

Carol L. Boden
133 Sparrow Hawk Mountain Road
Bethel, Maine 04217
207.381.1120

February 3, 2010
VIA EMAIL

Elected Official

RE: FAA/Massachusetts Air National Guard EIS Proposed Modification of CONDOR 1 & 2 MOA

Dear Elected Official:

In the interest of time and as a direct reflection of the importance of the issue, I am writing today on the above-referenced topic to respectfully reiterate, vehemently and succinctly, my request made to the Congressional Delegation office in October 2009. The reasons for today's reiteration follow.

In my October letter, multiple shortcomings and omissions by the Massachusetts Air National Guard in its Environmental Assessment (EA) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) processes and work products were detailed. These shortcomings and omissions effectively **OBSTRUCT INFORMED REASONING AND DECISION-MAKING** on the proposed modification to the CONDOR 1 & 2 MOA. The deficiencies were apparent to subject matter experts and lay people alike.

- Most importantly, the proposed action lacks true justification with regard to the **underlying NEED of the Massachusetts Air National Guard that can only be met by the proposed CONDOR MOA modification in Maine**. ALTERNATIVES to the proposed change were also not adequately explored. *Examples include the use of 'state of the art' technology to lessen or obviate the need for wasteful, polluting and pursuit-of-happiness-inhibiting 'old style' fighter training methods over Maine's citizens, visitors, animals, mountains, forests and countryside.*
- Inadequate scope throughout entire process beginning with the Environmental Assessment resulted in incomplete and misleading documentation.
 - **Input from key stakeholders was either not obtained or was not included in any published documentation.** *Incredibly, input from the Penobscot Nation, local representatives of key business/economic drivers, livestock operations and private pilots in affected communities is absent, as examples.*
 - **Inventory of aircraft types** the military plans to use in the CONDOR MOA is **incomplete**. One example is the F-35. It is now common knowledge the military plans to base this aircraft in Vermont. The Vermont Air National Guard is a primary user of the CONDOR MOA, and the Air Force presumably plans more than three years in advance, yet there is **no mention of the F-35 in EA or DEIS documentation.** *What other aircraft, crewed or uncrewed, might be missing from this list? The corresponding required sound/noise data is also inadequate* even for the aircraft listed in the inventory.

For the above key reasons as well as others detailed in previous correspondence to your office, I am reiterating my request made in October 2009: **Please initiate and support efforts to compel the sponsoring organizations to withdraw the currently proposed CONDOR Modification and EIS.**

Should the proposed CONDOR modification and EIS not be withdrawn, I am requesting the Maine Congressional Delegation convene a Public Hearing in Augusta, Maine at which the FAA, Massachusetts Air National Guard, EIS preparers and contributing subject matter experts will defend to the delegation and to Maine constituents, while under oath, the EIS and all information contained therein.

Sincerely,



Carol L. Boden