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What is the TMPC?

Texas Military Preparedness Commission

- Thirteen Commissioners are appointed by the Governor and are staffed by TMPC in Austin.

- Mission: To preserve and expand Texas’ military installations and their missions and assist communities that have been impacted by a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) action.
Military Installations in Texas

Map showing various military installations in Texas, including:
- Fort Bliss
- Sheppard AFB
- Dyess AFB
- Goodfellow AFB
- Fort Worth JRB
- Fort Hood
- Lackland AFB
- Naval Station Ingleside
- Lackland AFB
- Fort Sam Houston
- Randolph AFB
- Brooks City Base
- Kingsville NAS
- Ellington Field
- Red River Army Depot
- Lone Star Ammo Plant

Legend:
- • Slated for closure
- ● Active
Economic Impact of Military Operations

2005 Statewide Impact in Texas

- Department of Defense military expenditures in Texas in 2005 were $31.8 billion
- Associated economic impact of $75 billion
Texas Military Preparedness Commission

For More Information:

Rachel Wiggins, E.I.T.
rwiggins@nctcog.org
(817) 704-2502

www.governor.state.tx.us/divisions/tmpc
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What is the study area for the Joint Land Use Study surrounding NAS JRB?

Based on 65 db DNL (Day Night Average Sound Level)

The average sound level exposure over a 24-hour period with a 10 decibel penalty for noise events occurring between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.
What Is The JLUS?
Joint Land Use Study

Sponsored by the Department of Defense’s Office of Economic Adjustment.

Cooperative land use planning effort between military installations and the surrounding communities.

Promotes growth that supports military training and operational missions.
## Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)

### Cost of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOD OEA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consultant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 232,995</td>
<td>$ 229,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COG Cash</strong></td>
<td><strong>COG Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td>$ 12,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Kind</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 16,888</td>
<td>$ 16,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 258,883</td>
<td>$ 258,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Why is NAS JRB Important?

**Today’s Economic Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed Martin Payroll</td>
<td>$1.2 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS JRB Payroll</td>
<td>$220 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS JRB Operational Budget</td>
<td>$225 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS JRB Construction</td>
<td>$30 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Economic Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.2 Billion</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Is Conducting the JLUS?
Local Governments via a Policy Committee

JLUS Policy Committee
- Public Meetings
- Briefings to Elected Officials and other stakeholders
- Approval of Study Conclusions and Recommendations

Local Government
- Independent action to implement Study recommendations
- Independent action to change zoning, land use, or building code
- Varies by local government
# Joint Land Use Study

## Work to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navy nominated base for Joint Land Use Study Program</td>
<td>Summer 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD selected NAS JRB Fort Worth for the JLUS Program</td>
<td>Winter 2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy personnel worked with local communities to identify sponsor and submit application for funds to DOD</td>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Committee convened</td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant acquired, contract signed</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First public meeting conducted</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint Land Use Study
Schedule of Consultant Events

Consultant Tour of NAS JRB June 2007
Consultant Meeting – Builders/Realtors June 2007
Consultant Meeting – Base Officials July 2007
Policy Committee Approval of Recommendations for City Council Meetings August 2007
City Council Meetings Sept. 2007
Policy Committee Approval of Final Report October 2007
Possible Recommendations for Compatible Land Use

- Modify installation operations, if practical.
- Revise community comprehensive land use plans.
- Revise community zoning and development regulations.
- Limit development intensity within noise and aircraft approach/departure zones.
- Modify building codes - sound attenuation.
- Implement use of real estate disclosure statements.
Possible Implementation Measures

- Comprehensive Rezoning (By area)
- Overlay District Zoning
- Planned Unit Development (PUD)
- Subdivision Regulations
- Transfer of Development Right (TDR)
- Land Acquisitions (Purchase/lease)
- Easements
  - Aviation/Navigation/Avigation
  - Conservation
Joint Land Use Study

For More Information:

Mike Sims, A.I.C.P.
msims@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9226

or

Rachel Wiggins, E.I.T.
rwiggins@nctcog.org
(817) 704-2502

www.nctcog.org/jlus
Land for People Mission

The Trust for Public Land conserves land for people to enjoy as parks, gardens, and other natural places, ensuring livable communities for generations to come.
About TPL

- Provide complete suite of conservation services – planning, finance, transactions, site design & development.
- Work with private and public sectors.
- Span full range of landscapes.
- Offer local and national expertise.
TPL Conservation Accomplishments

- 3,300+ Projects
- 2.2 Million Acres
- $4.6 Billion
Conservation Vision
Setting Priorities

TPL helps agencies and communities define conservation priorities, identify lands to be protected, and plan networks of conserved land that meet public need.
Conservation Vision Process

- Constituency Building
- Greenprinting (GIS)
- Conservation Finance
- Action Planning
Step 1: Constituency Building

• Focused on implementation.
• Identifies key stakeholders’ interests and support for land conservation
• Success at all scales, from small towns, to large counties or multi-county initiatives.
Step 1: Constituency Building

Outcomes

• Clear understanding of community’s conservation goals.
• Political mandate to implement those goals, including support for a public finance measure.
• Strong partnerships for successful implementation of conservation strategies.
Conservation Vision Process

Constituency Building → Greenprinting (GIS)

Step 1: Identify key stakeholders’ interests and support for land conservation

Step 2: Use stakeholder values to devise land protection priorities with broad support.
Step 2: Greenprinting/GIS

Greenprinting uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to make informed, strategic decisions about land conservation and park creation priorities.
Step 2: Greenprinting Model

- Transparent and easy to understand.
- Engages community in defining and weighing priorities.
- Reflects community’s vision and unique resources.
- Provides a decision support tool, not just a mapping exercise.
Greenprinting Model

Five steps

1. Identify local goals and assemble data.
2. Translate data into a “priorities map” for each conservation goal....
Greenprinting Model (cont.)

2. Priority maps are expressed in terms of conservation value ranging from low to high across the region (yellow to red)
Greenprinting Model

3. Assign relative weightings that reflect community or regional priorities.

4. Create alternative scenarios by adding additional criteria or modifying relative importance of existing criteria.

5. Combine the building blocks into a composite conservation priority map.
Greenprinting Results

Travis County, TX Greenprint Overall Conservation Priorities

This map shows the Travis County, TX Greenprint and the overall conservation priorities. Areas in orange have a moderate conservation priority and areas in dark red have a high conservation priority.

Legend
- Travis County Boundary
- Parks and open space
- Hesedale Bend
- Belkore Canyons Reserves
- Refuge Trust Boundaries
- Water Quality Protection Lands
- Waterways
- Developed Lands
- All Others
- Resource Extraction

Overall Priorities
- Outdoor
- Moleular
- Transportation
- Infrastructure
- Major Road
- TX Corridor

Overall Priorities - Criteria Class Weightings
- Water Quality and Quantity: 25%
- Recreational Opportunities: 25%
- Sensitive and Rare Environmental Features: 25%
- Cultural Resources: 25%

Special thanks to the following data providers:
City of Travis, Travis County, University of Texas at Austin, Texas Parks and Wildlife, Texas Historical Commission, CAPCO, 2003
Map created by Christian Smith for The Trust for Public Land on May 17, 2003

Travis County Greenprint
The Trust for Public Land

Information on this map is provided for purposes of discussion and visualization only.

© Copyright 2004 The Trust for Public Land
Greenprinting Results

- Color-coded overview maps
- Parcel prioritization maps
Greenprinting Results

- Color-coded overview maps
- Parcel prioritization maps
- Strategic analysis reports
Greenprinting Results (cont.)

Model Investigator

- High priority parcel analysis tool.
- Shows how well a parcel scored in meeting community’s conservation goals.
Conservation Finance

Constituency Building

Step 1: Identify key stakeholders’ interests and support for land conservation

Greenprinting (GIS)

Step 2: Use stakeholder values to devise land protection priorities with broad support.

Conservation Finance

Step 3: Devise local, state and federal funding ‘quilt’ to secure priorities.
Conservation Finance
Securing Funds

TPL helps agencies and communities identify and raise funds for conservation from federal, state, local, and philanthropic sources. TPL’s Conservation Finance team advises governments on conservation funding and helps to design, pass and implement measures that dedicate new public funds for parks and land conservation.
Conservation Finance

- **Research**: analyze existing funds at local, state, federal level.
- **Technical assistance**: create new funding for conservation.
  - Feasibility research
  - Public opinion surveys
  - Ballot measure design
  - Legislative support
# Conservation Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TPL Measures</th>
<th>Wins</th>
<th>Conservation Funds Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$0.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$0.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$4.1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$0.9 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$3.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$0.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$5.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$0.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$2.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$0.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>$19.6 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

294 = 84% success rate

$19.6 billion
**Action Planning**

1. **Constituency Building**: Identify key stakeholders’ interests and support for land conservation.

2. **Greenprinting (GIS)**: Use stakeholder values to devise land protection priorities with broad support.

3. **Conservation Finance**: Devise local, state and federal funding ‘quilt’ to secure priorities.

4. **Action Planning**: Devise short term action steps to secure and finance acquisition priorities.
Action Plan

We deliver concrete plans that:

- Create both short-term success and a long-term conservation strategy.
- Are realistic, cost-effective, and implementable.
- Are politically and publicly supported.
- Accomplish multiple conservation objectives.
Southeastern Subregion

Southern Dallas County
Ellis County
Kaufman County
Southeastern Subregion

Southern Dallas County

Ellis County

Kaufman County

Vision North Texas
Understanding Our Options for Growth
THANK YOU
Encroachment Pressures
A Two-Way Street

Light Pollution
Cultural Interests on Military Lands
Radio Frequency Needs
Wilderness Designations
Commercial Development
Population Encroachment
Maritime Needs
Air Quality
Noise Generation & Abatement
Commercial Airspace
Endangered Species and Provision of Wildlife Habitat
Alternative Energy Sources
Need for Water
Munitions Constituents
Mission Realignment & Consolidation
Military Airspace
Dust & Smoke
Noise Generation & Abatement
Reduced Flexibility for the Military and the Community
Encroachment Pressures
Urban Sprawl Impacts Mission Capability

Great Smoky Mountains National Park

Ft. Bragg, North Carolina
Encroachment Pressures

- Endangered species and habitat
- Urbanization and land development
- Noise, smoke and dust
- Frequency allocation
Encroachment Pressures

Urban Encroachment Results in Habitat Loss

Urban Encroachment
Incompatible land use and conflicts over noise, dust, training activity

Habitat Loss
Army lands increasingly carry conservation responsibilities for surrounding areas

Result: Restrictions on type, timing, and location of training activities that can compromise military readiness
Encroachment Pressures
Compatible Use Buffering Authorities

10 USC, Chapter 159, Section 2684a

Department of Defense may partner with conservation groups

Mechanism for funding the transfer outside of traditional contracting
Encroachment Partnering

Initial Steps

- Initial Interest
  - Installation
  - NGO
  - Local/State Govt.

- Key Stakeholders
  - State Agencies
  - Local Government
  - Local Land Trust(s)
  - Business Community
  - Developers
  - Landowners

- Communicate & Educate
  - Congressional Meetings
  - Local Government Meetings
  - State Agency Meetings

- Seek Small Commitments
  - NJ Guard MTR Data
  - TNC/Rutgers GIS Support

- Incorporate in JLUS Process?
- Pursue formal partnerships?
Encroachment Partnering
Community Based Approach

• Partnerships
  – Diversified funding
  – Distributed risk
  – Address fears & suspicions
  – Longer term viability

• Stakeholder Empowerment
  – Greater potential for future funding
  – Reduce potential for political backlash
  – Ensure community control
  – Reconcile DOD needs with economic development desires
Encroachment Partnering Examples
Army Compatible Use Buffering (ACUB) Program

- Reduces or eliminates military training and testing restrictions
- Decreases neighbor conflicts over military activities
- Assists communities with local and regional planning objectives
- Supports conservation objectives for open space and species habitat

...Allows soldiers to train as we fight
Encroachment Partnering Examples

ACUB Benefits

- Army realizes greater training flexibility and reduced encroachment
- Partner gets financial support for land conservation, including endangered species and habitat protection, and other conservation uses
- Landowners receive financial benefit, can retain ownership, and contribute to conservation
- Installation can influence development patterns and trends outside of installation boundaries
Encroachment Partnering Examples

ACUB Details

• Projects identified locally, reviewed for approval up through HQDA

• Three-part process:
  – Proposal approval (evaluated for benefit to training)
  – Priority (according to strategic training importance and ability to affect encroachment)
  – Funding (dependent on priority, partner participation, level of cost-sharing and cooperation with other Services)

• Cooperating partner and willing seller are essential to success
Encroachment Partnering Examples
February 2006 ACUB Status

Approved ACUB Proposals

Pending ACUB Proposals

February 2006
Encroachment Partnering Examples
New Jersey Example

Multiple Issues
- Warren Grove Range safety issues
- Statewide MTR issues
- Multi-base development issues

Multiple Opportunities
- Multi-base JLUS
- An educated public and political environment
- Leveraging state conservation funds
- Existing networks of natural and recreational resources

Multiple Partners
- Rutgers University
- NJ Air National Guard
- NJ Green Acres Program
- NJ Conservation Foundation
- Nature Conservancy
- NJ Pinelands Commission
- Local Land Trusts – as needed
- Local Government – per installation
- Military Services – per Policy/installation
Encroachment Partnering Examples
Texas Examples

- **Ft. Bliss, Texas** (Underway)
  - Partners
    - Ft. Bliss
    - Frontera Land Alliance
    - City of El Paso
  - Multiple encroachment issues
  - Potential Castner Range reuse

- **NAS Corpus Christi** (Underway)
  - Partners
    - NAS Corpus Christi
    - Navy Region South
    - Coastal Bend Land Trust
    - Conservation Fund
  - APZ 1, Security, and other concerns
  - Regional Parks and Conservation Planning Effort
Encroachment Partnering Examples
Fort Sill, Oklahoma Example

Project Components

• Boundaries, priorities established by Fort Sill
• Priorities based upon development pressures, location of firing points
• 20,000 acres targeted
• Mostly productive ranch lands
• School Land Commission is the largest single landowner
• $22 million estimated total cost
• Steering committee established to help guide the project and assist with fundraising
Proposed Buffers

Section 1: 3,200 acres, approx. $2,000/acre for easement
Section 2: 2,560 acres, approx. $2,000/acre for easement
Section 3: 1,280 acres, approx. $1,000/acre for easement
Section 4: 7,040 acres, approx. $500/acre for easement
Section 5: 4,480 acres, approx. $500/acre for easement
Section 6: 3,840 acres, approx. $800/acre for easement
TOTAL estimated cost: $21.64 million

Acquire 1 mile strip along west boundary
Acquire area bounded by interstate and our borders
Acquire area ½ mile wide along northeast corner to buffer Elgin growth.
Acquire area 1 mile wide entire east border.
Acquire strip from Hiway 62 to post border running from 82nd st west to west boundary
Acquire 1 mile deep strip running from 45th street to east boundary.
Encroachment Partnering Examples
Fort Sill, Oklahoma Example

Progress to Date

• 650 Acres in 4 Transactions
• $1.866 million

Funding Sources

• USDA Farm and Ranchland Protection Program - $750,000
• State of Oklahoma - $250,000
• Local Government - $150,000
• Department of Defense - FY06 $1 million
Encroachment Partnering

Lessons Learned

- Landowners’ concerns, confusion
- Public support
- Landowners’ expectations
- Department of Defense (DOD) bureaucracy
- Cost share funding
- Up-front expenses (due diligence)

- 1-on-1 meetings, public outreach/press
- Steering committee
- “Hand-holding,” public meetings
- U.S. Department of the Interior assistance
- Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program, local funds
- State grant for direct, due diligence costs
Encroachment Partners
Potential Partner Example #1

IF

Area with high concentration of single family in noncompliant noise/safety zones

AND

Single family in the zone has a high concentration of rental property, code violations, and tax delinquent property

AND

Area has good or potentially good frontage roadway access

AND

DOD has goal of decreasing incompatible buffer land uses

AND

Local governments have the goal of transitioning to employment-related land uses

THEN

Encroachment partnering project to voluntarily acquire parcels, assemble, and re-plat for a compatible employment related land use
Encroachment Partners
Potential Partner Example #2

IF

Area with high concentration of single family in noncompliant noise/safety zones

AND

Single family in the zone has a high concentration of rental property, code violations, and tax delinquent property

AND

Area is adjacent or nearby to natural or park resources

AND

DOD has goal of decreasing incompatible buffer land uses

AND

Local governments and/or conservation partner have a goal of transitioning to park or natural resource areas

THEN

Encroachment partnering project to voluntarily acquire parcels, assemble, and re-plat for a compatible park or natural resource uses
Military Encroachment Partnering Examples

For More Information:

Mike Sims, A.I.C.P.
msims@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9226

www.nctcog.org/jlus