

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Beauchamp, Arthur, CIV, WSO-BRAC [Arthur.Beauchamp@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2005 9:48 AM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: Dyess MOAs & MTRs
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Bob,

Your point is a good one. We focus or include only those ranges and airspace that is officially by both the Air Force and FAA. The Pyote ATCAA is a work in progress. Art

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune) [mailto:Bob_Taylor@thune.senate.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2005 6:58 PM
To: Arthur.Beauchamp@wso.whs.mil
Subject: Dyess MOAs & MTRs

Art, beyond the Melrose question I asked earlier and regarding those maps you were given at Dyess, and their claim of ownership over those identified MOAs and MTRs, it is my understanding that some of these may be old training areas no longer in use, some for many years, e.g. Valentine MOA on the map. In other words, how many of these are active, approved by the FAA, have an EIS and are actually in use now?

Have you asked the Air Force to tell the BRAC what the SCHEDULED USE and what the ACTUAL USE is for each of these claimed MOAs/MTRs?

I.E., Dyess should not be claiming old airspace or airspace seldom used in their DoD scoring of ranges. Apparently special use air space that has been previously approved by the FAA will apparently require an audit by the FAA if actual use falls below a certain percentage of scheduled use; e.g. the approval becomes invalid. Some of these old MOA/MTRs may have seen little recent use and should therefore not be claimed as an Dyess asset when, in effect, they may have to go through approval process again from scratch.

Finally, I note in these maps that Dyess is claiming under development ATCAA bridges with the Lancer MOA allowing high altitude flight between the different MOAs; Pyote apparently one of these. Has the Air Force demonstrated to your satisfaction that there is the FAA approval for these bridges? EIS?

7/20/2006