



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
PACIFIC AIR FORCES

12 Jan 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR Alaska Civil/Military Aviation Council (ACMAC)

FROM: 611 AOC/CODK
9480 Pease Ave. Suite 121
JBER, AK 99506

SUBJECT: Alaska Civil/Military Aviation Council, Subcommittee Minutes, 6 January 2011

1. The subcommittee meeting convened 6 January at 0900L and was VTC between JBER (ALCOM rm. 201) and Eielson AFB (353 CTS conference room).

2. Member Attendance: Mr. John Crowe, 611 AOC/CODK, chaired the meeting. The attendance roster is attached (See attachment).

3. Opening Remarks by Subcommittee Chairman:

a. Mr. Crowe welcomed the committee members then Introduced Col Thomas Bell Alaska Command (ALCOM), and Mr. John Mathers (SAIC) to the committee members before introductions went around the room.

b. Mr. Crowe gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda, and highlighted that the intent of the meeting was to provide clarity on each of the 10 Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex (JPARC) proposals and answer questions as needed by having numerous subject matter experts present.

4. Col. Thomas Bell spoke on behalf of Alaska ALCOM:

a. Col. Bell explained to the committee members that ALCOM's role with JPARC was to integrate military activities within Alaska to maximize the combat readiness of all services. Its mission is to improve the availability and quality of training resources and testing capabilities in the air and on the land and sea to provide the best combat training and testing for all services into the future.

b. Col. Bell briefly explained JPARC's NEPA process and also pointed out that the public comment period for the JPARC EIS was just under 60 days long which is almost a month longer than what is required. Col. Bell ensured the committee members that if a concerned was not addressed at this meeting that a follow up answer would be provided following the meeting. He then turned the meeting over to Mr. John Mathers to brief each proposal.

5. Mr. John Mathers (SAIC):

a. Mr. Mathers thanked the committee members for being present and to allow the military to share, and clarify the information within each proposal. He also explained to the committee members the length of the JPARC EIS process, and how training, and requirements were researched within all services which

drove the basis for each proposal within the JPARC EIS. Mr. Mathers went into detail about the public scoping process, public hearing process, and how to submit comments.

b. Mr. Mathers then proceeded to brief each of the 10 proposals off of the JPARC brochure to the committee members followed by a question and answer session.

1. Proposed Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA

Question: None

Answer: N/A

2. Proposed Realistic Live Ordinance Delivery

Question 1: Mr. Tom George (AOPA) asked about the frequency of use for all of the alternatives.

Answer: John Mathers (SAIC) said the military doesn't see this as continuous usage at this time due to inventory, and budget restraints. The military is still working at how often that usage would be and will be looking for feedback from the public for their impacts. Mr. George pointed out that anytime the airspace is restricted, there will be an impact. Tom George also said the military is displaying military requirements only and there are civil requirements as well.

Question 2: Mr. Tom George asked if people on the ground would be removed under alternative C.

Answer: Mr. Mathers answered yes, the weapons footprint must be cleared of non-participating personnel when any ordinance is dropped.

Question 3: Mr. Adam White (Alaska Airmen's Assn.) asked if all of the proposals were in a prioritized order of need.

Answer: Mr. Mathers answered no but he added that some give an increased capacity. The NEPA process will not allow an identity of a preferred alternative until public concerns are available.

Question 4: Harry Cook (Alaska Airmen's Assn.) asked if the FAA has been involved in the planning of the proposals.

Answer: Mr. Mathers explained the FAA has been involved during the Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA) process.

Question 5: Rich Sewell (Alaska Statewide Aviation) suggested that Alaska railroad and federally recognized tribes are part of the JPARC discussions.

Answer: Mr. Mathers explained in detail how this has been accomplished and is part of the NEPA process. Mr. Sewell was curious to what extent and landowners and or state lands are involved. Mr. Mathers explained State agencies would be part of cooperating agencies through the NEPA process.

Question 6: Mr. Sewell asked if there was any anticipated need for usage of state airfields for training.

Answer: Mr. Mathers said that hasn't been looked at and all the military airfields available fill the requirements but if a need arises and it helps accomplish training and goals, it could be considered.

3. Proposed Joint Combined Arms Live Fire(JCALF)

Question: Mr. George expressed concern about the restricted airspace proposal over the Battle Area Complex (BAX) when there was recently an EIS that was completed and the airspace alternatives over the BAX were considered and rejected.

Answer: Mr. Mathers explained the NEPA process would study all the impacts and comments and come to a solution.

4. Proposed Night Joint Training

Question : Mr. Tom George asked about the hours of training and if the training hours were extended an hour, would the training start an hour later or would the training increase an hour all together.

Answer: Mr. Mathers confirmed that is true for alternative A, and Mr. Bussa confirmed that is true for Alternative B and C as well.

5. Proposed Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space

Question 1: Mr. Mike Morgan (Alaska Air Carriers Association) expressed concern with four of the routes (A,B,C,and F). He said these proposed routes will restrict a Victor airway, a Jet route, and interfere with commercial traffic, and training. He asked if these UAV's will be transponder equipped and will ATC notify pilots of their location.

Answer: John Mathers discussed in detail the "see and avoid" options along with the "sense and avoid" option that is not yet available for the types of UAV's the military owns in Alaska. Mr. Mathers stated at this point, the military realizes they still have to work with the FAA to find a viable, safe option to conduct this proposed training. CW4 Greenwood added that if the FAA allows "sense and avoid" for these types of aircraft in the future, there would most likely not be a need for an airspace requirement.

Question 2: Mr. Morgan asked if the UAV's portable and can they be transported to the restricted airspace without tying up the airspace in between by flying them back and forth.

Answer: Mr. Mathers stated in order to conduct large a large scale exercise, the ability to make decisions how to deploy the UAV is critical. The ability to transition the UAV to and from over the airspace is an important training objective.

Question 3: Mr. Tom George added that the civil community also uses these areas for training sometimes at low altitudes which will conflict as well. He also added that it is possible to have commander's decisions on deploying the UAV's simulated to achieve the training without tying up the airspace.

Answer: John Mathers welcomed other ideas during the scoping process to achieve this training.

6. Proposed Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space

Question: Adam White asked if this proposal was contingent on the Alaskan railroad's proposed infrastructure that is not yet in place. If the railroad does not build as expected, would this change the proposal of the military.

Answer: Mr. Mathers confirmed that by stating this proposal is programmatic in nature based on what Adam white stated. He also added that if the infrastructure was not put in place, that would identify what areas would lend themselves to ground maneuver space in the future.

7. Proposed Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex (JAGIC)

Question: None

Answer: N/A

8. Proposed Intermediate Staging Bases (ISBs)

Question: Tom George inquired about the ISBs and asked specifically about the one located south of Ft. Greely. He asked what exactly would be staged/built there when it is located in such close proximity to Ft. Greely and why wouldn't this new infrastructure be built on Ft. Greely.

Answer: Mr. Mathers said the main driver for this proposal is to support company level (200 people) and above for weeks at a time to be located at the Donnelly training area (DTA). The new proposed infrastructure there would provide a more administrative support closer to

ground forces at DTA. He also added that Mr. George's proposal could be looked as an alternative.

9. Proposed Live Fire for AIM-9X and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska

Question 1: Mr. George asked if the Temporary Maritime Activities Area (TMAA) is the Navy's equivalent of a MOA.

Answer: Major Cabral stated that the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) TMAA was built for the Northern Edge exercise. The way the TMAA operates is that it becomes a temporary restricted area over the water but isn't called a restricted area or warning area because it is located over international waters and it is temporary in nature. He added the Air Force would propose to use the Navy's EIS to conduct operations in the TMAA.

Question 2: Mr. George asked if more of the air-to-air training can be conducted in the same type of place as the GOA to reduce the amount of traffic over the land.

Answer: Col Bell stated that that would only meet a small portion of the training and would not satisfy the Joint Army/Air Force types of training that is needed to be conducted over land. The GOA training is strictly air-to-air.

Answer: Maj. Cabral added that there are weather restrictions in the GOA also that makes training access limited along with a whole host of flying constraints that make the GOA not ideal for daily flying.

10. Proposed Joint Precision Airdrop System (JPADS) Drop Zones

Question: None

Answer: N/A

6. Closing Comments:

a. Mr. Mathers concluded his briefing and encouraged all members to submit comments to <http://www.jparceis.com> then turned the floor over to Col. Bell.

b. Col. Bell suggested a once around the room for additional comments. Mr. Crowe thanked the committee members for attending and ensured everyone that JPARC EIS updates will continue during the future b ACMAC's. Col. Bell thanked everyone for coming and shared that the goal is to meet the military requirements while sharing the resources the best we can and be as safe as we possibly can. He added that he looks forward to seeing all the comments from everyone and working through the scoping process.

c. Pete Haggland commented on a letter he had dated 1994 from the Alaska Aviation Safety Foundation which was a result of public scoping meetings from the mid 90's. He said it lists a number of things relevant to airspace issues we are discussing right now for JPARC. He asked if the military has gone back and reviewed such documents. Col. Bell emphasizes that the military has spent the past 18 months reviewing past requirements. Since 2001, new requirements have surfaced along with new technology. The anticipated requirements for JPARC extend into the next 20-30 years.

d. Tom George reminded the committee that IFR access is being blocked by MOA's when they are activated. He stated that the FAA needs to be engaged more at this period of the EIS process and find a way to get real time air traffic control so airspace can be shared in our existing MOA's much less any proposed new ones. Mr. George reminded everyone that as we try to improve the safety in the state of Alaska, and we go more to an IFR infrastructure, we have to have the airspace that will allow it. Mr. George said he appreciated the time shared this morning and he appreciates the joint intervention with these proposals

7. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM. Questions, comments, and/or concerns should be addressed to Mr. John Crowe, 611 AOC/CODK at Commercial (907) 552-0999 or DSN 317-552-0999.

//Signed, 12 Jan 11, jfc//
JOHN F. CROWE, GS-12, DAF
ACMAC Subcommittee, Chairman

Attachments:

1. ACMAC Attendee List
2. JPARC Brochure

cc:
11 AF/CV