

Beauchamp, Arthur, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune) [Bob_Taylor@thune.senate.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 9:55 AM
To: Beauchamp, Arthur, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Supplement to letter # 5789

Art, thanks. I appreciate it. You probably already intend to ask these but here are some questions you might ask:

-- because training requirements, threat analysis and technology changes over time doesn't the AF desire flexibility built into their ranges, MOAs and MTRs to allow them to adjust as necessary to different flying requirements, including altitude? Was this factored-in, if not why not? Isn't overall capability measured?

-- If a MOA or MTR has limitations put on its altitude floor or ceiling how did the Air Force measure the quality of that particular training area? Does it not effect the quality of training, if a commander would like his crews to run a training mission at 300 feet, but cannot.

-- Did the AF assess and score the quality of electronic scoring (e.g. the number and types of different simulator-emitters) on its MTRs?

-- If the AF has all these other MOAs and IRs available in Texas for the B-1s, why has it established and fought so hard since 1997 to obtain approval of the RBTI?

-- Why did senior AF officers swear under oath that the RBTI is vital to training earlier this year, yet the AF is implying to the BRAC commission now that it would not be constrained by limitations on the RBTI?

-- Does the AF assess numbers of sortie-operations into range, MOA use and availability? Does it measure limitations put on sortie-operations?

-- Does the AF distinguish between ranges having certain access without training limitations and ranges with a future of uncertainty as to access & training limitations?

-- Besides the RBTI, what is the nearest low-level MTR to Dyess that would "both" allow them to fly down to 300 feet AGL and have electronic scoring?

From: Beauchamp, Arthur, CIV, WSO-BRAC [mailto:Arthur.Beauchamp@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 9:23 AM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: Supplement to letter # 5789

Bob, tks for the information. I have a meeting this morning with the Air Force OPRs to discuss the degree to which quality was factored into the training ranges and IRs. If you have any specific questions let me know before 1000 hrs this morning.
Art

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune) [mailto:Bob_Taylor@thune.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2005 1:20 PM
To: Beauchamp, Arthur, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Supplement to letter # 5789
Importance: High

8/3/2005

Art. thanks for meeting with us this morning. Attached is a supplement to the weather related letter the SD delegation sent last week, # 5789 in the Commission's library.



8/3/2005