From:

Duff Ortman/ASO/FAA

To:

Date:

Friday, April 21, 2006 09:16AM

Subject: Re: LEX Airspace Reclass

## Darryl,

Given that our request to reduce operating hours has languished for 2 years, I suppose I should consider it a victory that the service area only took 3 months to flip-flop and decide that reclassing airspace is a big deal after all. You'll recall that this was to allow ZID (who is willing & able) to take over the radar services between 1200A and 630A.

I'll write another airspace study if that's really what they want but it seems like wasted effort.

I continue to staff only 1 CPC on the midshift so as to have a fighting chance of staying within my OT budget. You mentioned a month or so ago that there was some softening of Mr. Johnson's position. Anything new on that front? If he would give facilities (who have requests to reduce hours pending) some wiggle room, the entire problem would go away. Otherwise, I have a sinking feeling that I'll be penning another staff study to be used as somebody's paper weight.

**Duff Ortman** ATM, ETSA/LEX

----Forwarded by Duff Ortman/ASO/FAA on 04/21/2006 09:07AM ----

To: Duff Ortman/ASO/FAA@FAA From: Rich Horrocks/AEA/FAA Date: 04/21/2006 08:51AM

Subject: Lex -mid shift

Hi Duff,

Sorry no one has gotten back to you sooner. My team lead Frank Jordan has been out sick for quite some time and I just got back from vacation. The only info I have is, there was a staff study of the reduction of hours at your facility but not a study of a need to modify your Class C airspace. Further, there is a memo to Director-Terminal Planning which is only a Service Area recommendation regarding facility operating hours. I still have not been advised that Terminal Planning responded in agreement with the reduction of LEX hours. My office does not have oversight of facility hours reductions. This decision must be made before we start rulemaking to cut the Class C hours.

Also, according to the current official data, LEX still exceeds the minimum requirements for Class C airspace. For CY 2004 (latest available), LEX passenger emplanements were 582,328 (at least 250,000 required for Class C). For CY 2004 & 2005, Instrument Operations were 162,590 and 157,851, respectively, (75,000 required for Class C). The airspace staff study should discuss/justify the need for a part-time Class C even though the enplanement and instrument operations counts remain well above the minimum criteria. We will have to justify this for those users who may comment in opposition to the plan to reduce

the hours for Class C services at LEX (this may be simply a matter of demonstrating that minimal counts occur during the planned closure period).

Also, If the tower is completely closed during the mids- you could not have Class D because an operating tower is required for D. If the tower stayed open as a VFR tower, then Class D would be appropriate. If the tower is completely closed during the mids, the airspace could change to a Class E surface area, but ONLY if weather observations and reporting remain available for LEX and an ATC facility had communications capability down to the runway surface (see para. 17-2-9). If the weather and comm requirements can't be met, the best you could get is a 700' transition area when the tower is closed. All of these items should be addressed in the airspace staff study.

In summary, here's what we need to initiate rulemaking:

- Service Area recommendation memo (original signature copy) requesting that rulemaking action be initiated and explaining the need to reduce LEX Class C hours;
- Airspace staff study to validate need for reduction of Class C times (note: the LEX staff study could be incorporated into, or attached to, the airspace study).

I am to speak with more personnel next week about your situation. I believe this project will take a substantial amount of time. I wish I could be of more help to you, but I will keep you in the loop as I receive more info. Talk to you soon-Richie

Richie Horrocks Airspace Specialist ETSU-520