Sheppard Air Force Base T-7A Recapitalization Draft EIS
Pre-recorded Presentation Script

Slide 1: **Introduction**

Hello and welcome! This recording presents the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or Draft EIS, for T-7A Recapitalization at Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas. Over the next 30 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 in the summer of 2024 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 that process.

The Air Force is preparing an EIS for T-7A Recapitalization at Sheppard 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 the EIS will be considered before the Air Force decides whether to implement this proposal.

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

Sheppard Air Force Base is home to the 80th Flying Training Wing of the Air Force's Air Education and Training Command, or AETC. The 80th Flying Training Wing conducts the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program, which trains combat pilots for 14 NATO partners. The element of that mission relevant to this project is pilot training using the T-38C "Talon" aircraft.

T-38C aircraft have been in use for Air Force pilot training for about 50 years, and in that time, the capabilities, performance, and use of Air Force aircraft have seen multiple generational advancements. As a result, 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, Vance, and Sheppard 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 Sheppard AFB Fifth?**

The Acting Secretary of the Air Force selected Sheppard Air Force Base to be the fifth installation to undergo T-7A recapitalization. Basing the T-7A aircraft at Sheppard Air Force Base fifth 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, Laughlin, and Vance Air Force Bases are the first, second, third, and fourth installations in the T-7A recapitalization sequence.

Slide 6: **Project Location**

The focus of this EIS is recapitalization at Sheppard Air Force Base. Separate NEPA analysis has already been completed for Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph and Columbus and Laughlin Air Force Bases. A separate EIS addressing recapitalization at Vance Air Force Base is currently in development, with completion anticipated in 2026.

Sheppard Air Force Base is in northern Texas, in the northern portion of the city of Wichita Falls within Wichita County. The T-7A aircraft would be operated in existing training airspace, which is composed of several military operations areas and military training routes in northern Texas and southern Oklahoma. T-7A operations would also be performed at the Falcon Range Restricted Area, which is associated with Fort Sill and located northwest of Lawton, Oklahoma.

Slide 7: **Purpose & Need**

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to continue the T-7A strategic basing initiative by recapitalizing Sheppard 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 Sheppard 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 explain the Sheppard Air Force Base T-7A recapitalization program in detail and discuss the alternatives under consideration.

In simple terms, recapitalization at Sheppard Air Force Base entails the following elements:

- Replacement of all 131 T-38C aircraft assigned to Sheppard 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 Sheppard Air Force Base region because the installation would be training pilots with and maintaining two types of aircraft from 2034 through 2036.
- And, construction of and upgrade to operations, support, and maintenance facilities to support pilot training and aircraft operations and maintenance.

Regarding the construction element, the Air Force is proposing 16 small to medium-scale construction or renovation projects on Sheppard Air Force Base to provide modern facilities and infrastructure. These projects could involve constructing a new ground-based training system facility, maintenance hangar with unit maintenance training facility, and hush house; replacing aircraft shelters; and building an addition onto an existing facility. The flightline ramp could be expanded and potentially include new jet blast deflectors, mooring points, and anchor rods. The interior of the squadron operations building, a warehouse, and at least one hangar could be renovated. Other potential construction projects could include repairs to the compass rose and trim pad, constructing a concrete pad for ejection seat explosive component storage, and expanding the existing hammerhead paved area.

In total, the proposed construction projects would disturb up to 3.8 acres and occur under all three action alternatives. The construction projects are expected to begin in 2031 and 2032 and be complete prior to the

arrival of the first T-7A aircraft in 2034. The exact construction projects selected for implementation and their timetable for execution will depend on funding levels and priorities in the overall T-7A program.

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 108 T-7A aircraft and entail operations at a level sustaining pilot training. Alternative 2 would provide the same number of T-7A aircraft and entail operations at a level 25 percent greater than Alternative 1. And, Alternative 3 would provide up to 131 T-7A aircraft and entail operations at a level approximately 21 percent greater than Alternative 1. The following slides will provide additional 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 178,700 annual operations at Sheppard Air Force Base, which equates to a little more than 1,350 annual operations for each of the 131 T-38C aircraft assigned to the installation.

Slide 10: **Alternative 1**

Alternative 1 addresses the Air Force’s anticipated training needs. Up to 108 T-7A aircraft would be delivered to Sheppard Air Force Base beginning in 2034 and continuing through 2036. These aircraft would replace all 131 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 2034 and be complete by the end of 2036.

T-7A operations would begin in 2034 and increase to steady state in 2037. 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 2037 and later would be approximately 31,400 less than current T-38C operations because 23 fewer aircraft would be assigned to the installation. T-38C operations would begin to decrease in 2034 and conclude by the end of 2036.

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, Sheppard Air Force Base would receive 108 T-7A aircraft with aircraft arriving beginning in 2034. T-38C withdrawal would be complete by the end of 2036, T-7A operations would increase to steady state by 2037, and T-38C operations would conclude by the end of 2036.

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 184,100, which would be about 5,400 greater than current T-38C operations.

Slide 12: **Alternative 3**

Alternative 3 is intended to provide the Air Force with operational flexibility so that a total of 131 T-7A aircraft can be assigned to Sheppard Air Force Base, if needed. T-7A aircraft would begin being delivered to Sheppard Air Force Base beginning in 2034 with all deliveries complete by the end of 2037. T-7A operations would increase to steady state by 2037, and T-38C operations would conclude by the end of 2036.

On a per aircraft basis, the T-7A would perform the same number of operations as the current T-38C. And, because 131 T-7A aircraft is equal to the current number of T-38C aircraft, the total annual operations would not change from the current level, which is 178,700. Compared to the other action alternatives, T-7A operations would be approximately 21 percent greater than Alternative 1 and approximately 3 percent less than Alternative 2.

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 Sheppard 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 Sheppard 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 Sheppard 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 Sheppard Air Force Base at an undetermined installation.

Slide 14: **Alternatives Comparison**

Summarized here is the information we just presented with a comparison of the three action alternatives to each other as well as to current conditions.

As a reminder, there are currently 131 T-38C aircraft assigned to Sheppard Air Force Base, and annual T-38C operations in 2023 totaled approximately 178,700. 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 108 T-7A aircraft, which is 23 fewer aircraft than the current number of T-38Cs. Alternatives 1 and 2 propose approximately 147,300 and 184,100 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 131 T-7A aircraft with operations totaling approximately 178,700. The operational tempo would be identical to existing conditions and Alternative 1, but the total number of operations would be greater than Alternative 1 because there would be 23 additional aircraft assigned to Sheppard 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, along with the No Action Alternative. The Draft EIS is organized into 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 Waste, Safety, and Water Resources. Other resource subjects were also considered but determined not to have a potential for significant impacts. These do not warrant detailed analysis in the Draft EIS and include Airspace, Geological Resources, Infrastructure and Transportation, and Socioeconomics.

The following slides 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 occur in 2031 and 2032 from the use of heavy equipment. Operational air emissions would begin in 2033 and include those produced from heating new building space and new aircraft operations.

The Draft EIS contains the estimated annual air emissions of volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, lead, and greenhouse gases resulting from the three action alternatives. These estimates are "net," which means they include increased emissions from construction, temporary personnel additions, heating new buildings, and introduction of T-7A operations as well as decreased emissions from ending T-38C operations. Separate emissions estimates were developed for the Sheppard AFB region, the special use airspace region as a whole, and one military training route that crosses a region near Dallas-Fort Worth that is subject to stricter General Conformity air quality regulations.

All three action alternatives would increase annual emissions of volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, and greenhouse gases. The increased emissions would represent an adverse impact but would not represent a significant impact because of the already good air quality of the region and effective dispersion of air pollutants when emitted at high altitudes. The increased air emissions are not expected to contribute to an exceedance of any air quality standards, including the General Conformity *de minimis* level thresholds applicable to nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compound emissions within the Dallas-Fort Worth region. All three action alternatives would decrease net annual emissions of carbon monoxide and particulate matter in the long-term.

Slide 17: **Noise and Land Use**

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 in identifying noise and land use impacts. In general, aircraft noise above 65 decibels DNL is considered incompatible with residential land use.

The Air Force calculated the DNL levels for current, or No Action, conditions and for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, and plotted the 65, 70, 75, and 80 decibel DNL contour lines for each. The acreage and population within the 65 decibel DNL noise zones for each alternative would increase from current conditions, with Alternative 2 encompassing the largest area and greatest population of the three action alternatives. The modeled noise zones and calculated changes in acreage and population for each alternative are provided in the EIS and shown on the next few slides.

Slide 18: **Noise and Land Use (continued)**

For Sheppard Air Force Base and the surrounding region, the acreage and population within the 65-decibel-or-greater DNL noise zones for each alternative are summarized here. The 65-decibel-or-greater DNL noise

zone for current conditions, or No Action, encompasses an area of approximately 7,478 acres, including both on- and off-installation properties. By comparison, Alternative 1 would encompass 9,309 acres, Alternative 2 would encompass 10,468 acres, and Alternative 3 would encompass 10,308 acres.

The population within the 65-decibel-or-greater DNL noise zone for current conditions, or No Action, is estimated to be approximately 413 people on-installation and 276 off-installation. By comparison, Alternative 1 would have an estimated population of 816 on-installation and 429 off-installation, Alternative 2 would have 1,888 on-installation and 588 off-installation, and Alternative 3 would have 1,661 on-installation and 571 off-installation. The modeled noise zones for each alternative at Sheppard Air Force Base are shown on the next three slides.

Slide 19: **Noise – No Action Conditions vs. Alternative 1**

Here are two maps. The map on the left shows the No Action noise zones, which represent current noise conditions. The map on the right shows the resultant noise zones for Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would result in a general expansion of each noise zone beyond those of the No Action Alternative.

The noise zones extend their farthest from Sheppard Air Force Base along the centerline for the main runways. In line with Runway 15C/33C, the northernmost extent of the Alternative 1 65-decibels-DNL noise zone would extend approximately a half mile farther to the northwest than the No Action Alternative 65-decibels DNL noise zone, ending approximately a quarter mile east of the intersection of Route 240 and Daniels Road. By comparison, the northernmost extent of the No Action Alternative 65-decibels-DNL noise zone is approximately a third of a mile east of the intersection of Route 240 and Farm Road 1177. In the opposite direction, the southernmost extent of the Alternative 1 65-decibels-DNL noise zone would extend approximately three-quarters mile farther to the southeast than the No Action Alternative 65-decibels DNL noise zone, ending just north of the intersection of Harding Street and Reynolds Lane. By comparison, the southernmost extent of the No Action Alternative 65-decibels-DNL noise zone is approximately the Wichita River.

Also, note the blue dots on both maps. Each dot denotes a noise-sensitive location, which include residential areas, schools, and places of worship where the population could possibly be sensitive to increased noise levels. The Draft EIS identifies each of these locations and contains a detailed noise analysis for each.

Slide 20: **Noise – No Action Conditions vs. Alternative 2**

Here, again, are two maps. The map on the left has not changed from the previous slide and shows the current condition, or No Action, noise zones. The map on the right shows the resultant noise zones for Alternative 2. Like Alternative 1, Alternative 2 also would result in a general expansion of the noise zones, covering a larger acreage and greater population than the No Action noise zones. Alternative 2 encompasses

the largest area and greatest population of the three action alternatives because it entails the most aircraft operations.

Along the centerline of Runway 15C/33C, the northernmost extent of the Alternative 2 65-decibels-DNL noise zone would extend almost 1 mile farther to the northwest than the No Action Alternative 65-decibels DNL noise zone, ending approximately a half mile northeast of the intersection of Route 240 and Daniels Road. In the opposite direction, the southernmost extent of the Alternative 2 65-decibels-DNL noise zone would extend almost one and a half miles farther to the southeast than the No Action Alternative 65-decibels DNL noise zone, ending immediately to the north of the intersection of Hampton Road and Stesco Avenue.

Slide 21: **Noise – No Action Conditions vs. Alternative 3**

Again, here are two maps. The map on the left has not changed from the previous two slides and shows the current condition, or No Action, noise zones. The map on the right shows the resultant noise zones for Alternative 3. Like the other action alternatives, the Alternative 3 noise zones are larger in acreage and affect a greater population than the No Action noise zones. Compared to the other action alternatives, the Alternative 3 noise zones are slightly smaller than those for Alternative 2 but larger than those for Alternative 1.

The northernmost and southernmost extents for the Alternative 3 65-decibels-DNL noise zone would be slightly closer to Sheppard Air Force Base than the corresponding extents for Alternative 2. Along the centerline of Runway 15C/33C, the northernmost extent of the Alternative 3 65-decibels-DNL noise zone would extend a little more than three quarters mile farther to the northwest than the No Action Alternative 65-decibels DNL noise zone, ending slightly less than a half mile northeast of the intersection of Route 240 and Daniels Road. In the opposite direction, the southernmost extent of the Alternative 3 65-decibels-DNL noise zone would extend approximately one and a third miles farther to the southeast than the No Action Alternative 65-decibels DNL noise zone, ending slightly to the north of the intersection of Hampton Road and Stesco Avenue.

Slide 22: **Noise and Land Use Compatibility**

As a reminder, aircraft noise above 65 decibels DNL is generally considered incompatible with residential land use. For all three action alternatives, the 65 decibel-or-greater DNL noise zones would be larger than the corresponding noise zones for current, or No Action, conditions, which would potentially expose additional acreage and population to incompatibility. The expansion of potentially incompatible areas would be an adverse impact, but it would not be considered a significant impact because most of the newly exposed area consists of open, recreation, agriculture, and low-density residential land uses. Other newly exposed areas include commercial, undeveloped, and agricultural land uses.

To mitigate noise impacts on residential land uses, the Air Force would update the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone, or AICUZ, study for Sheppard Air Force Base and potentially for Falcon Range to address any

increase of land area within the 65 decibel DNL or greater noise contour. The goal of the AICUZ study is to guide neighboring community development in a manner that protects the installation's flight capabilities as well as public health, safety, and welfare.

The Air Force also would continue to partner with state and local agencies on recommendations regarding compatible land use and potential encroachment concerns inside and outside of the DNL zones. Municipalities would be encouraged to promote the most compatible land use by updating local zoning ordinances and building construction standards.

Slide 23: **Noise and Land Use – Conclusions**

The Draft EIS contains a much more detailed analysis of noise and land use impacts than can be conveyed during this presentation. The potential for speech interference, classroom learning interference, sleep disturbance, hearing loss, and damage to structures at nearby locations were analyzed for each alternative in the Draft EIS. Additionally, the Draft EIS contains an analysis of noise and land use impacts from training within special use airspace, including a detailed analysis for the Falcon Range Restricted Area associated with Fort Sill.

To briefly summarize the overall finding of the noise and land use analysis, each action alternative would result in additional acreage and population potentially exposed to incompatible noise levels, when compared to current conditions, or taking no action, but the increase would not represent a significant impact because of the predominately open and low-density land uses within the newly exposed areas.

Slide 24: **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 nonnative vegetation, such as bermudagrass, for construction of new facilities. The planned facilities would be situated within highly urban areas or on existing impervious surfaces on Sheppard Air Force Base, minimizing the amount of vegetation removal. 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 also would not be significant for the same reasons.

Long-term impacts on wildlife from aircraft strikes 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 T-7A aircraft operations at Sheppard Air Force Base.

The three action alternatives would have no effect on special status species with potential to occur on Sheppard Air Force Base or with potential for flight at the same altitude as the proposed T-7A operations within the special use airspace. The Air Force consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on project-specific effects under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act by notifying the Arlington Ecological Services Field Office of the “no effect” finding.

Slide 25: **Cultural Resources**

No impacts on cultural resources would occur. The Air Force determined the buildings that would be modified under the Proposed Action lack the significance and integrity necessary for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Additionally, the projects requiring ground disturbance are not anticipated to encounter archaeological resources at Sheppard Air Force Base.

The Air Force consulted with the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer, or SHPO, 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. The Texas SHPO concurred with the Air Force’s finding of no effect on historic properties in early 2025. The consulted Native American tribes did not identify any resources of tribal interest and do not require further consultation unless cultural items are inadvertently discovered.

Slide 26: **Other Resources**

Other resource subjects that were analyzed in detail in the Draft EIS are hazardous materials and wastes, safety, and water resources. No significant impacts on hazardous materials and wastes and safety would occur from Alternatives 1, 2, or 3, and no mitigation measures would be required to minimize adverse impacts on these two resource subjects.

Water resources also would experience no significant impacts from Alternatives 1, 2, or 3, but mitigation measures would be necessary because most of the proposed construction would occur within a floodplain. The Air Force would implement “mitigation by design,” whereby new construction would be specifically designed to minimize floodplain impacts and flood damage. An example of a possible floodplain mitigation measure is designing the floor and flood-susceptible utilities of a proposed building to be at least 3 feet above the 100-year flood elevation. Specific floodplain mitigation measures would be developed for each facility proposed within a floodplain as design advances.

Further details on all resource subjects, including hazardous materials and wastes, safety, and water resources, are found in the Draft EIS.

Slide 27: **The EIS Timeline**

Now that you've heard the environmental consequences from T-7A recapitalization at Sheppard 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 December 19, 2025. At that time, the Draft EIS was published on the project website and a paper copy was placed on reserve at the Wichita Falls 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 February 2, 2026.

Slide 28: **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 2026 and will be used by Air Force deciding officials to determine whether or not to implement this proposal.

Slide 29: **Providing Comment**

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 https://sheppard.t-7anepadocuments.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 and envelope. For your comments to receive timely consideration in the Final EIS, please submit them by February 2, 2026.

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 30: **Thank You**

Thank you for your time and interest in the T-7A Recapitalization at Sheppard 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 Wichita Falls Public Library. Thank you for your time today.