft.
5-14	Pg. 5-19	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Strategy Table: "State of Idaho" and "Other"</u></p> <p>It would be helpful to clarify who the "state of Idaho" and "Other" categories are in the strategy table. Being one of those state agencies it is hard to tell who is being referred to in the table and discussion. When first reading through the strategies I assumed that the "State of Idaho" referred to all state agencies and "Other" was Federal agencies and special interest groups.</p>		Revised table to be provided for public draft.
5-15	Pg. 5-20	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Lease: Acquisitions – Lease</u></p> <p>The discussion under the least section could use some clarification. When referring to "... this may be a way to control land uses for a short timeframe." What is a "short timeframe"? A time reference would be helpful. The lease option is of course a "placeholder" if you will until permanent acquisition could be accomplished – correct?</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-16	Pg. 5-21	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Strategies 2 and 3: Acquisitions – Tank Trail/OTA</u></p> <p>Adding reference to the later strategies, such as #58, discussing specific area plans for the tank trail area, would be helpful to reinforce the ongoing need to jointly plan and communicate within the entire JLUS area.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-17	Pg. 5-22	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 6</u></p> <p>It appears to be misleading to suggest to use the clear zone to Augment Community Activities or passive recreation. Recommend change it to read "could" augment community activities or passive recreation rather than "can"</p>		Change made.
5-18	Pg. 5-22	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Strategy 8: Department Reference</u></p> <p>NOTE DEPARTMENT REFERENCE: The Idaho Department of Lands is the correct reference for the Department. Correct all uses of "State Lands Department." Reference to the lands that the Department manages should read Endowment Trust</p>	GIS and TEXT	Revised figure to be provided for public draft.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			Lands, or State Trust Lands.		
5-19	Pg. 5-23	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>AICUZ Standards: AICUZ Map</u></p> <p>Discussion of the AICUZ standards would be aided by including the AICUZ map and the listing of compatible land uses or at least discussing the se items and indicating where they are available and why they are not included in the JLUS document. Will MHAFB be posting the AICUZ map on its website?</p>	GIS	Revised figure to be provided for public draft.
5-20	Pg. 5-25	Bill Richey	<p><u>Avigation Easements, Current Status</u></p> <p>It is confusing to me how you relate military to police, police powers? Is this statement in conflict with "Posse Comitatus" might buy a military base falling under "other?? Definitely need to get Attorney General's interpretation....</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-21	Pg. 5-26	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 11</u></p> <p>Recommend cross reference with Strategy #59, plus add box for "other" and or State of Idaho under Responsible Entity area and annotate Attorney General at bottom, also add GF to the Focus Area</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-22	Pg. 5-32	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 24</u></p> <p>Recommend defining "Noise Impact Area" The discussion implies that certain areas needs sound attenuation and is therefore in the Noise Impact Area. The ETI EIS Table4-2-3, using noise modeling, shows that the only areas exceeding 65 Ldnmr in the MHRC is at the area of concentration flight entering Saylor Creek Range.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-23	Pg. 5-32	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 25</u></p> <p>Need to blend in MHAFB in discussion of future mission or build an entire new Strategy addressing that.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-24	Pg. 5-33	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Strategies 26, 27 and 28: Sound Attenuation/Noise and Vibration – Tank Trail</u></p> <p>Is there a noise contour map for the Tank Trail? Will one be developed? When? How about a vibration study? It would be appropriate, as a base line, to have the Idaho National Guard and/or Ada County develop such base line studies.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			Then, as development occurs, specific analysis can be done with regard to each development proposal; each can be required to provide acoustic and vibration study.		
5-25	Pg. 5-36	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Strategies 35 and 36: Road Corridors/Access Points</u></p> <p>Include in these strategies references to the Lake Hazel extension as well.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-26	Pg. 5-37	Bill Richey	<p><u>Paragraph 2 Current Status</u></p> <p>Revise wording MHAFB and the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes have on going Government to Government Consultation requirement. (Recommend getting wording from MHAFB)</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-27	Pg. 37-43	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Communications/Coordination: Military to Local/State/Other Agencies</u></p> <p>Clear strategies/discussion needs to be added regarding the communications and coordination from the military to the local jurisdictions and state agencies. The majority of this section emphasizes what appears to be a one-way communication from “civilian to military” if you will. While it is clearly understood that matters of national security come into play at times, the communication/coordination recommendations for the military side of the equation should be clearly states.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-28	Pg. 5-41	Bill Richey	<p>Clearing House Responsible Entity State of Idaho. Recommend adding note stating where/who is maintaining the JLUS Clearing House.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-29	Pg. 5-43	Idaho Department of Lands	<p><u>Strategy 51: BLM and State Trust Lands</u></p> <p>Correct reference as noted in Comment 11. The strategy needs to be expanded or another strategy added to include the Gowen/OTA side of the JLUS. Since State Trust Lands and BLM managed lands make up a substantial portion of the area affected by the JLUS, both focus areas need to be addressed.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-30	Pg. 5-44	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 54</u></p> <p>Elmore County? Chart only shows Mountain Home but verbiage talks MHAFB and “GF” Need to add box for Idaho National Guard under Responsible Entity</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-31	Pg. 5-46	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 55</u></p>	Providing a direct page	Revise text,“

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			<p>expand explanation of where goals and policies can be found i.e. Revised wording—"Goals and Policies found in the "General" Section starting on page 47."</p>	<p>reference at this juncture is not recommended given the changes to be implemented and repagination to occur.</p>	<p>Update Comprehensive Plans with the Compatibility Policy Set The goals and policies contained on the following pages following this table are proposed for inclusion into each county/city comprehensive plan. These changes provide a complete policy package for compatibility planning and provide a policy basis for many of the other strategies contained in this JLUS</p>
5-32	Pg. 5-46	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 56</u> Recommend adding boxes for both GF and MHAFB in the Responsible Entity area. The box shows their part in providing noise data. ADD to bottom of explanation "As part of their effort Gowen Field and MHAFB will provide updated noise data as their mission or number or type of weapon systems changes." (This would be consistent with Strategy 57.)</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-33	Pg. 5-48	Bill Richey	<p><u>Goal MIL-2</u> Sentence reads unclear, Recommend changing should to "to" "Goal Mil-2 To provide opportunities for the [county/city], military installations, residents, industry and agencies to collaboratively participate in all phases....."</p>		Change made.
5-34	Pg. 5-50	Bill Richey	<p>Mitigating Compatibility Issues –Goal MIL 3 Policy: Avigation Easement Recommend changing the scope of this goal to have Avigation Easements <u>as required in the MIA</u> supporting the military installations or airport supporting military flight missions.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-35	Pg. 5-50	Bill Richey	<p><u>Policy Vertical Obstruction</u> Recommend addition "All new development and substantial redevelopments in the county/city shall conform to FAA Part 77 height limits and developed to not interfere with military flight operations.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-36	Pg. 5-50	Bill Richey	<p>Mitigating Compatibility Issues -- Goal Mil 3 Policy: Vertical Obstruction All new developments or substantial redevelopments in the [county/city] shall conform to FAA Part 77 height limits. I would recommend that wording be added to the Policy:</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			<p>Vertical Obstruction, to further protect Military flight operations and issue proper communication/coordination.... Such as: ... and furthermore be developed to be compatible with the mission of the military base or operations in the [county/city]. <u>Or:</u> ...and furthermore be developed to not pose a safety hazard to the military operations in the [county/city]. <u>Or:</u> ... and coordinate with the MHAFB/Id National Guard to insure compatibility of the height of the structure with military flight operations.</p> <p>Something broad that insure that everyone agrees that the restrictions might be more stringent than FAA Part 77</p>		
5-37	Pg. 5-52	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 59 and Strategy 60</u></p> <p>Recommend adding cross reference of the strategies they refer to. Strategy 59 Add "_____ " Strategy 60 Add "See Strategy 11 Avigation Easement"</p>		Revisions to be made for the public draft.
5-38	Pg. 5-52	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 59</u></p> <p>Recommend adding Gowen Field to the Focus area. Place a "GF" in the focus area column. The legislation will affect both focus areas.</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-39	Pg. 5-54	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 63</u></p> <p>The wording says "Seek Military input.... " Recommend adding a Responsible Entity box for "all" Jurisdictions should be marked since they have the action to "seek".</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.
5-40	Pg. 5-69	Bill Richey	<p><u>Strategy 69 Ensure FAA Part 77 Compliance</u></p> <p>Recommend adding the following to the title (and compatible height limitations to guarantee safe military flight operation.) Add wording to paragraph-- For all new.....transmission generation towers, etc.). In addition, insure the developments and structures are compatible and do not pose a safety hazard to Military Flight Operations. See Strategy 38 and 63. Note: for further information on part 77.....</p> <p>As a minimum cross reference with Strategy 38 and 63 that is</p>		To be discussed at the next committee meeting.

ID #	JLUS Document Location	Name	Concerns/Comments	Possible Response(s)	Action Taken
			discussing Strategy for communication and coordination...		