

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE**C-130 BACKGROUND PAPER***

Introduction – The Air Force BRAC recommendations pertaining to the C-130 involve 21 installations and affect 156 aircraft.¹ This paper addresses issues related to a subset of those recommendations regarding the consolidation of C-130s at Little Rock Air Force Base (AFB). These issues are introduced in this section.

The consolidation of much of the C-130 fleet at Little Rock AFB contradicts stated Air Force organizational principles and will entail the movement of 77 aircraft and affect seven installations.² Two more facilities will be required to transfer an additional 16 C-130s to Pope AFB to replace 25 C-130s that are transferred from Pope AFB to Little Rock AFB.³ Twenty four of the total aircraft recommended for relocation to Little Rock AFB are currently located at four Air National Guard (ANG) units and their removal may be complicated or even negated by issues related to Title 32.⁴

Many of the C-130 Air Force recommendations appear to demonstrate an inconsistent use of the Air Force Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Analysis Tool used to assign Mission Capabilities Indices (MCIs) for assessing military value. A higher MCI number is intended to reflect a higher military value. In theory, facilities with lower MCIs would be favored for realignment or closure over those facilities having higher MCI values. As part of the effort to consolidate C-130s at Little Rock AFB however, aircraft were recommended for transfer to Little Rock AFB from Pope and Dyess AFBs. Both of these facilities had higher MCI values than Little Rock AFB.

The information used to assign military value also may have been outdated or incorrect. Data used in assessing military value was collected using the Web-based Installation Data Gathering and Entry Tool (WIDGET) software developed by the Air Force.⁵ The BRAC Analysis Tool then used these data in conjunction with military value and weighting criteria to develop the respective MCI values for each of the 154 Air Force installations.⁶ In order to standardize the evaluations, data obtained after 2003 were not considered for use in the analysis.⁷ However, this cut-off period may have led to incorrect conclusions. A prime example is the overarching justification for removing C-130s from many ANG and Air Force Reserve (AFR) bases. These units were often recommended for realignment or closure because they were considered unable to accommodate the optimal 12 aircraft recommended by the Air Force for an ANG or AFR C-130 squadron.⁸ BRAC staff visited seven of the C-130 bases having activities associated with Little Rock AFB, and found that all could accommodate the optimal number of aircraft.

When viewed as a whole, the Air Force BRAC recommendations pertaining to the C-130 consolidation at Little Rock AFB appears to be a response to Congressional prohibitions on retiring C-130Es and initial cancellation of the programmed purchases of C-130Js.

* Michael H, Flinn, Ph.D. (703) 699-2932
Senior Analyst, Air Force Team
Base Realignment and Closure Commission

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE

Air Force C-130 Allocation – Much of the confusion pertaining to the Air Force C-130 recommendations stem from the number of versions available. The C-130 situation is clouded still further by the numerous C-130 mission configurations (i.e. airlift, gunship, or weather). This paper addresses only those C-130 models configured for airlift missions. There are currently three C-130 models in the Air Force inventory, the C-130E, C-130H and the C-130J. They are allocated as shown in Table 1.⁹

Table 1: Air Force C-130 Allocation by Organization

Organization	C-130 Allocation
Air Mobility Command (AMC)	91
Air National Guard (ANG)	174
Air Force Reserves (AFR)	76
Air Education and Training Command (AETC)	47
United States Air Force Europe (USAFE)	20
Pacific Air Force (PACAF)	29

Decisions Made Regarding the C-130E – Many C-130Es currently assigned to units are over 40 years old and are either no longer flyable or are flyable only under certain restricted conditions. The primary concern with the aging C-130E is cracked wing boxes. It takes three years to get the wing boxes fixed at a cost of \$10 million per plane.¹⁰ The Air Force BRAC recommendations designate a total of 47 C-130Es for retirement.¹¹ However, Senate Bill 1043 Section 134 states “[t]he Secretary of the Air Force may not retire any C-130E/H tactical airlift aircraft of the Air Force in fiscal year 2006.”¹² When asked to comment on the apparent contradiction between this and the BRAC recommendations, the Air Force Clearinghouse response was:

In accordance with the BRAC law, the Air Force developed BRAC recommendations based on the future force structure plan submitted to the congress (*sic*) in November, 2004. If the congress (*sic*) subsequently prohibits the retirement of the aircraft, the Air Force will maintain the aircraft in accordance with the law and approved BRAC recommendations.¹³

Decisions Made Regarding the C-130H – There are five variants of the C-130H model; the C-130H, C-130H1, C-130H2, C-130H2.5, and the C-130H3.¹⁴ Externally, the aircraft are all very similar in appearance to each other and to the C-130E.¹⁵ The differences in variant designation are related to avionics and instrumentation upgrades.¹⁶ Because of these differences, crew trained in the operation of one variant cannot fly a different variant without additional training.¹⁷ However, safety issues essentially prevent dual training.¹⁸ As might be expected, there are also different maintenance requirements for these variants.¹⁹

Decisions Made Regarding the C-130J – The C-130J/J-30 was selected to replace the C-130E.²⁰ In addition to being longer than the “E” and “H” models, the C-130J is air-refuelable.²¹ Approximately 168 C-130J/J-30s were planned for the Air Force inventory as of September 2003.²² By the end of fiscal year 2004, 37 of these aircraft had already

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE

been delivered with most going to the AFR and ANG.²³ An additional 41 C-130Js were scheduled to go to Air Reserve Component (ARC) units. Future allocations of the remaining 90 C-130Js to active units are shown in Table 2.²⁴

Table 2: C-130J Programmed Deliveries Through Fiscal Year 2017

Installation Name	Number of C-130Js Programmed	Programmed Delivery
Little Rock AFB (AETC)	14	FY 05 – FY 11
Little Rock AFB (AMC)	16	FY 14 – FY 17
Pope AFB	31	FY 07 – FY 13
Ramstein Air Base	18	FY 09 – FY 11
Yokota Air Base	11	FY 14 – FY 16

Although the aircraft purchases were programmed, all procurements of the C-130J for the Air Force were terminated on 23 December 2004.²⁵ However, funding for C-130J purchases appears to have been reinstated on 17 May 2005 under different acquisition regulations.²⁶ The following section indicates that Air Force realignment and closure decisions may have been influenced by the status of the C-130J program.

Air Force Scenarios Regarding the C-130 – The various scenarios regarding the movement of C-130s to and from Little Rock and Pope AFBs were obtained from the “Scenario Tracker” database and are provided in Attachment 1. While not definitive in nature, the proposed scenarios are useful for providing some insight into the Air Force decision-making process. The first scenario (USAF-0012) is entitled “Consolidate C-130 Fleet” and entails realigning the current C-130 force structure in as “few locations as practicable using standard squadron sizes and crews. . . .” Based on the scope of the first scenario, it seems reasonable to consider all following scenarios as subsets of the initial recommendation. Table 3 summarizes the BRAC C-130 scenarios as they pertain to Little Rock AFB.

Through 17 December 2004, the Air Force scenarios divided the C-130 recommendations almost equally between Little Rock AFB (36 PAA) and other locations (31 PAA). With the recommended retirement of 14 C-130Es and the recoding to backup aircraft inventory (BAI) of another 14 C-130Es, Little Rock AFB effectively received only 8 additional aircraft. Beginning on 6 January 2005 however, the direction of aircraft movement was clearly towards Little Rock AFB. From 6 January until 8 April 2005, the various scenarios had Little Rock AFB receiving 45 additional aircraft as opposed to 19 aircraft received at four other installations. The change in aircraft movement direction closely follows the 23 December date for PBD 753 and may suggest that the movement direction was influenced to some degree by decisions pertaining to the C-130J program.

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE**Table 3: C-130 Scenarios Relative to Little Rock and Pope AFBs**

Scenario Date	Scenario Title	C-130 Model	Number Moved To
09/22/04	Consolidate C-130 Fleet	All	Not applicable
10/21/04	Close Ellsworth AFB	Unspecified models from 317 th Airlift Group at Dyess AFB, TX	Elmendorf AFB, AK (4 PAA)* Peterson AFB, CO (4 PAA) Cheyenne Airport AGS, WY (4 PAA) Pope/Ft. Bragg, NC (4 PAA) Little Rock AFB, AR (16 PAA)
12/17/04	Realign Little Rock AFB	C-130E C-130J	Pope AFB, NC (5 PAA C-130E, 2 PAA C-130J) Little Rock AFB Backup Aircraft Inventory (14 PAA C-130E) Retirement (14 PAA C-130E)
12/17/04	Realign Maxwell AFB	C-130H	Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (4 PAA) Little Rock AFB, AR (4 PAA)
12/17/04	Close Mansfield-Lahm MAP AGS	C-130H	Maxwell AFB, AL (4 PAA) Little Rock AFB, AR (4 PAA)
12/17/04	Realign Schenectady County Airport AGS	C-130H	Little Rock AFB, AR (4 PAA)
12/17/04	Realign Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS	C-130H	Little Rock AFB, AR (8 PAA)
01/06/05	Close Pope AFB	C-130E C-130J	Little Rock AFB, AR (11 PAA C-130E, 14 PAA C-130J)
02/04/05	Close Niagara Falls ARS	C-130H	Little Rock AFB, AR (8 C-130H)
02/04/05	Realign Pope AFB	C-130E C-130J	Little Rock AFB, AR (25 PAA C-130E) Little Rock retires 27 PAA C-130E Little Rock distributes 1 PAA C-130J to Quonset Airport AGS, RI Little Rock distributes 2 PAA C-130J to Channel Islands AGS, CA
02/04/05	Close Pittsburgh IAP ARS	C-130H	Little Rock AFB, AR (4 PAA C-130H) Pope AFB, NC (4 PAA C-130H)
04/08/05	Realign Boise Air Terminal AGS	C-130H	Little Rock AFB, AR (4 PAA C-130H)
04/08/05	Close General Mitchell ARS	C-130H	Dobbins ARB, GA (4 PAA C-130H) Little Rock AFB, AR (4 PAA C-130H)

* PAA – Primary Aircraft Assigned

Air Force BRAC Recommendations – The scenarios formed the basis for the Air Force recommendations. The stated justification for transferring C-130s to Little Rock AFB, resulted from the lower military values calculated for ANG or AFR installations.²⁷ Further justification was provided by an effort to transfer the C-130 force structure to “address a documented imbalance in the active/reserve manning mix for C-130s”.²⁸ The primary determinant of military value relative to AFR or ANG installations appears to be their ability to support the optimal 12 plane squadron. Table 4 depicts the seven different recommendation that send C-130s to Little Rock AFB.

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE**Table 4: Air Force BRAC Recommendations Directing Aircraft to Little Rock AFB**

Recommendation	Reference	Source Installation	Moved to Little Rock AFB
Ellsworth AFB, SD and Dyess AFB, TX	Air Force - 43	Dyess AFB, TX	24
Reno-Tahoe International Airport AGS, NV	Air Force - 31	Reno-Tahoe AGS, NV	8
Niagara Falls ARS, NY	Air Force - 33	Niagara Falls ARS, NY	8
Schenectady County Airport AGS, NY	Air Force - 34	Schenectady County Airport AGS, NY	4
Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport AGS, OH	Air Force - 39	Mansfield-Lahm AGS, OH	4
General Mitchell ARS, WI	Air Force - 52	General Mitchell ARS, WI	4
Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport ARS, PA, and Yeager AGS, WV	Air Force - 35	Pope AFB, NC	25

The following subsections discuss the installation specific issues associated with the recommendations for consolidating C-130s at Little Rock AFB.

Little Rock AFB, AR – Little Rock AFB is the center for C-130 training and houses a C-130J Academic/Simulator Complex – Facility consisting of three different C-130J cockpit simulators of increasing complexity, a C-130J crew maintenance trainer, and a C-130J engine repair trainer.

There are currently 86-88 C-130s assigned to Little Rock AFB. These are allocated to the following commands:

- AMC (14 C-130H3s and 15 C-130Es)²⁹
- ANG (10 C-130Es)³⁰
- AETC (45 C-130Es and 4 C-130Js)³¹

Of the 70 C-130Es assigned to the three Little Rock AFB units, 15 (21%) are grounded and 21 (30%) are restricted.³² The Air Force recommended retiring 27 C-130Es stationed at Little Rock AFB.³³ Three of the four C-130Js at Little Rock AFB are recommended for distribution to Channel Islands AGS, CA and Quonset State AGS, RI.³⁴ These reallocations will leave Little Rock AFB with 56 – 58 of its original aircraft.

Table 5 summarizes the recommended movement of aircraft to Little Rock AFB.³⁵

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE**Table 5: Recommended C-130 Movements to Little Rock AFB**

Installation	Number at Installation	Model	To Be Moved to Little Rock AFB
Dyess AFB, TX	32	C-130H	24
Reno-Tahoe AGS, NV	8	C-130H	8
Niagara Falls ARS, NY	8	C-130H	8
Schenectady County Airport AGS, NY	4	C-130H	4
Mansfield-Lahm AGS, OH	8	C-130H	4
General Mitchell ARS, WI	8	C-130H	4
Pope AFB, NC	25	C-130E	25

Moving 77 additional aircraft to Little Rock AFB may be problematic. The BRAC recommendations will raise the total number of aircraft to 133 – 135 (PAA and BAI) C-130E, H, and J models distributed to an AETC Wing, an ANG Wing, and an AMC Group. Three of the installations recommended to transfer aircraft to Little Rock AFB are ANG facilities, and therefore, the recommended movement of 16 C-130Hs from these locations may be complicated or even negated because of Title 32.³⁶ Further, the location of this many C-130 aircraft at Little Rock will consolidate approximately 31% of the C-130 fleet in a centralized location and contradicts Air Force principles for airlift mobility bases that states:

Our airlift mobility bases must have robust inter-modal transportation infrastructure to mobilize joint, interagency forces and be *geographically separated* [emphasis added] to reduce the likelihood of a single point of failure due to environmental or infrastructure problems. Airlift bases *located near or with primary users* [emphasis added] can enhance joint training and responsiveness.³⁷

Finally, discussions with base personnel during the 8 July staff only visit suggested that the existing support infrastructure had reached its maximum capacity. This observation was subsequently confirmed in a letter from Congressman Walsh citing a recent Air Force BRAC site survey estimating Little Rock AFB would need an additional \$107 to \$270 million in MILCON as a result of the BRAC recommendations.³⁸

Dyess AFB, TX – DOD recommended realigning Dyess AFB by transferring 24 C-130s to Little Rock AFB.³⁹ This realignment would make room for B-1 bombers transferred under the recommendation to close Ellsworth AFB, SD.⁴⁰ Dyess AFB has the capability to accommodate up to 68 B-1s and 35 C-130s.⁴¹

Because Dyess AFB had a higher MCI rating (11) than did Little Rock AFB (17), community representatives noted that transferring Dyess AFB's C-130s to Little Rock AFB was inconsistent with the Air Force's use of military value determinations.⁴² The Little Rock AFB recommendations also would combine C-130E, C-130H, and C-130J models at a single location, apparently contradicting the Air Force plan to consolidate

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE

aircraft of the same type.⁴³ Community advocates further maintained the beddown the C-130s at Little Rock AFB would cost more than keeping C-130s at Dyess AFB and relocating B-1s from Ellsworth AFB.⁴⁴ The cost of C-130s remaining at Dyess and consolidating B-1s at Dyess is \$167M” while “the costs to transfer the C-130s to Little Rock and to consolidate the B-1s at Dyess is \$185M.”⁴⁵

Reno-Tahoe International Airport AGS, NV – Representatives of Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS stated the MCI value for their facility was low and that the realignment justification was incomplete.⁴⁶ Reno-Tahoe IAP/AGS is capable of supporting 12 C-130s on existing land.⁴⁷ Since the data call, there has been an Air Force-approved airport authority land agreement allowing the expansion to 16 aircraft.⁴⁸ Further, eliminating the entire aviation program, aerial port, and fire department at Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS would incur unaddressed costs of nearly \$100M in 2005 dollars over a 20 year period to support the remaining expeditionary combat support (ECS) and other joint missions.⁴⁹ The position taken by representatives of Reno-Tahoe IAP AGE was that this is a significant departure from DOD’s cost savings analysis as outlined in BRAC Report.⁵⁰ Finally, Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS representatives indicated that the BRAC recommendation to relocate the ANG AW violates both the specific language and intent of the U.S. Constitution, several federal statutes, and the direction of the United States Supreme Court.⁵¹

Niagara Falls ARS, NY – Representatives of the community felt the Air Force recommendations were made based on outdated or incomplete information. Since 1995, the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station (NFARS) has made a concerted effort to improve its infrastructure.⁵² As a result, 100% of excess capacity (33% of total) was eliminated over the past 10 years.⁵³ The average age of NFARS’ buildings is 32 years, or approximately 10 years less than that of other AFR facilities.⁵⁴ A recent agreement with the State of New York reduced electricity rates from \$0.11 per kilowatt hour to approximately \$0.06 per kilowatt hour, giving NFARS an annual reduction in electric utility costs of approximately 45% or \$450,000 annually.⁵⁵

Schenectady County Airport AGS, NY – Community representatives suggested that relocating four C-130H to Little Rock AFB will increase the usage of the ski mounted LC-130s and shorten their operable lifespan by approximately 25%.⁵⁶ They also reiterated issues related to the legality of the proposed realignment of the installations as follows:

- Proposed movement of aircraft is not related to infrastructure restructuring.⁵⁷
- Recommendations to relocate, withdraw, disband, or change the organization of an ANG unit, unless done so for infrastructure rationalization is inconsistent with the intent of BRAC legislation.⁵⁸
- The Adjutant General Association of the United States (AGAUS) has validated that programmatic moves of the aircraft is inconsistent with BRAC objectives.⁵⁹

Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport AGS, OH – Unit personnel stated the data for their facility was incorrect.⁶⁰ The installation can accommodate more than eight C-130s on the current ramp and they were given no credit for their hangar because of the width of the door.⁶¹ However, wings slots in the hangar wall allow it to accommodate the C-130.⁶²

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE

General Mitchell Field ARS – During the base visit, all of the buildings appeared to be in good condition and very well maintained. The BRAC staff was informed by base officials that they currently have 8 C-130s, are manned for 12, and have the capability to expand to 16 aircraft.⁶³ Projects currently programmed include ramp expansion (75 ft.), propulsion shop expansion, and a new main gate.⁶⁴

Gen. Mitchell ARS officials felt that the MCI values for their facility were flawed and used the MCI scores of the co-located National Guard unit as an example.⁶⁵ Although the Guard unit flies tankers, using the same airspace and runway as the Reserve unit, the tanker unit received a higher MCI airlift value.

Pope AFB, NC – The stated justification for downsizing Pope AFB would be to take advantage of mission-specific consolidation opportunities to reduce operational and maintenance costs.⁶⁶ The corresponding smaller manpower footprint would facilitate transfer of the installation to the Army.⁶⁷

The 25 C-130Es from Pope AFB are intended to replace the 27 C-130Es recommended for retirement at Little Rock AFB.⁶⁸ In a related recommendation, the aircraft moving from Pope AFB will be replaced by a 16 C-130H AFR/Active Duty associate squadron comprised of eight C-130 aircraft from Yeager Airport AGS and eight C-130 from Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station (Pittsburgh IAP ARS).⁶⁹ The recommendation to transfer aircraft from Yeager AGS also may be affected by Title 32 concerns.

Pittsburgh IAP ARS – The justification for realigning Pittsburgh IAP ARS was based on the major command's capacity briefing that "land constraints prevented the installation from hosting more than 10 C-130 aircraft . . ." ⁷⁰ However, information provided by base personnel demonstrated ample space available for 20 aircraft with no additional MILCON required.⁷¹

Members of the unit also believed they did not receive the appropriate credit for the load bearing capacity of their ramp in determining the MCI value.⁷² As part of Pittsburgh IAP, the ramp area has been used as a taxiway for such heavy aircraft as 747s, C-5s, and B-52s and is routinely used by C-130s.⁷³ However, the ramp did not have a "published" pavement condition number (PCN) and consequently could not be used in the model for determining the MCI for the facility.⁷⁴ The lack of a PCN cost the installation 2.98 points.⁷⁵

Installation representatives also felt that other aspects of the WIDGET Model and the BRAC Analysis Tool overrated assets that were not necessary for the C-130 airlift mission.⁷⁶ Although these issues do not represent examples of using inaccurate or outdated data, or errors with the model, they do represent a bias in the model towards large, active duty facilities. Examples include:

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE

- Fuel hydrant systems – Because C-130s carry only 9,000 gallons, a fuel hydrant system is not necessary for accomplishing the C-130 airlift mission.⁷⁷
- Proximity to and quality of surveyed landing zones (LZs) – Surveyed LZs are not required for C-130 training.⁷⁸
- Distance to selected overseas Army Post Office Europe locations – The question is irrelevant for an installation flying theater airlift C-130s.⁷⁹

Yeager Airport AGS, WV – The major command's capacity briefing also reported that Yeager Airport AGS cannot support more than eight C-130s.⁸⁰ However, the Wing Commander reported that the unit can actually park 12 C-130s.⁸¹ During the base visit of 13 June 2005, there were eleven aircraft present. A little-used secondary runway also can be used for parking during surge operations.⁸² Further, the base received no credit in the MCI determination for its hangar since it was constructed to house fighters.⁸³ However the hangar has been able to contain C-130 for over 25 years with the addition of wall slots.⁸⁴

Conclusions – This paper demonstrates that use of the MCI military value scores appears to have been applied inconsistently in relation to the decision to consolidate C-130s at Little Rock AFB. The stated justification for closing or realigning ANG and AFR units, and moving their associated aircraft was because their MCI scores were lower than that of Little Rock AFB. If this justification were applied consistently, it follows that the C-130s recommended for Little Rock AFB (MCI value of 17) would instead have been recommended for Dyess AFB (11) or Pope AFB (6). The model also may demonstrate a bias towards active duty facilities and information used in determining MCI values may be outdated or incorrect.

The impetus behind the BRAC process is to save money by reducing infrastructure. It seems unlikely that realigning three Air Guard Stations, and closing three Air Reserve Stations and one Air Guard Station, will offset the \$107 to \$270 million in new MILCON required to accommodate the relocated aircraft at Little Rock AFB. Additionally, potential savings anticipated from the BRAC recommendations related to ANG units may be eliminated because of Title 32 issues. These issues also may affect recommendations regarding AFR units that are co-located with ANG units. Finally, any implied savings from the realignment of Pope AFB may have already been reduced or lost due to construction of a \$10.7 million two-door C-130J hangar that is 68% complete.⁸⁵

The effort to consolidate a large portion of the C-130 fleet at Little Rock AFB appears to contradict Air Force organizational principles regarding airlift mobility bases. This contradiction seems to be driven by a need to extend the operational life of the C-130E (and some H variants) by spreading the flight hours more evenly. This need took on greater urgency with the 23 December 2004 cancellation of the C-130J model. However, the C-130J was reinstated after the release of the BRAC recommendations and would seem to render moot the Air Force BRAC recommendations related to consolidating the C-130 fleet at Little Rock AFB.

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE**References**

1. Department of Defense *Base Closure and Realignment Report* Vol. 1 Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005.
2. White Paper “Air Force Organizational Principles” 16 Jul 04.
3. Department of Defense *Base Closure and Realignment Report* Vol. 1 Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005.
4. Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission White Paper “Discussion of Legal and Policy Considerations Related to Certain Air Force Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations”.
5. *Department of the Air Force Analysis and Recommendations BRAC 2005* Volume V, May 2005.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Personal discussion with Michael Callahan.
8. Department of Defense *Base Closure and Realignment Report* Vol. 1 Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005.
9. *Ibid*
10. Personal discussion with James W. Crowhurst.
11. Department of Defense *Base Closure and Realignment Report* Vol. 1 Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005.
12. Senate Bill 1043 Section 134, May 17, 2005.
13. Response from OSD Clearinghouse dated 7 June 2005 regarding BI-0045 Commission Question on Congressional Prohibition of Aircraft Retirement (OSD Clearinghouse Tasker C0240).
14. Personal discussion with Brad McRee.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*
20. <http://www.af.mil/factsheets/factsheet.asp?fsID=92>
21. Personal discussion with Brigadier General Paul Dornan.
22. <http://www.af.mil/factsheets/factsheet.asp?fsID=92>
23. Draft C-130J Beddown Plan of August 2003.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Program Budget Decision 753 dated 23 December 2004.
26. Senate Bill 1043 Section 134, May 17, 2005.
27. Department of Defense *Base Closure and Realignment Report* Vol. 1 Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005.
28. *Ibid.*
29. 314 MXG Plans and Scheduling Office Worksheet
30. *Ibid*
31. *Ibid*
32. *Ibid*

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE**References (continued)**

33. Department of Defense *Base Closure and Realignment Report* Vol. 1 Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005.
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Ibid.*
36. Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission White Paper “Discussion of Legal and Policy Considerations Related to Certain Air Force Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations”.
37. White Paper “Air Force Organizational Principles” 16 Jul 04.
38. Letter to The Honorable Anthony J. Principi, Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission from Congressman James T. Walsh, Chairman of the Military Quality of Life Appropriations Subcommittee dated July 20, 2005.
39. Department of Defense *Base Closure and Realignment Report* Vol. 1 Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Point Paper provided by Thelen, Reid and Priest, LLP on behalf of the Abilene , Texas community under memorandum dated July 8, 2005.
42. *Ibid*
43. *Ibid*
44. “Issues for BRAC Staff Consideration” City of Abilene, July 28, 2005.
45. Air Force Base Closure Executive Group Meeting Minutes dated 14 Aug 2004
46. Base personnel
47. *Ibid*
48. *Ibid*
49. *Ibid*
50. *Ibid*
51. *Ibid*
52. Niagara Falls ARS briefing materials provided as part of Commissioners’ base visit of 27 June 2005.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*
56. Information received from Schenectady County in conjunction with meeting of 4 August 2005
57. *Ibid*
58. *Ibid*
59. *Ibid*
60. Base personnel
61. *Ibid*
62. *Ibid*
63. Information received during base visit of 2 June 2005
64. *Ibid*
65. *Ibid*

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE

References (concluded)

66. Department of Defense *Base Closure and Realignment Report* Vol. 1 Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005.
67. *Ibid.*
68. *Ibid.*
69. *Ibid.*
70. *Ibid.*
71. Pittsburgh IAP ARS briefing materials provided as part of Commissioner's base visit of 21 June 2005.
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Ibid.*
74. *Ibid.*
75. *Ibid.*
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Ibid.*
79. *Ibid.*
80. Base personnel
81. *Ibid*
82. *Ibid*
83. *Ibid*
84. *Ibid*
85. *Fayetteville Observer* "C-130J Hangar Work Goes On" July 30, 2005

Attachment 1

C-130 Realignment Scenarios Related to Pope and Little Rock Air Force Bases

Date	Scenario Number	Title	Scenario
09/22/04	USAF-0012	Consolidate C-130 Fleet	<p>Realign current C-130 force structure at as few locations as practicable using standard squadron sizes and crews, consistent with Mission Capabilities Indices and Future Total Force tenants.</p> <p>Principles: Primary determinant - MCI rating; optimize squadron size; consolidate airlift assets</p> <p>Exceptions: If installation has consolidated MDS now, do not reduce</p>
10/21/04	USAF-0018	Close Ellsworth AFB (S200.1c3)	<p>The 28th Bomb Wing will inactivate. The wing's 24 B-1B aircraft will be distributed to the 7th Bomb Wing, Dyess AFB. The 317th Airlift Group at Dyess will inactivate and its C-130 aircraft will be distributed to the 3d Wing, Elmendorf AFB (4 PAA); 302d Airlift Wing (AFRC), Peterson AFB (4 PAA); 153d Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne Airport AGS (4 PAA); Pope/Ft Bragg (4 PAA); and 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock AFB (16 PAA). Peterson, Cheyenne and Pope/Ft Bragg will have C-130 active duty/ARC associations at a 50/50 force mix. Elmendorf will have C-130 association mix of 8 PAA/4PAA (ANG/SD).</p> <p>Belle Fourche Electronic Scoring Site assets will need to be moved. Active/ARC C-130 associations at Elmendorf, Peterson, Cheyenne and Little Rock (50/50 mix). Active/ARC mix at Pope/Ft Bragg will be 50/50 mix (AFRC/AD).</p>
12/17/04	USAF-0058	Realign Little Rock AFB (S301)	<p>Assigned C-130E aircraft (5 PAA) and C-130J aircraft (2 PAA) will be redistributed to the 43rd Airlift Wing, Pope AFB, North Carolina.; other assigned C-130E aircraft will be recoded to backup aircraft inventory (14 PAA) and retire (14 PAA). The 23rd Fighter Group's A-10 aircraft (36 PAA) assigned to Pope AFB will be redistributed to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.</p>
12/17/04	USAF-0059	Realign Maxwell AFB (S322)	<p>The 908th Airlift Wing (AFRC) will inactivate. The wing's C-130H aircraft (4 PAA) will be distributed to the 94th Airlift Wing, Dobbins ARB, Georgia, and the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock AFB, AR (4 PAA).</p>
12/17/04	USAF-0066	Close Mansfield Lahm MAP AGS (S319.1)	<p>The 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) will inactivate. The wing's C-130H aircraft will be distributed to the 908th Airlift Wing (AFRC), Maxwell AFB, AL (4 PAA) and the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock AFB (4 PAA). Flying related ECS moves to Louisville IAP AGS, Kentucky (Aerial Port) and Toledo Express Airport AGS, Ohio (Firefighters).</p>
12/17/04	USAF-0067	Realign Schenectady County APT AGS (S320)	<p>Relocate C-130H aircraft (4 PAA) to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock AFB.</p>
12/17/04	USAF-0068	Realign Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS (S311Z)	<p>The 152nd Airlift Wing (ANG) will inactivate. The wing's C-130H aircraft will be distributed to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock AFB, Arkansas (8 PAA).</p> <p>The wing's ECS elements and the DCGS will remain as an enclave. ANG manpower will associate with active duty aggressor unit at Nellis AFB.</p>

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – NOT FOR FOIA RELEASE**Attachment 1 (Concluded)****C-130 Realignment Scenarios Related to Pope and Little Rock Air Force Bases**

Date	Scenario Number	Title	Scenario
01/06/05	USAF-0096	Close Pope AFB (S315)	The 43rd Airlift Wing will be inactivated. Assigned C-130E (11PAA) and C-130J (14 PAA) aircraft will be distributed to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. The 23rd Fighter Group's A-10 aircraft (36 PAA) will be reassigned to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana.
02/04/05	USAF-0121	Close Niagara Falls ARS (S318.3c1)	The 914th Airlift Wing (AFRC), Niagara Falls IAP ARS, New York will inactivate. The wing's 8 C-130H aircraft will be distributed to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock AFB. The 107th Airlift Wing (ANG) will inactivate and its 8 KC-135R aircraft will be distributed to the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) Bangor, Maine. KC135E aircraft assigned (8 PAA) to the 101st ARW will retire.
02/04/05	USAF-0122	Realign Pope AFB (S316.2)	The 43rd Airlift Wing will be inactivated. Assigned C-130E (25 PAA) aircraft will be distributed to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. Little Rock will retire C-130E aircraft (27 PAA); recode C-130E aircraft to BAI (8 PAA); distribute C-130J aircraft to the 143rd Airlift Wing (ANG) Quonset State APT AGS, Rhode Island (1 PAA) and 146th Airlift Wing (ANG) Channel Islands AGS, California (2 PAA). The 23rd Fighter Group at Pope will inactivate and associated A-10 aircraft (36 PAA) will be distributed to Moody AFB, Georgia. The 347th Rescue Wing's HC-130P (11 PAA) and HH-60 (14 PAA) aircraft will be distributed to the 355th Wing, Davis Monthan AFB, Arizona. AFRC Aerial Port at Pope AFB will remain in place as a tenant to the Army. Additional Air Force will remain in place, as a tenant to the Army, to support Army Requirements at Ft Bragg.
02/04/05	USAF-0123	Close Pittsburgh IAP ARS (S317.1)	The 911th Airlift Wing (AFRC) will inactivate. The wing's C-130H aircraft (8 PAA) will be distributed to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock AFB (4 PAA) and to Ft Bragg/Pope AFB (AFRC) (4 PAA). The flight related ECS (Aeromed Squadron) will be moved to Youngstown-Warren Regional APT ARS. The remaining ECS will be moved to Offutt AFB, NE. AFRC Ops and Maintenance manpower will be transferred to Offutt AFB, NE.
02/25/05	USAF-127	Realign Yeager APT AGS (S321.3c2)	The 130th Airlift Wing (ANG) will inactivate. The wing's C-130H aircraft (8 PAA) will be distributed to Pope/Ft Bragg to form a 12 PAA AFR and active duty associate unit. Flying related ECS is moved from Yeager to Shepherd (Aerial Port and Fire Fighters.) Remaining 130th Airlift Wing ECS remains in place in enclave at Yeager.
04/08/05	USAF-128	Realign Boise Air Terminal AGS, Boise, ID (S325)	The 124th Wing, Boise Air Terminal, will distribute assigned C-130H aircraft to Little Rock AFB, Arkansas (2 PAA to ANG, 2 PAA to active duty).
04/08/05	USAF-130	Close General Mitchell ARS, Milwaukee (S324)	The 440th Airlift Wing (AFRC) will realign. The wing's C-130H aircraft will be distributed to the 94th Airlift Wing (AFRC), Dobbins ARB, Georgia (4 PAA) and the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock, Arkansas (4 PAA). The Wing's ECS Ops and MX will realign to Ft Bragg, NC.