

Air Force Installation Capacity Summary

The installation capacity summary is a consolidation of data provided by the Air Force MAJCOM through a series of presentations in August of 2004. The goal of the summary was to capture and visually display the MAJCOM presented information for reference in a smaller, consolidated format.

Below are descriptions of the associated columns used in the spreadsheet:

1. **MDS** : Mission Design Series represents aircraft operating at the listed installation
2. **Blk / Model**: Reflects, where necessary, the specific Block of a given MDS operating at the location
3. **PAA Used**: Primary Aircraft Authorization identifies the optimal number aircraft per MDS for a squadron based on the Air Force's White Paper on Organizational Principles
4. **Total Acft #**: The total number of aircraft at the location (per MDS) based on MAJCOM Capacity briefings Aug 2004
5. **Squadron Equivalent In Place**: The number of equivalent squadrons at an installation determined by dividing the Total Aircraft by the PAA Used
6. **Squadron 1 thru 6**: X signifies a squadron currently (2006) in place. A shaded box represents a partial squadron (less than 1) that cannot be expanded. A box with a dollar value represents the ability to add a full squadron at that cost (in \$Millions). ** MAJCOMs were directed to provide estimates for adding up to 2 squadrons at installations.
7. **Total Capacity**: Is the total "Theoretical" capacity based on current aircraft capacity in squadrons as well as capacity that could be available (at a cost) up to 2 additional squadrons.

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Installation Sort

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equip In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|-----------------|--------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------------------------|
| ANG | Barnes, MA | A-10 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | \$40.7 | | | | | 2 |
| AFRC | Beale | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$22.5 | | | | | | 1 |
| ACC | Beale | RQ-4 | 18 | 51 | 2.8 | X | X | \$0.0 | \$54.3 | \$61.2 | | 5 |
| ACC | Beale | T-38 | 24 | 13 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ACC | Beale | U-2 | 18 | 34 | 1.9 | X | | | | | | 1.9 |
| ANG | Birmingham | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$22.8 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Boise | A-10 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | \$19.8 | \$22.4 | | | | 3 |
| ANG | Boise | C-130 | 16 | 4 | 0.3 | \$15.2 | \$28.9 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Bradley | A-10 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | \$47.2 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Buckley | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Burlington, VT | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ACC | Cannon | F-16 | 24 | 69 | 2.9 | X | X | \$0.0 | \$18.0 | \$35.1 | | 5 |
| ACC | Cannon (FMS) | F-16 | 24 | 10 | 0.4 | | | | | | | 0.4 |
| ANG | Capital, IL | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Channel Islands | C-130 | 16 | 12 | 0.8 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | Charleston | C-17 | 12 | 48 | 4.0 | X | X | X | | | | 4 |
| ANG | Charlotte, NC | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Cheyenne, WY | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$15.3 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Dannelly | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ACC | Davis Monthan | A-10 | 24 | 75 | 3.1 | X | X | X | \$32.5 | \$32.8 | | 5 |
| ACC | Davis Monthan | EC-130 | 7 | 10 | 1.4 | X | | | | | | 1.4 |

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Installation Sort

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equip In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|---------------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|----------------------------|
| ACC | Davis Monthan | HC-130 | 7 | 4 | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.6 |
| AFRC | Davis Monthan | HH-60 | 7 | 31 | 4.4 | X | X | X | X | \$0.0 | \$13.5 | 6.4 |
| ACC | Davis Monthan | VARIOUS | 14 | 14 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Des Moines | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Dobbins | C-130 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | \$6.8 | | | | | | 1 |
| ARMY | Dobbins | VARIOUS | 21 | 21 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | Dover | C-17 | 12 | 12 | 1.0 | X | \$159.2 | | | | | 2 |
| AMC | Dover | C-5 | 12 | 16 | 1.3 | X | | | | | | 1.3 |
| ANG | Duluth, MN | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| * ACC | Dyess | B-1 | 12 | 35 | 2.9 | X | X | \$0.0 | \$63.4 | \$98.3 | | 5 |
| AMC | Dyess | C-130 | 16 | 28 | 1.8 | X | | | | | | 1.8 |
| AFMC | Edwards | VARIOUS | 24 | 44 | 1.8 | X | \$0.0 | \$30.5 | \$18.2 | | | 4 |
| ACC | Eglin | F-15 | 24 | 54 | 2.3 | X | X | \$17.2 | \$56.5 | | | 4 |
| AFMC | Eglin | F-15 | 24 | 22 | 0.9 | \$0.0 | \$17.3 | \$66.7 | | | | 3 |
| AFRC | Eglin | MC-130 | 7 | 14 | 2.0 | X | \$4.2 | \$48.6 | | | | 3 |
| AFRC | Eglin | MC-130 | 7 | 9 | 1.3 | X | | | | | | 1.3 |
| AFMC | Eglin | VARIOUS | 24 | 0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0 |
| ANG | Eielson | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| PACAF | Eielson | A-10 | 24 | 18 | 0.8 | \$0.0 | \$113.1 | | | | | 2 |
| PACAF | Eielson | F-16 | 24 | 18 | 0.8 | \$57.9 | \$306.1 | \$398.5 | | | | 3 |
| ANG | Ellington Field, TX | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Installation Sort

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equip In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|------------------|--------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|----------------------------|
| * ACC | Ellsworth | B-1 | 12 | 29 | 2.4 | X | X | \$16.4 | \$53.1 | | | 4 |
| PACAF | Elmendorf | C-12 | 12 | 3 | 0.3 | | | | | | | 0.3 |
| PACAF | Elmendorf | C-17 | 12 | 8 | 0.7 | \$8.1 | | | | | | 1 |
| PACAF | Elmendorf | E-3 | 6 | 2 | 0.3 | | | | | | | 0.3 |
| PACAF | Elmendorf | F-15 | 24 | 42 | 1.8 | X | \$0.0 | \$185.0 | \$237.6 | | | 4 |
| PACAF | Elmendorf | F-15 | 24 | 18 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| ANG | Fairchild | KC-135 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | \$15.8 | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | Fairchild | KC-135 | 16 | 38 | 2.4 | \$12.1 | \$10.5 | \$30.8 | | | | 3 |
| AETC | Fairchild | UH-1 | 6 | 3 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ANG | Forbes Field, KS | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$6.6 | \$46.0 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Fort Smith | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Fort Wayne, IN | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Fort Worth | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$11.7 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Fort Worth | F-16 | 24 | 17 | 0.7 | \$12.1 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Fresno | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Gabreski, NY | HC-130 | 7 | 4 | 0.6 | \$0.2 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Gabreski, NY | HH-60 | 7 | 5 | 0.7 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Gen Mitchell | C-130 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | \$5.5 | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | Grand Forks | KC-135 | 16 | 36 | 2.3 | X | X | | | | | 2.3 |
| ANG | Great Falls, MT | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Grissom | KC-135 | 16 | 16 | 1.0 | X | \$25.7 | | | | | 2 |

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equiv In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|----------------|-----------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|----------------------------|
| ANG | Hancock, NY | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Harrisburg, PA | EC-130 | 16 | 6 | 0.4 | | | | | | | 0.4 |
| ANG | Hector, ND | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Hickam | F-15 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Hickam | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| PACAF | Hickam | C-17 | 12 | 8 | 0.7 | \$11.1 | \$154.8 | \$164.7 | | | | 3 |
| PACAF | Hickam | C-37/C-40 | 2 | 2 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Hill | F-16 | 24 | 17 | 0.7 | \$1.6 | \$30.1 | | | | | 2 |
| AFMC | Hill | F-16 | 24 | 4 | 0.2 | \$74.7 | \$96.2 | | | | | 2 |
| ACC | Hill | F-16 | 24 | 76 | 3.2 | X | X | X | \$65.1 | \$67.5 | | 5 |
| ACC | Holloman | F-117 | 24 | 51 | 2.1 | X | X | \$25.9 | \$55.6 | | | 4 |
| ACC | Holloman | MQ1/9 | 32 | 24 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| ACC | Holloman | QF-4 | 24 | 20 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| ACC | Holloman | T-38 | 24 | 14 | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.6 |
| ACC | Holloman | Tomado | 24 | 42 | 1.8 | X | | | | | | 1.8 |
| AFRC | Homestead | F-16 | 24 | 17 | 0.7 | \$4.5 | \$21.2 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Hulman | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFSOC | Hurlburt | AC-130 | 7 | 33 | 4.7 | X | X | X | X | \$49.9 | \$33.8 | 6 |
| AFSOC | Hurlburt | MH-53 | 7 | 17 | 2.4 | X | X | | | | | 2.4 |
| AFSOC | Hurlburt | VARIOUS | 5 | 5 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ACC | Indian Sprs AS | MQ1/9 | 32 | 100 | 3.1 | X | X | X | \$39.0 | \$41.3 | | 5 |

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equip In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------------------------|
| ANG | Jackson | C-17 | 12 | 8 | 0.7 | \$4.9 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Jacksonville | F-15 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Joe Foss Field | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.4 | \$29.8 | | | | | 2 |
| AFRC | Keesler | C-130 | 16 | 18 | 1.1 | X | | | | | | 1.3 |
| ANG | Key Field | KC-135 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | \$11.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AETC | Kirtland | CV-22 | 7 | 6 | 0.9 | \$0.0 | \$14.8 | \$89.0 | | | | 3 |
| ANG | Kirtland | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AETC | Kirtland | HC-130 | 16 | 12 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| AETC | Kirtland | HH-60 | 7 | 13 | 1.9 | X | | | | | | 1.9 |
| ANG | Klamath Falls | F-15 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | \$59.6 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Kulis, AK | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ANG | Kulis, AK | HC-130 | 7 | 3 | 0.4 | | | | | | | 0.4 |
| ANG | Kulis, AK | HH-60 | 7 | 5 | 0.7 | | | | | | | 0.7 |
| AFRC | Lackland | C-5 | 12 | 16 | 1.3 | X | \$78.8 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Lackland (Kelly Field) | F-16 | 24 | 18 | 0.8 | \$0.0 | \$44.8 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Lambert, MO | F-15 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ACC | Langley | F-22 | 24 | 75 | 3.1 | X | X | X | \$38.6 | \$65.9 | | 5 |
| ANG | Lincoln, NE | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ANG | Little Rock | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| AETC | Little Rock | C-130 | 16 | 69 | 4.3 | X | X | X | X | | | 6.8 |
| ANG | Louisville, KY | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Installation Sort

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equip In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|------------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|--------|----------------------------|
| AFRC | Luke | F-16 | 24 | 17 | 0.7 | \$4.6 | | | | | | 1 |
| AETC | Luke | F-16 | 24 | 163 | 6.8 | X | X | X | X | X | X | 6.8 |
| AETC | Luke (FMS) | F-16 | 24 | 23 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | MacDill | KC-135 | 16 | 33 | 2.1 | X | \$28.4 | \$105.9 | | | | 3 |
| NOAA | MacDill | VARIOUS | 13 | 13 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Madison, WI | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Mansfield, OH | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| AFRC | March | C-17 | 12 | 8 | 0.7 | \$14.7 | \$72.5 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | March | KC-135 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.6 |
| AFRC | March | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$7.6 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Martinsburg, WV | C-5 | 12 | 10 | 0.8 | \$4.8 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Maxwell | C-130 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.6 |
| AMC | McChord | C-17 | 12 | 42 | 3.5 | X | X | X | \$205.0 | \$253.8 | | 5 |
| ANG | McConnell | KC-135 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | McConnell | KC-135 | 16 | 58 | 3.6 | X | X | X | | | | 3.6 |
| ANG | McEntire, SC | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.3 | \$53.5 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | McGhee Tyson, TN | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$32.7 | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | McGuire | C-17 | 12 | 12 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | McGuire | KC-10 | 12 | 30 | 2.5 | X | X | \$132.4 | \$223.4 | | | 4 |
| ANG | McGuire | KC-135 | 16 | 16 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Memphis, TN | C-5 | 12 | 8 | 0.7 | \$4.4 | | | | | | 1 |

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Installation Sort

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equip In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|---------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|----------------------------|
| ANG | Milwaukee, WI | KC-135 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | \$45.1 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Minneapolis | C-130 | 16 | 16 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Minneapolis- St. Paul, MN | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ACC | Minot | B-52 | 12 | 35 | 2.9 | X | X | \$0.0 | \$67.2 | \$114.6 | | 5 |
| ACC | Minot | UH-1 | 6 | 6 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Moffett | HH-60 | 7 | 5 | 0.7 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Moffett | MC-130 | 7 | 4 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFSOC | Moody | HC-130 | 7 | 12 | 1.7 | X | X | \$13.4 | \$23.3 | | | 4 |
| AFSOC | Moody | HH-60 | 7 | 16 | 2.3 | X | X | | | | | 2.3 |
| AFSOC | Moody | T-38 | 24 | 55 | 2.3 | X | X | | | | | 2.3 |
| AFSOC | Moody | T-6A | 24 | 39 | 1.6 | X | | | | | | 1.6 |
| ACC | Mt Home | F-15 | 24 | 49 | 2.0 | X | X | \$24.8 | \$33.3 | | | 4 |
| ACC | Mt Home | F-16 | 24 | 22 | 0.9 | | | | | | | 0.9 |
| ANG | Nashville, TN | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ACC | Nellis | A-10 | 24 | 10 | 0.4 | | | | | | | 0.4 |
| ACC | Nellis | F-15 | 24 | 32 | 1.3 | X | \$88.4 | \$89.0 | | | | 3 |
| ACC | Nellis | F-16 | 24 | 53 | 2.2 | X | X | | | | | 2.2 |
| ACC | Nellis | F-22 | 24 | 17 | 0.7 | | | | | | | 0.7 |
| AFSOC | Nellis | HH-60 | 7 | 16 | 2.3 | X | X | | | | | 2.3 |
| ACC | Nellis | JSF | 24 | 14 | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.6 |
| ANG | New Castle | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$28.6 | | | | | | 1 |

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Installation Sort

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equip In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|--------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|----------------------------|
| AFRC | New Orleans | A-10 | 24 | 17 | 0.7 | \$32.9 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | New Orleans | F-15 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Niagara | C-130 | 16 | 11 | 0.7 | \$20.3 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Niagara | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ACC | Offutt | E-4 | 5 | 4 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| ACC | Offutt | E-6 | 6 | 2 | 0.3 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| ACC | Offutt | RC-135 | 5 | 17 | 3.4 | X | X | X | \$56.5 | | | 4 |
| ANG | Otis ANG | F-15 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.5 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Patrick | HC-130 | 7 | 5 | 0.7 | \$3.7 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Patrick | HH-60 | 7 | 9 | 1.3 | X | | | | | | 1.1 |
| AFRC | Patrick | VARIOUS | 8 | 8 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Pease, NH | KC-135 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | \$17.7 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Peoria | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$43.1 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Peterson | C-130 | 16 | 12 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| AMC | Peterson | C-21 | 12 | 10 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| AFSPC | Peterson | VARIOUS | 13 | 13 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Phoenix | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| AFRC | Pittsburgh | C-130 | 16 | 9 | 0.6 | | | | | | | 0.6 |
| ANG | Pittsburgh | KC-135 | 16 | 16 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | Pope | A-10 | 24 | 36 | 1.5 | X | | | | | | 1.5 |
| AMC | Pope | C-130 | 16 | 28 | 1.8 | X | \$0.0 | \$72.9 | \$125.4 | | | 4 |

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Installation Sort

| MAJCOM | Installation | MDS | PAA Used | Total Acft # | Sqdn Equiv In Place | Sqdn 1 | Sqdn 2 | Sqdn 3 | Sqdn 4 | Sqdn 5 | Sqdn 6 | Total Capacity (Squadrons) |
|--------|----------------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------------------------|
| AMC | Pope | VARIOUS | 11 | 11 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Portland | F-15 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Portland | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ANG | Quonset, RI | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$29.4 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Reno, NV | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ANG | Richmond, VA | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Rickenbacker AGS, OH | KC-135 | 16 | 18 | 1.1 | X | | | | | | 1.1 |
| ANG | Robins | E-8 | 16 | 14 | 0.9 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AMC | Robins | KC-135 | 16 | 12 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 0.8 |
| ANG | Rosecrans, MO | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ANG | Salt Lake City, UT | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$45.9 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | San Juan | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ANG | Savannah | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$11.3 | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Schenectady | C-130 | 16 | 14 | 0.9 | | | | | | | 0.9 |
| AMC | Scott | C-21 | 12 | 14 | 1.2 | X | \$29.2 | | | | | 2 |
| AFRC | Scott | C-9 | 6 | 6 | 1.0 | X | | | | | | 1 |
| ANG | Scott | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| ANG | Selfridge | C-130 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$21.8 | \$26.3 | | | | | 2 |
| ANG | Selfridge | F-16 | 24 | 15 | 0.6 | \$0.0 | | | | | | 1 |
| AFRC | Selfridge | KC-135 | 16 | 8 | 0.5 | \$9.3 | | | | | | 1 |
| ACC | Seymour Johnson | F-15 | 24 | 96 | 4.0 | X | X | X | X | \$53.5 | \$75.0 | 6 |

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Alabama

Birmingham IAP

| | |
|--|--|
| - ANG KC-135Rs | To Bangor Apt., NE; McGhee-Tyson AGS, TN; and Phoenix Sky Harbor IAP, AZ |
| - ANG Fire fighters | To Dannelly Field AGS, AL |
| + Armed Forces Reserve Center, Birmingham (Army) | From Birmingham AGS, AL |

Dannelly Field ANGB

| | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| + F-16 block 30 | From Great Falls IAP AGS, MT |
| + ANG Fire fighters | From Birmingham IAP AGS, AL |

Maxwell AFB

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| + C-130H | From Mansfield-Lahm AGS, OH |
| - C4ISR RDAT&E Consolidations (Tech) | To Hanscom AFB, MA |
| - Establish Joint CoE for Religious Functions (E&T) | To Fort Jackson, SC |

Redstone Arsenal

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| + Establish Joint Centers for Rotary Wing RDAT&E (Tech) | From Robins AFB, GA |
|---|---------------------|

Alaska

Eielson AFB

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| - A-10 | To Barksdale AFB, LA; Moody AFB, GA; and back-up aircraft inventory |
| - F-16 block 40 | To Nellis AFB, NV |

Elmendorf AFB

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Establish Joint Base-Elmendorf-Rich. (HSA) | From Fort Richardson, AK |
| + C-130H | From Dyess AFB, TX |
| + ANG Wing | From Kulis AGS, AK |
| + C-130H, HC-130N, HH-60 | From Kulis AGS, AK |
| - F-15E | To Mountain Home AFB, ID |
| - F-15C/D | To Langley AFB, VA |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Kulis AGS

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| - ANG Wing | To Elmendorf AFB, AK |
| - C-130H, HC-130N, HH-60 | To Elmendorf AFB, AK |

Arizona***Air Force Research Lab Mesa City***

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| - Defense Research Service Led Labs (Tech) | To Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |
|---|-----------------------------|

Luke AFB

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| - Regional Supply Sq manpower | To Logistics Readiness Sq Langley AFB, VA |
| - F-16 Blk 25 & 42 | To retire |
| - F-16 Blk 32 | To Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA |
| - JSF Initial Joint Trng Site (E&T) | To Eglin AFB, FL |

Phoenix Sky Harbor IAP AGS

| | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|
| + KC-135R | From Birmingham IAP AGS, AL |
|-----------|-----------------------------|

Arkansas***Fort Smith Regional Apt. AGS***

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| - F-16 block 32 | To Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA; and to retire |
| - F-16 block 25 | To retire |
| - Fire fighters | To Savannah IAP AGS GA; and Tulsa IAP AGS, OK |

Little Rock AFB

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| + C-130E/H | From: Niagara Falls ARS, NY, Schenectady Apt AGS, NY, Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS, NV, Mansfield-Lahm Mncpl Apt AGS, OH, Pope AFB, NC, Dyess AFB, TX, General Mitchell ARS, WI |
| +/- C-130J | Transfer from active duty to ANG at Little Rock |
| - C-130 E | To retire and back up aircraft inventory |
| - C-130J | To Quonset State Apt. AGS RI; Channel Islands AGS, CA, and Little Rock AFB, AR (ANG) |
| - Regional Supply Sq manpower | To Logistics Readiness Sq, Scott AFB, IL |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

California

Beale AFB

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| - AFRC Air Refueling Wing | Realign in place for emerging missions |
| - KC-135R | To Selfridge ANGB MI; and McGhee Tyson Apt. AGS, TN |

Channel Islands AGS

| | |
|--|--|
| + Expeditionary Combat Support (Aerial Port) | From Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS, NV |
| + C-130J | From Little Rock AFB, AR, and Martin State AGS, MD |
| - C-130E | To retire |

NAS China Lake

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| + Establish Joint Centers for Fixed Wing RDAT&E (Tech) | From Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |
|--|-------------------------------|

Edwards AFB

| | |
|--|--|
| + Maritime/ Air & Space C4ISR RDAT&E (Tech) | From Eglin AFB, FL |
| - Department of Defense Joint Regional Correctional Facilities (HSA) | To Marine Corps Station Miramar, San Diego, CA |

Fresno-Yosemite Air Terminal AGS

| | |
|--|---|
| + Expeditionary Combat Support (Fire fighters) | From Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS, NV |
| + F-16 block 32 | From Luke AFB, AZ, Fort Smith Mncpl. Apt. AGS, AR, and Nellis AFB, NV |

March ARB

| | |
|---------------|--|
| - ANG KC-135R | To March (AFRC) ARB, CA; Pease International Tradeport AGS, NH; McGhee-Tyson ANGB, TN; and McConnell AFB, KS |
|---------------|--|

MCAS Miramar

| | |
|--|------------------|
| - Joint Strike Fighter Initial Trng Site (E&T) | To Eglin AFB, FL |
|--|------------------|

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Onizuka AFS

- AF Satellite Control Network backup To Vandenberg AFB, Ca

Vandenberg AFB

+ AFRC Air Refueling Wing Expeditionary From Portland IAP AGS, OR
Combat Support

+ AF Satellite Control Network backup From Onizuka AFS Sunnyvale, CA

Colorado***Buckley AFB***

+ F-16 From Springfield-Beckley

Buckley AFB Annex

+ Consolidate Defense Finance and From Offutt AFB, NE
Accounting Functions (HSA)

- Consolidate/Co-locate Personnel & To Randolph AFB, TX
Recruiting Centers for Army, Navy, and Air
Force (HSA)

- Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve To Robins AFB, GA
Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army,
Navy, and Air Force (HSA)

Colorado Springs

- Co-locate Military Investigation Agencies To Peterson AFB, CO
(HSA)

Fort Carson

+ Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics From USAF Academy, CO
(Med)

Peterson AFB

+ Co-locate Service Investigation Agencies From Colorado Springs, CO
(HSA)

+ C-130Hs From Dyess AFB

USAF Academy

- Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics To Fort Carson, CO
(Med)

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Connecticut

Bradley IAP AGS

| | |
|--|---|
| + Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility | From Barnes AGS, MA, Selfridge ANGB, MI, Shaw AFB, SC, Martin State AGS, MD |
| + Air Sovereignty Alert facility | From Otis ANGB, MA |
| - A-10 | To Barnes Mncpl Apt AGS, MA, and to retire |

Delaware

Dover AFB

| | |
|---|--|
| + Expeditionary Combat Support (Aerial Port & Fire fighters) | From New Castle County Apt. AGS, DE |
| + Establish National Military Medical Center and realign Air Force Institute of Pathology (Med) | From Walter Reed Army Medical Center, DC |

New Castle County Apt. AGS

| | |
|---|--|
| - C-130H | To Charlotte/Douglas IAP AGS, NC; and Savannah IAP AGS, GA |
| - Flying related Expeditionary Combat Support | To McGuire State AGS, RI; and Dover AFB, DE |

Florida

Eglin AFB

| | |
|--|--|
| + Expeditionary Combat Support (AFRC) manpower | From Willow Grove ARS, PA |
| + JSF Initial Joint Trng Site (E&T) | From MCAS Miramar, CA, Luke AFB, AZ, NAS Oceana, VA, NAS Pensacola, FL, Sheppard AFB, TX |
| + Relocate Wpns /Armaments RDAT&E Ctrs (Tech) | From Fort Belvoir, VA, and Hill AFB, UT |
| + Relocate 7th SFG (Army) | From Fort Bragg, NC |
| - Regional Supply Sq manpower | To Logistics Support Center, Scott AFB, Ill |
| - Maritime /Air & Space C4ISR RDAT&E (Tech) | To Edwards AFB, CA |

Homestead ARB

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| + F-16 block 30 | From Hill AFB, UT, and Richmond IAP AGS, VA |
|-----------------|---|

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-)= outbound assets

Jacksonville IAP AGS

| | |
|---|--|
| + F-15C | From Otis ANGB, MA, and Mountain Home AFB, ID |
| - F-100 engine intermediate maintenance | To Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility at NAS New Orleans ARS, LA (ANG) |

MacDill AFB

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| + Air Refueling Wing (AFRC--personnel only) | From Selfridge ANGB, MI |
| + KC-135R | From Grand Forks AFB, ND |
| - Convert inpatient services to clinics (Med) | N/A |

Patrick AFB

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| - Integrated Wpns /Armaments RDAT&E Ctrs (Tech) | To Sub Base Kings Bay, GA |
|---|---------------------------|

NAS Pensacola

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| + DoD Undergraduate Pilot and NAV/NFO/ CSO training (E&T) | From Randolph AFB, TX |
| - JSF Initial Trng Site (E&T) | To Eglin AFB, FL |
| - Create CoE for Chem/Bio/Rad (Med) | To Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |

Tyndall AFB

| | |
|--|--|
| + F-15 Avionics Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility | From Langley AFB, VA |
| - F-100 engine intermediate maintenance | To Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility at NAS New Orleans ARS, LA (ANG) |
| - Create CoE for Chem/Bio/Rad (Med) | To Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD |

Georgia

NAS Atlanta

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| - Close NAS Atlanta, GA; (Navy) | To Dobbins ARB, GA, Robins AFB, GA |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|

Dobbins ARB

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| + C-130H | From Gen Mitchell ARS, WI |
| + Naval Air Reserve and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center (Navy) | From NAS Atlanta, GA |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Sub Base Kings Bay

+ Integrated Wpns /Armaments RDAT&E Ctrs (Tech) From Patrick AFB, FL

Moody AFB

+ A-10 From Pope AFB, GA, and Eielson AFB, AK

+ ALQ-184 maint. manpower for Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility From Shaw AFB, SC

- T-6, T-38 (E&T) To Columbus AFB, MS, Laughlin AFB, TX, Randolph AFB, TX, Sheppard AFB, TX, Vance AFB, OK

Savannah IAP AGS

+ C-130H From New Castle County Apt. AGS, DE

+ Fire fighter positions To Fort Smith Mncpl. Apt. AGS, AR

Robins AFB

- KC-135R To McConnell AFB, KS

+ 202 EIS, Middle Georgia Rgnl. Apt., Macon To Robins AFB, GA

+ Storage and distribution functions (S&S) Various locations

+ Consolidate service ICPs under DLA (S&S) From Hill AFB, UT; Lackland AFB, TX; Tinker AFB, OK; Wright-Patterson AFB, OH

+ Privatized supply, storage and distribution (S&S) Various locations

+ AH-1 Cobra helicopter (Navy) From NAS Atlanta, GA

+ Consolidate/Co-locate service personnel & recruiting centers (HSA) From Air Reserve Personnel Center, CO

- Consolidate civilian personnel offices within each service and the defense agencies (HSA) To Randolph AFB, TX

- Consolidate/Co-locate service personnel & recruiting centers (HSA) To Randolph AFB, TX

- Establish Joint Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform RDAT&E (Tech) To Wright-Patterson AFB, OH

- Establish Joint Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform RDAT&E (Tech) To Redstone Arsenal, AL

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Hawaii

Hickam AFB

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| + KC-135R | From Grand Forks AFB, ND |
| - RSS positions | To Logistics Support Center, Langley AFB, VA, |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Establish Jnt Bases (Hickam/Pearl Harbor) (HSA) | N/A |
|---|-----|

Idaho

Boise Air Terminal AGS

| | |
|----------|---------------------------|
| + A-10 | From Willow Grove ARS, PA |
| - C-130H | To Cheyenne AGS, WY |

Mountain Home AFB

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| + F-15E | From Elmendorf AFB, AK |
| - F-16 block 52 | To McEntire AGS, SC; Nellis AFB, NV; and back-up aircraft inventory |
| - F-15C | To Nellis AFB, NV; Jacksonville IAP AGS, FL; and to retire |

Illinois

Capital Mncpl. Apt. AGS

| | |
|---|---|
| + F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility | From Truax, AGS, WI; Joe Foss Field AGS, SD; Des Moines AGS, IA; Fort Wayne AGS, IN; and Lackland AFB, TX |
| - F-16 block 30 | To Fort Wayne IAP AGS, IN |
| - Fire fighters | To Dane County Rgnl Apt.-Truax Field AGS, WI |

Greater Peoria Regional Apt. AGS

| | |
|----------|----------------------------|
| + C-130H | From Nashville IAP AGS, TN |
|----------|----------------------------|

Scott AFB

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| + KC-135R | From Grand Forks AFB, ND |
| - KC-135E | To retire |
| + Logistics Readiness Sq | From Hurlburt AFB, FL; Little Rock AFB, AR; and Altus AFB, OK |
| + Fire fighters | From Lambert-St Louis IAP AGS, MO |
| + Co-locate TRANSCOM Components (HSA) | From Alexandria/I-395 Annex, VA, Fort Eustis VA, Norfolk VA |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-)= outbound assets

- Disestablish inpatient capabilities at Scott AFB (Med) N/A

Indiana

Fort Wayne IAP AGS

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| + F-16 block 30 | From Capital Apt. AGS, IL, and Hulman Regional Apt. AGS, IN |
| - F-16 block 25 | To retire |
| - F-110 intermediate maintenance | To Capital AGS, IL |

Grissom ARB

- Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center (Navy)

Hulman Regional Apt. AGS

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| - F-16 block 30 | To Fort Wayne IAP AGS, IN; and to retire |
|-----------------|--|

Iowa

Des Moines IAP AGS

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| + F-16 block 30 | From Great Falls IAP AGS, MT, Springfield Beckley Mncpl. Apt. AGS, OH, and Richmond IAP AGS, VA |
| - F-16 block 42 | To Toledo Express Apt. AGS, OH; and Tulsa IAP AGS, OK |
| - F-110 intermediate maintenance | To Capital AGS, IL |

Sioux Gateway AGS

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| + KC-135R | From Fairchild AFB, WA (ANG) |
| + Regional Supply Sq manpower | From LRS Langley AFB, VA |
| - KC-135E | To retire |

Kansas

Forbes Field AGS

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| + KC135R | From McConnell AFB, KS (ANG), and Portland IAP, OR (AFRC) |
| - KC-135E | To retire |
| + ANG ops and maintenance manpower | From McConnell AFB, KS (ANG) |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

McConnell AFB

| | |
|--|---|
| + KC-135R | From Grand Forks AFB, ND, Robins AFB, GA, March ARB, CA |
| - KC-135R | To Forbes Field AGS, KS |
| + Standard Air Munitions Package (STAMP)/Standard Tank, Rack, Adaptor, and Pylon Packages (STRAPP) | From Lackland AFB, (Medina Annex), TX |
| - ANG Air Refueling Wing ops and maint. manpower | To Forbes Field AGS, KS |

Kentucky

Louisville IAP AGS

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| + Aerial Port Squadron (ANG) | From Mansfield-Lahm Mncpl. Apt. AGS, OH |
| + C-130H | From Nashville IAP AGS, TN |

Louisiana

Barksdale AFB

| | |
|--------|---|
| + A-10 | From Eielson AFB, AK, and NAS New Orleans ARS, LA |
|--------|---|

New Orleans ARS

| | |
|---|--|
| + Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (ANG) | From Tyndall AFB, FL; and Jacksonville AGS, FL |
| - AFRC A-10 | To Whiteman AFB, MO; and Barksdale AFB, LA |
| - AFRC WG HQ element | To Nellis AFB, NV |
| - AFRC Expeditionary Combat Support | To Buckley AFB, CO |
| + ANG F-15C | From Portland IAP AGS, OR |
| + 214 th EIS (geographically separated unit) | From Jackson Barracks, New Orleans, LA |

Maine

Bangor IAP AGS

| | |
|-----------|---|
| + KC-135R | From Birmingham AGS, AL, Key Field AGS, MS, and Niagara AGS, ME |
| - KC-135E | To retire |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Maryland

Aberdeen Proving Grounds

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| + 311 Human Sys. WG (Med) | From Brooks City-Base, TX |
| - Create CoE for Chem/Bio/Rad (Med) | From Brooks City-Base, TX, Tyndall AFB, FL |

Andrews AFB

| | |
|---|---|
| + F-16 block 30 | From Cannon AFB, NM |
| - Air Force Flight Standards Agency | To Will Rogers Apt. AGS, OK |
| - C-21 | To Will Rogers Apt. AGS, OK |
| - Air Force Flight Standards Agency support personnel | To Tinker AFB, OK |
| + Co-locate miscellaneous USAF leased locations and National Guard HQ (HSA) | From Alexandria/I-395 Annex, VA, Crystal City, VA, Rosslyn - Ballston, VA |
| - Disestablish Andrews AFB inpatient services (Med) | N/A |
| - Co-locate service investigation agencies (HSA) | To MCB Quantico, VA |

NNMC Bethesda

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| + Co-locate Service and DoD Medical Activities (HSA) | From Bolling AFB, DC |
| + Consolidate Extramural Research Prgm Mgrs | From Arlington, VA |

Martin State Apt. AGS

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| + A-10 | From Willow Grove ARS, PA |
| - C-130J | To Channel Islands AGS, CA; and Quonset State Apt. AGS, RI |
| - Engine intermediate maintenance | To Bradley IAP AGS, CT |

Fort Meade

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| + Collocate Defense/Service Adjudication Activities at Ft Meade (HSA) | From Bolling AFB, DC |
|---|----------------------|

NAS Pax River

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| + Establish Joint Centers for Rotary Wing RDA, &T&E (Tech) | From Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |
|--|-------------------------------|

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Massachusetts

Barnes Mncpl. Apt. AGS

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| + A-10 | From Bradley IAP AGS, CT |
| - TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance | To Bradley IAP AGS, CT |

Hanscom AFB

| | |
|--|--|
| + C4ISR RDAT&E Consolidations (Tech) | From Lackland AFB, TX, Maxwell AFB, AL, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |
| - Defense Research Service Led Labs (Tech) | To Kirtland AFB, NM, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |

Otis ANGB

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| - F-15C | To Jacksonville IAP, FL and Atlantic City IAP AGS, NJ |
| - Fire fighters | To Quonset State Apt. AGS, RI |

Westover ARB

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| + Armed Forces Reserve Center (Army) | From Chicopee, MA |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|

Michigan

Selfridge ANGB

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| + ANG KC-135R | From Selfridge (AFRC) ANGB, MI, and Beale AFB, CA |
| + A-10 | From W K Kellogg Apt. AGS, MI, Willow Grove ARS, PA |
| - AFRC KC-135R | To Selfridge ANGB, MI |
| - F-16 block 30 | To retire |
| - C-130E | To retire |
| - Engine Intermediate Maintenance | To Bradley IAP AGS, CT |

W. K. Kellogg Apt. AGS

| | |
|--------|-----------------------|
| - A-10 | To Selfridge ANGB, MI |
|--------|-----------------------|

Minnesota

Duluth IAP AGS

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| - F-16 block 25 | To retire |
|-----------------|-----------|

Mississippi

Columbus AFB

| | |
|-------------|--------------------|
| + T-6 (E&T) | From Moody AFB, GA |
|-------------|--------------------|

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Keesler AFB

| | |
|---|-----|
| -Disestablish inpatient capabilities at Kessler AFB (Med) | N/A |
|---|-----|

Key Field AGS

| | |
|-----------|--|
| - KC-135R | To General Mitchell Apt. AGS, WI; McGhee-Tyson Apt. AGS, TN; Bangor Apt. AGS, ME; and back-up aircraft inventory |
|-----------|--|

Missouri***Lambert-St Louis IAP AGS***

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| - F-15 | To Nellis AFB, NV; and Atlantic City IAP AGS, NJ |
| - Fire fighters | To Scott AFB, IL |

Rosecrans Memorial Apt. AGS

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| + C130Hs | From Will Rogers World Apt. AGS, OK |
| + Aeromedical Squadron | From Will Rogers World Apt. AGS, OK |

Whiteman AFB

| | |
|--------|------------------------------|
| + A-10 | From NAS New Orleans ARS, LA |
|--------|------------------------------|

Montana***Great Falls IAP AGS***

| | |
|---|--|
| - F-16 block 30 | To Dannelly Field AGS, AL; Des Moines IAP AGS, IA; and to retire |
| - Fire fighters and Expeditionary Combat Support elements | To Malmstrom AFB, MT |

Malmstrom AFB

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| + Armed Forces Reserve Center | From Galt Hall USARC, MT |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|

Nebraska***Offutt AFB***

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| + Expeditionary Combat Support (AFRC-non-flying) manpower | From Pittsburgh IAP ARS, PA |
| - Consolidate Defense Finance and Accounting System (HSA) | To Buckley AFB Annex, CO |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Nevada

Nellis AFB

| | |
|---|--|
| + F-15C | From Lambert-St Louis IAP AGS, MO, and Mountain Home AFB, ID |
| + F-16 block 40 | From Cannon AFB, NM, and Eielson AFB, AK |
| + ANG operations and maintenance manpower (associate) | From Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS, NV |
| + AFRC wing HQ element | From New Orleans ARS |
| + F-16 block 52 | From Mountain Home AFB, ID |
| - F-16 block 42 | To Tulsa IAP AGS, OK; and to retire |
| - F-16 block 32 | To Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA; and to retire |

Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS

| | |
|--|---|
| - C-130H | To Little Rock AFB, AR |
| - Expeditionary Combat Supports (flying) | To Channel Islands AGS, CA (Aerial Port); and Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA (Fire fighters) |

New Hampshire

Pease International Tradeport AGS

| | |
|-----------|---------------------|
| + KC-135R | From March (ANG) CA |
|-----------|---------------------|

New Jersey

Atlantic City IAP AGS

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| + F-15C | From Otis ANGB, MA, Lambert-St Louis IAP AGS, MO, and Portland IAP AGS, OR |
| - F-16 block 25 | To Burlington IAP AGS VT; and to retire |

McGuire AFB

| | |
|---|---|
| + H-53, C-130, C-9, C-12, AH-1 (Navy) | From MCRC Johnstown, PA, Willow Grove, PA |
| Establish Jnt Base (McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst) (HSA) | N/A |
| Establish Jnt Mobilization Site (McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst) (HSA) | N/A |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

New Mexico

Cannon AFB

| | |
|--------|---|
| - F-16 | To Dane County Regional APT, Truax Field AGS, WI (block 30); Joe Foss Field AGS, SD (block 30); Kirtland AFB, NM (block 30); Andrews AFB, MD (block 30); Hill AFB, UT (block 40); Nellis AFB, NV (block 40); and back-up aircraft inventory (block 40/50) |
|--------|---|

Kirtland AFB

| | |
|--|--|
| + F-16 block 30 | From Cannon AFB, NM |
| + Armed Forces Reserve Center | From Jenkins Armed Forces Reserve Center, NM |
| + Defense Research Service Led Laboratories (Tech) | From Hanscom AFB, MA |
| - Department of Defense Joint Regional Correctional Facilities (HSA) | To MCAS, Miramar, San Diego, CA |

New York

Niagara Falls IAP ARS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| - C-130H | To Little Rock AFB, AR |
| - KC-135R | To Bangor IAP AGS, MA |
| - AFRC Expeditionary Combat Support | To Schriever AFS, CO |
| - AFRC HQ elements | To Langley AFB, VA |

Schenectady Apt. AGS

| | |
|----------|------------------------|
| - C-130H | To Little Rock AFB, AR |
|----------|------------------------|

Rome Labs

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| - Defense led Research labs (selected) | To Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |
|--|-----------------------------|

North Carolina

Charlotte/Douglas IAP AGS

| | |
|----------|-------------------------------------|
| + C-130H | From New Castle County Apt. AGS, DE |
|----------|-------------------------------------|

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Pope AFB

| | |
|--|--|
| + C-130H | From Yeager AGS, WV and Pittsburgh ARS, PA |
| + Expeditionary Combat Support (AFRC) | From Gen Mitchell ARS, WI |
| - C-130E | To Little Rock AFB, AR |
| - A-10 | To Moody AFB, GA |
| + HQ US Army Forces Command and HQ US Army Reserve Command (HSA) | From Fort McPherson, GA |
| + US Army Forces Command (HSA) | From Fort Gillem, GA, Ft Dix, NJ |

Seymour Johnson AFB

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| + Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility | From Langley AFB, VA |
| + KC-135R | From Grand Forks AFB, ND |

North Dakota**Grand Forks AFB**

| | |
|-----------|--|
| - KC-135R | To Scott AFB, IL; Seymour-Johnson AFB NC; McConnell AFB, KS; MacDill AFB, FL; and Hickam AFB, HI |
|-----------|--|

Hector IAP AGS

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| - F-16 block 15 | To retire |
| + Armed Forces Reserve Centers (Army) | From Fargo, ND |

Ohio**Mansfield Lahm Apt. AGS**

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| - C-130H | To Maxwell AFB, AL, and Little Rock AFB, AR |
| - Aerial Port Sq | To Louisville IAP AGS, KY |
| - Fire fighters | To Toledo Express APT AGS, OH |
| + Armed Forces Reserve Centers (Army) | From Scouten Army Reserve Center, Mansfield, OH; Parrott Army Reserve Center, Kenton, OH |

Springfield- Beckley Mncpl. Apt. AGS

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| - F-16 block 30 | To Des Moines IAP AGS, IA; Buckley AFB, CO; and to retire |
| - Fire fighters | To Rickenbacker AGS, OH |
| + Armed Forces Reserve Centers (Army) | From Springfield OH |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Toledo Express Apt. AGS

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| + Fire fighters (ANG) | From Mansfield-Lahm Mncpl. Apt. AGS, OH |
| + F-16 block 42 | From Des Moines AGS, IA |

Wright-Patterson AFB

| | |
|---|---|
| + Consolidate service ICPs and transfer to DLA(S&S) | From various |
| + Defense Research Service Led Laboratories (Tech) | From Air Force Research Lab Mesa, AZ Hanscom AFB, MA Rome Laboratory, NY |
| + Establish Jnt Centers for Fixed Wing Platforms RDAT&E (Tech) | From Hill AFB, UT, Robins AFB, GA, Tinker AFB, OK |
| + Realign Air Force Human Systems D&A (Med) | From Brooks City-Base, TX |
| - C4ISR RDAT&E Consolidations (Tech) | To Hanscom AFB, MA |
| - Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Service and the Defense Agencies (HSA) | To Randolph AFB, TX |
| - Defense Research Service Led Laboratories (Tech) | To Hanscom AFB, MA |
| - Establish Jnt Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform RDAT&E (Tech) | To NAS China Lake, CA |
| - Establish Jnt Centers for Rotary Wing RDAT&E (Tech) | To NAS Pax River, MD |

Youngstown-Warren Regional Apt. ARS

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| + Expeditionary Combat Support (Aeromedical) manpower | From Pittsburgh IAP ARS, PA |
|---|-----------------------------|

Oklahoma

Altus AFB

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| - Regional Supply Squadron manpower | To Logistics Support Ctr, Scott AFB, IL |
|-------------------------------------|---|

Tinker AFB

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| + AIS BOS personnel | From Randolph AFB, TX |
| + KC-135R | From Portland IAP AGS, OR |
| + Ops and maint. manpower (for 4 aircraft) | From Portland IAP AGS, OR |
| - Global Air Traffic Operations Prgm Office | To Will Rogers World Apt. AGS, OK |
| - Consolidate service ICPs and transfer to DLA(S&S) | To Robins AFB, GA and DLA |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

| | |
|---|---|
| - Privatize Supply, Storage and Distribution on Specific Commodities (S&S) | |
| - Storage and Distribution Functions (S&S) | |
| - Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Service and the Defense Agencies (HSA) | To Randolph AFB, TX |
| - Establish Joint Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform RDAT&E (Tech) | |
| <i>Tulsa IAP AGS</i> | |
| + F-16 block 42 | From ANG fighter wing Des Moines, IA, and Nellis AFB, NV |
| + Fire fighters | From Fort Smith Mncpl. Apt. AGS, AR |
| <i>Vance AFB</i> | |
| + Armed Forces Reserve Center (Army) | From Robbins United States Army Reserve Center located in Enid, Oklahoma |
| + Undergraduate Pilot and NAV/ NFO/ CSO Trng (E&T) | From Moody AFB, GA |
| <i>Will Rogers World Apt. AGS</i> | |
| + Air Force Flight Standards Agency (AFFSA) | From Andrews AFB, MD |
| + C-21 | From Andrews AFB, MD |
| + USAF Advanced Instrument School | From Randolph AFB, TX |
| + Global Air Traffic Operations Program Office | From Tinker AFB, OK |
| - C-130H | To Carswell ARS, TX; and Rosecrans Memorial Air Port AGS, MO |
| - Aeromedical Squadron, Fire fighters | To Rosecrans Memorial Apt. AGS, MO |
| - Aerial Port | To Carswell ARS, TX |
| Oregon | |
| <i>Portland IAP AGS</i> | |
| - KC-135R | To Tinker AFB, OK (AFRC); Forbes AGS, KS, and to back-up aircraft inventory |
| - F-15C | To Atlantic City IAP AGS, NJ; NAS JRB New Orleans, LA |
| - AFRC Air Refueling Wing ops and maint. manpower | To Tinker AFB, OK |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| - AFRC Air Refueling Wing Expeditionary Combat Support | To Vandenberg AFB, CA |
| - Rescue squadron (AFRC) | To McChord AFB, WA |
| - EIS (Jackson Barracks) | To NAS New Orleans, LA |

Pennsylvania

MCRC Johnstown

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| - Close NAS JRB Willow Grove, PA, Realign Cambria Apt (Johnstown), PA; (Navy) | To McGuire AFB, NJ |
|---|--------------------|

Pittsburgh IAP-ARS

| | |
|--|---|
| - C-130H | To Pope/Ft Bragg, NC |
| - Expeditionary Combat Support (Aeromedical) | To Youngstown-Warren Regional Apt. ARS, OH |
| - Expeditionary Combat Support (non- flying) elements | To Offutt AFB, NE |

Tobyhanna

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| + Realign all depot maintenance workload and capability (Ind) | From Lackland AFB, TX |
|--|-----------------------|

Willow Grove ARS

| | |
|---|--|
| - C-130E | To retire |
| - A-10 | To Boise Air Terminal AGS, ID; Martin State Apt. AGS, MD; Selfridge ANGB, MI; Retire |
| - Expeditionary Combat Support (AFRC) manpower | To Eglin AFB, FL |
| - Close NAS JRB Willow Grove, PA, Realign Cambria Apt, PA (Navy) | To McGuire AFB, NJ |

Rhode Island

Quonset State Apt. AGS

| | |
|--|--|
| + Fire fighters | From Otis ANGB, MA |
| + C-130J | From Martin St., MD and Little Rock AFB, AR |
| + Expeditionary Combat Support (Aeromedical Sq) | From New Castle County Apt. AGS, DE |
| - C-130E | To retire |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

South Carolina

Charleston AFB

Establish Jnt Base (Charleston AFB/NAS N/A
Charleston) (HSA)

Fort Jackson

+ Establish Joint CoE for Religious From Maxwell AFB, AL
Functions (E&T)

McEntire AGS

+ F-16 block 52 From Mt Home AFB, ID

Shaw AFB

- TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance To Bradley IAP AGS, CT and Moody
AFB, GA

- ALQ-184 intermediate maintenance To Langley AFB, VA
manpower

+ 3d Army Headquarters (Army) From Fort McPherson, GA

South Dakota

Ellsworth AFB

- B-1B To Dyess AFB, TX

Joe Foss Field AGS

+ F-16 block 30 From Cannon AFB, NM

- F-110 intermediate maintenance To Capital AGS, IL

Tennessee

McGhee-Tyson Apt. AGS

+ KC-135R From Key Field AGS, MS, Birmingham
IAP AGS, AL, Beale AFB, CA, and
March (ANG), CA

- KC-135E To retire

Nashville IAP AGS

- C-130H To Greater Peoria Apt. AGS, IL;
Louisville IAP AGS, KY

- Expeditionary Combat Support (Fire To Memphis IAP AGS, TN
fighters & Aerial Port)

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-)= outbound assets

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| - Expeditionary Combat Support (Aeromedical) | To Carswell ARS, TX |
|---|---------------------|

Texas

Carswell ARS

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| + C-130H | From Will Rogers World Apt. AGS, OK |
| + F-16 block 30 | From Hill AFB, UT |
| + Aeromedical ECS | From Nashville |

Dyess AFB

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| + B-1B | From Ellsworth AFB, SD |
| - C-130H | To Elmendorf AFB, AK; Peterson AFB, CO and Little Rock AFB, AR |
| + Armed Forces Reserve Center | From Grimes United States Army Reserve Center, Abilene, Texas |

Lackland AFB

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| + F-16 block 30 | From Springfield-Beckley IAP, AGS, OH |
| - Standard Air Munitions Package (STAMP)/Standard Tank, Rack, Adaptor, and Pylon Packages (STRAPP) (Medina Annex) | To McConnell AFB, KS |
| - F-110 Intermediate Maintenance | To Capital AGS, IL |
| + Establish Joint Base (Lackland/Ft. Sam Houston/Randolph) (HSA) | Realign |
| - Department of Defense Joint Regional Correctional Facilities (HSA) | To Ft Leavenworth, KS |
| - Disestablish Inpatient Facility (Med) | To Fort Sam Houston, TX |
| - Transfer Service ICPs to DLA and Consolidate (Include DLRs) (S&S) | To Robins AFB, GA and DLA |
| - C4ISR RDAT&E Consolidations (Tech) | To Hanscom AFB, MA |
| - Establish Joint CoE for Culinary Trng (E&T) | To Fort Lee, VA |
| - Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Trng (E&T) | To Fort Lee, VA |
| - Realign all depot maintenance workload and capability (Ind) | To Tobyhanna, PA |
| + AFRC Expeditionary Combat Support | From Nashville |

Randolph AFB

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-)= outbound assets

| | |
|--|--|
| + Establish Joint Base (Lackland/Ft. Sam Houston/Randolph) (HSA) | N/A |
| + Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Service and Defense Agencies (HSA) | From Bolling AFB, DC, Hill AFB, UT, Robins AFB, GA, Tinker AFB, OK, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, Air Reserve Personnel Center, CO, Robins AFB, GA |
| + Undergraduate Pilot and NAV/ NFO/ CSO Trng (E&T) | From Moody AFB, GA |
| - Undergraduate Pilot and NAV/ NFO/ CSO Trng (E&T) | To NAS Pensacola, FL |
| - Advanced Instrument School (AIS) | To Will Rogers, OK |
| Sheppard AFB | |
| + T-6, T-38 (E&T) | From Moody AFB, GA |
| - Disestablish Medical Wing Inpatient Facility (Med) | To Fort Sam Houston, TX |
| - JSF Initial Joint Trng Site (E&T) | To Eglin AFB, FL |
| Brooks City - Base | |
| - USAF School of Aerospace Medicine, Institute of Operational Health, 311 Human Sys. WG, AF Research lab and assorted AF medical functions | To Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, Randolph AFB, TX, Lackland AFB, TX, Ft Sam, TX, and Aberdeen Prov. Gnd., MD |
| Utah | |
| Hill AFB | |
| + F-16 block 40 | From Cannon AFB, NM |
| - F-16 block 30 | To Homestead ARB, FL; Carswell ARS, NAS Fort Worth JRB, TX |
| - Privatize Supply, Storage and Distribution on Specific Commodities (S&S) | To Tinker AFB, OK |
| - Consolidate Service ICPs / transfer to DLA (S&S) | To Robins AFB, GA and DLA |
| - Storage and Distribution Functions (S&S) | To Various |
| - Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each service and the Defense Agencies (HSA) | To Randolph AFB, TX |
| - Establish Joint Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform RDAT&E (Tech) | To Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |
| - Relocate Wpns /Armaments RDAT&E Ctrs (Tech) | To Eglin AFB, FL |

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

Vermont

Burlington IAP AGS

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| + F-16 block 25 | From Atlantic City IAP AGS, NJ |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|

Virginia

Langley AFB

| | |
|--|---|
| + ANG Fighter wing manpower | From Richmond IAP AGS, VA |
| + F-15C | Elmendorf AFB, AK |
| + Logistics Readiness Sq | From Hickam AFB, HI; and Luke AFB, AZ |
| + ALQ-184 intermediate maintenance manpower | From Shaw AFB, SC |
| - F-15 avionics intermediate maintenance | To Tyndall AFB, FL (Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility) |
| - F-100 engine intermediate maintenance | To Seymour Johnson AFB, NC |
| + Establish Jnt Base (Langley AFB/North Hampton Roads) (HSA) | N/A |

Richmond IAP (Byrd Field) AGS

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| - F-16 block 30 | To Des Moines IAP AGS, IA; Homestead ARB, FL; back-up aircraft inventory |
| - ANG Fighter wing manpower | To associate at Langley AFB, VA |

MCB Quantico

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| + Co-locate Service Investigation Agencies (HSA) | From Andrews AFB, MD |
|--|----------------------|

Fort Lee

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| + Establish Joint CoE for Culinary Trng (E&T) | From Lackland AFB, TX |
| + Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Trng (E&T) | From Lackland AFB, TX |

Air Force Research Lab/AFOSR, Arlington, VA

| | |
|---|------------------|
| - Consolidate Extramural Research Program Managers (Tech) | To NNMC Bethesda |
|---|------------------|

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-)= outbound assets

Alexandria/I-395 Annex

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| - Co-locate miscellaneous USAF leased locations and National Guard HQs (HSA) | To Andrews AFB, MD |
| - Co-locate TRANSCOM components (HSA) | To Scott AFB, IL |

Fort Belvoir

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| - Relocate Wpns /Armaments RDAT&E Ctrs (Tech) | To Eglin AFB, FL |
|---|------------------|

Crystal City Lease

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| - Co-locate miscellaneous USAF leased locations and National Guard HQs (HSA) | To Andrews AFB, MD |
|--|--------------------|

Fort Eustis

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| - Co-locate TRANSCOM components (HSA) | To Scott AFB, IL |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|

NAS Oceana

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| - JSF Initial Joint Trng Site (E&T) | To Eglin AFB, FL |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|

Norfolk VA

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| - Co-locate TRANSCOM components (HSA) | To Scott AFB, IL |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|

Rosslyn - Ballston Corridor

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| - Co-locate miscellaneous USAF leased locations and National Guard HQs (HSA) | To Andrews AFB, MD |
|--|--------------------|

Washington

Fairchild AFB

- | | |
|--|--|
| - KC-135R (ANG) | To Sioux Gateway Apt. AGS, IA |
| - Four Lakes--256CBCS, and Spokane--242 CBCS | Consolidate on Fairchild AFB, WA |
| + Armed Forces Reserve Center | From Mann Hall Army Reserve Center and Walker Army Reserve Center in Spokane, WA |

McChord AFB

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| + Rescue squadron (AFRC) | From Portland IAP AGS, OR |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**

(+)= inbound assets; (-)= outbound assets

Establish Jnt Base (Ft Lewis/McChord
AFB) (HSA)

- Establish Jnt Mobilization Site (Ft
Lewis/McChord AFB) (Army)

- Realign medical care (Med) To Fort Lewis, WA

Fort Lewis

+ Realign medical care (Med) From McChord AFB, WA

West Virginia

Eastern W.V. Regional Apt Shepherd Field

AGS

+ Expeditionary Combat Support (Aerial Port & Fire fighters) From Yeager Apt. AGS, WV

Yeager Apt. AGS

- C-130H To Pope/Fort Bragg, NC

- Expeditionary Combat Support (Aerial Port & Fire fighters) To Eastern West Virginia Regional Apt./Shepherd Field AGS, WV

Wisconsin

General Mitchell International Apt AGS

+ KC-135R From Key Field AGS, MS

General Mitchell ARS

- C-130H To Little Rock AFB, AR; and Dobbins ARS, GA

- AW Ops, maintenance, and Expeditionary Combat Support manpower Pope/Ft Bragg, NC

Dane County Regional (Truax Field) AGS

+ F-16 block 30 From Cannon AFB, NM

+ Expeditionary Combat Support (Fire fighters) From Capital Apt. AGS, IL

- F-110 intermediate maintenance To Capital AGS, IL

Wyoming

Cheyenne Mncpl. Apt. AGS

+ C-130H From Boise Air Terminal AGS, ID

**Disposition of Units and Aircraft
Organization and Aircraft Moves by State**
(+) = inbound assets; (-) = outbound assets

F.E. Warren AFB

| | |
|--|---|
| + Army Aviation Support Facility (AASF) to FE Warren AFB, WY (Army) | From Wyoming Army National Guard (WYARNG) AASF, Cheyenne, WY |
|--|---|

Districts and Possessions**Washington, DC*****Anacostia Annex***

| | |
|--|---|
| + Consolidate Extramural Research Program Managers (Tech) | From Air Force Research Lab/AFOSR, Arlington, VA |
|--|---|

Bolling AFB

Establish Joint Base (Bolling/Anacostia)
(HSA)

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| - Collocate Defense/Service Adjudication Activities at Ft Meade, MD (HSA) | To Fort Meade, MD |
|--|-------------------|

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| - Co-locate Service and DoD Medical Activities (HSA) | To NNMC Bethesda, MD |
|---|----------------------|

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| - Co-locate the Tri-Service Directed Energy (Med) | To Lackland AFB, TX |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| - Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Service and the Defense Agencies (HSA) | To Randolph AFB, TX |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| - Co-locate selected DIA and Army Analytical Elements at Rivanna Station, Charlottesville, VA (Int) | To Army Analytical Elements, VA |
|---|---------------------------------|

Walter Reed Army Medical Center

| | |
|---|------------------|
| - Establish National Military Medical Center (National Capital Region) – Realign Air Force Institute of Pathology (AFIP) (Med) | To Dover AFB, DE |
|---|------------------|

Guam***Andersen AFB***

| | |
|---|-----|
| Establish Jnt Base (Andersen/NAS Marianas) (HSA) | N/A |
|---|-----|

Department of the Air Force

Summary of Selection Process

Introduction

The Secretary of Defense, in initiating the BRAC 2005 effort, established the following goals:

- Transform the current and future force and its support systems to meet new threats,
- Eliminate excess physical capacity,
- Rationalize the base infrastructure with the new defense strategy,
- Maximize both warfighting capability and efficiency, and
- Examine opportunities for joint activities.

Consistent with these goals, the Secretary of the Air Force established the following four goals to support right-sizing the force and enhancing its capabilities through BRAC 2005:

- Transform by maximizing the warfighting capability of each squadron, ✓
- Transform by realigning Air Force infrastructure with the future defense strategy. ✓
- Maximize operational capability by eliminating excess physical capacity, and ✓
- Capitalize on opportunities for joint activity. ✓

Strategy

The Air Force strategy for BRAC 2005 was to consolidate and right-size operational and support units and in the process reduce excess infrastructure and capacity. This strategy was dictated by two primary dynamics. First, over the 20-year period of the force structure plan (FSP), the Service's combat force will become smaller, even as it becomes more capable. Older weapons systems are being replaced by more capable platforms on a less than one-for-one basis. Second, the current force is organized in too many small, less than optimal sized operational units.

BRAC offered the Air Force the opportunity to rebase its current force to increase its combat capability and efficiency, while preparing to integrate new weapons systems into the Service during the 20-year period of the FSP. Concurrently, this rebasing strategy ensured that the restructured force provided capabilities to support the new defense strategy; increased overall efficiency by eliminating excess plant capacity; retained those Air Force bases that, by virtue of location or other difficult to reconstitute attributes, had the highest military value; supported joint basing initiatives where feasible; and generated savings within a reasonable period.

Selection Process

The Air Force BRAC analysis was grounded in the 20-year Force Structure Plan, the Service's facility inventory, and the BRAC selection criteria. In developing its recommendations, the Air Force base analysis was shaped by three underlying rules:

- Military value, both quantitative and qualitative, was the primary factor;
- All installations were treated equally; and
- Installation military value was determined not only on a base's current mission but also on its capacity to support other core missions.

The Secretary of the Air Force chartered the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG) to advise and assist him in developing BRAC recommendations. The BCEG comprised 12 senior military and civilian executives.

Capacity Analysis

The Air Force estimated the theoretical capacity of each installation using data collected from its installations, other data available at Headquarters Air Force, and weapons system templates provided by the Air Force Major Commands. These templates detailed operational and support capabilities required to host the major weapons systems.

This capacity information, along with other inputs, was used in the Air Force Cueing Tool (the cueing tool is a Binary Integer Goal Programming tool) identify an optimal set of bases to support a specified force.

Military Value Analysis

The Service assessed the military value of its operational bases using certified data derived from individual installations. Rather than focus on fungible attributes like assigned personnel or relocatable equipment and forces, the military value assessment stressed installation characteristics that were either immutable or outside the control of the Air Force or were difficult to replicate elsewhere due to expense or complexity. Immutable characteristics include geographic location and proximity to other physical features or defense activities, terrain, and prevailing weather. Difficult-to-reconstitute characteristics include the installation's transportation infrastructure, missile silos, or basic airfield infrastructure.

Applying operational capability data collected through a web-based installation data gathering and entry tool to BRAC Selection Criteria 1-4 and the weighing guidance assigned by the BCEG, each of the Air Force's 154 installations was given a Mission Capability Index (MCI). For a given installation, there was a separate MCI for each of the eight mission areas (fighter, bomber, tanker, airlift, special operation / combat search and rescue, intelligence / surveillance / reconnaissance, unmanned aerial vehicles, and space control).

Ultimately, using these data to assess all Active and Reserve Component installations on an equal basis, all installations were rank ordered on their relative ability to support the eight Air

Force missions. The objective was to find an optimal long-term basing plan that, within physical and operational constraints, located the Air Force's long-term force structure at installations with the highest military value.

Scenario Development

The Air Force started the scenario development process using a model called the Air Force Cueing Tool. Application of this binary integer, goal programming tool assisted in arraying the force at the strongest constellation of bases by applying automated, but relatively simple rules. The tool produced what was termed "first-look" output which provided a starting point for BCEG consideration. Through an iterative deliberation, the BCEG refined the "first-look" results to remove actions that the tool was unable to recognize. The BCEG also rejected options that failed to improve aggregate military value, or ran counter to compelling military rationale. In this process, BRAC Selection Criteria 1-4 (military value) were effectively applied.

These iterations continued until a set of potential force structure deployments were reached that conformed to Air Force principals; did not violate any Air Force imperative; improved aggregate military value; and were consistent with sound military judgment.

Once an optimal basing plan was identified, the Air Force analysis teams developed a related group of potential base closure and realignment options. The BCEG reviewed these proposals and selected the most promising to become scenarios that would undergo further analysis.

Scenario Analysis

Each of the scenarios analyses included the application of the COBRA model, and Criteria 6-8. The results of these analyses, i.e., payback (as determined by COBRA), community infrastructure support capability, and economic and environmental impacts of each scenario, were briefed to the BCEG. Again, an iterative process of review and refinement continued until the BCEG approved a candidate recommendation for consideration by the DoD review group, the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC).

During this process, the three Military Department BRAC directors chartered a Joint Action Scenario Team (JAST) to coordinate, manage, and assist in the process of developing joint operational basing scenarios. The JAST passed scenarios from other Military Departments that affected Air Force installations to the Air Force for action. Opportunities for joint basing were worked into Air Force scenarios and formal analyses, and were briefed to the BCEG as part of the development of the Air Force's candidate recommendations.

Summary of Results

Ultimately, the Air Force portion of the Secretary of Defense's recommendation package included the closure of ten installations: three in the Active force and seven in the Reserve Components. Additionally, the Air Force Secretary's package included 62 realignment recommendations affecting a total of 115 installations, or 76 percent of all Air Force bases in the

United States. Of 142 installations with operational flying missions, 28 (or 20 percent) will lose these missions.

The following patterns emerge from the Air Force's recommendations:

- The concept of joint operational basing will be advanced by the reassignment of the Army's Seventh Special Forces Group to Eglin AFB, where it will collocate with the center of Air Force Special Operations. Initial graduate-level pilot training on the Joint Strike Fighter for the Navy, Marines, and Air Force will be conducted jointly at the same base.
- Air Force flying units will be restructured into a smaller number of fully equipped squadrons to increase operational effectiveness and efficiency. In the process, aircraft of like configuration (i.e., block) will be based together.
- In selected cases, personnel from Reserve Component units will be transferred into blended units similar to the well-proven Reserve Associate concept that has long been common in the strategic airlift mission area.
- Forces will be rebased to fully support the homeland security-related air sovereignty taskings of the US Northern Command.
- Forces across mission areas will be based to enhance their capability to provide a global response to the needs of combatant commanders around the world.
- The annual recurring savings of the Air Force recommendations will be approximately \$2.6B, and the net present value of these savings over twenty years will be \$14.5B.

The recommendations approved by the Secretary of Defense follow:

Recommendations and Justifications

Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station, AL

Recommendation: Realign Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), AL. Distribute the 117th Air Refueling Wing's (ANG) KC-135R aircraft to the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport AGS, ME (two aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport AGS, TN (four aircraft); and the 161st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport AGS, AZ (two aircraft). The 117th Air Refueling Wing's firefighter positions will move to Dannelly Field AGS, AL, and the remaining expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place.

Justification: Phoenix Sky Harbor (37) scored higher than Birmingham (63) in military value for the tanker mission. This recommendation takes advantage of available capacity at Phoenix by robusting the air refueling squadron size from eight to ten aircraft, increasing the wing's overall capability. It also capitalizes on the favorable recruiting environment of the greater Phoenix region that can sustain this increased squadron size. Although McGhee-Tyson (74) and Bangor (123) ranked lower, military judgment argued in favor of retaining and adding force structure to these installations to increase their overall effectiveness. Bangor was increased in squadron size from 8 to 12 aircraft because of its critical role in the Northeast Tanker Task Force, as well as its participation in the transatlantic air bridge. The Air Force considered McGhee-Tyson's available capacity and Air National Guard experience in replacing aging, high maintenance KC-135E aircraft with re-engined KC-135R models and in increasing the squadron from 8 to 12 aircraft. Birmingham's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained and experienced Air National Guard personnel.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$11.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$7.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$0.8M, with a payback expected in 18 years. The net present value of the savings to the Department over 20 years is \$0.5M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 307 jobs (183 direct jobs and 124 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Birmingham-Hoover, AL, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; waste management; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.2M thousand in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Eielson Air Force Base, AK, Moody Air Force Base, GA, and Shaw Air Force Base, SC

Recommendation: Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK. The 354th Fighter Wing's assigned A-10 aircraft will be distributed to the 917th Wing Barksdale Air Force Base, LA (three aircraft); to a new active duty unit at Moody Air Force Base, GA (12 aircraft); and to backup inventory (three aircraft). The 354th Fighter Wing's F-16 aircraft will be distributed to the 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (18 aircraft). The Air National Guard Tanker unit and rescue alert detachment will remain as tenant on Eielson. Realign Moody Air Force Base, by relocating base-level ALQ-184 intermediate maintenance to Shaw Air Force Base, SC, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Shaw Air Force Base, SC for ALQ-184 pods. Realign Shaw Air Force Base, relocating base-level TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance to Moody Air Force Base, establishing a CIRF at Moody Air Force Base for TF-34 engines.

Justification: Eielson's (11) military value is high because of its close proximity to valuable airspace and ranges. Eielson is, however, an expensive base to operate and improve (*build*). The Air Force recommends realigning Eielson, but keeping the base open in a "warm" status using the resident Air National Guard units and a portion of the infrastructure to continue operating the base for USAF/Joint/Combined exercises. The Air Force distributes the F-16s to Nellis (13) a base with high military value, and the A-10s to Moody (11-SOF/CSAR), which also ranks high in military value. The CIRFs at Moody and Shaw compliment force structure moves and anticipate these bases as workload centers for these commodities.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$141.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$594.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$229.4M with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$2,780.6M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4,711 jobs (2,940 direct jobs and 1,771 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Fairbanks, AK, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 8.7 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 40 jobs (23 direct jobs and 17 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Sumter, SC, economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of Metropolitan Statistical economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the community to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Nellis Air Force Base is in a National Ambient Air Quality Standards nonattainment area for carbon monoxide (serious), particulate matter (PM10, serious), and ozone (8-hr, subpart 1). A preliminary assessment indicates that a conformity determination may be required to verify that positive conformity can be achieved. Costs to mitigate this potential impact have been included in the payback calculation and this is not expected to be an impediment to the implementation of this recommendation. There are also potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$2.4M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Kulis Air Guard Station, AK, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK

Recommendation: Close Kulis Air Guard Station (AGS), AK. Relocate the 176th Wing (ANG) and associated aircraft (eight C-130Hs, three HC-130Ns, and five HH-60s) and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) to Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK. Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base. With the addition of four aircraft from another installation (see Air Force recommendation for Ellsworth Air Force Base and Dyess Air Force Base), the 176th Wing at Elmendorf will form an ANG/active duty association with 12 C-130H aircraft. The 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 24 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA.

Justification: This recommendation distributes C-130, HC-130 and HH-60 aircraft from Kulis AGS (110) to Elmendorf Air Force Base (51), which has a higher military value. Moving these aircraft to Elmendorf Air Force Base consolidates two installations in the same city, reduces infrastructure, creates an active/ARC association, and retains the skilled, highly trained ANG

personnel from Kulis AGS. This recommendation also distributes a portion of the F-15C/Ds at Elmendorf Air Force Base (36-fighter) to Langley Air Force Base (2-fighter). Elmendorf retains one squadron (18 aircraft) for air sovereignty missions and distributes the remaining 24 F-15Cs to Langley Air Force Base.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$81.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$20.6M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$17.3M, with payback expected in 4 years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$146.7M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,470 jobs (848 direct jobs and 622 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Anchorage, AK, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.7 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of the community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support forces, missions and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Langley Air Force Base is in a National Ambient Air Quality Standards nonattainment area for ozone (8-hr, marginal). A preliminary assessment indicates that a conformity determination may be required to verify that positive conformity can be achieved. Costs to mitigate this impact have been included in the payback calculation and this is not expected to be an impediment to the implementation of this recommendation. There are also potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Impacts of costs include \$1.5M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Fort Smith Air Guard Station, AR, and Luke Air Force Base, AZ

Recommendation: Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport (MAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), AR. Distribute the 188th Fighter Wing's (ANG) F-16s to the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG) Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA (seven aircraft) and retirement (eight aircraft). The 144th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements remain in

place. Fire fighter positions realign to Tulsa, OK, and the Home Station Training Site moves to Savannah, GA. Realign Luke Air Force Base, AZ. The 56th Fighter Wing, Luke Air Force Base, AZ, distributes its F-16 Block 25s (13 aircraft) and F-16 Block 42s (24 aircraft) to retirement. The 944th Fighter Wing distributes its F-16s to the 144th Fighter Wing at Fresno (11 aircraft).

Justification: Military value played the predominant role coupled with homeland defense. The Air Force recommendation realigns 15 aircraft from Fort Smith (110) to Fresno (87), which supports the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert mission. Additionally, this recommendation helps align the eight different F-16 models across the Air Force. Finally, this recommendation makes experienced Airmen available to support the new ANG flying training unit created at Little Rock Air Force Base, AR.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$17.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$12.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.4M with a payback expected in 16 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$2.0M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 134 jobs (78 direct jobs and 56 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Fort Smith, AR-OK, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 386 jobs (184 direct jobs and 202 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; waste management; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.3M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC

actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Beale Air Force Base, CA, and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI

Recommendation: Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA. The 940th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) will realign its KC-135R tanker aircraft while its expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place. Beale's KC-135R aircraft will be distributed to the Air National Guard at Selfridge ANGB, MI (four aircraft) and 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (four aircraft). Realign Selfridge Air Reserve Base, MI. The 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) at Selfridge will distribute its eight KC-135 aircraft to the 127th Wing (ANG) at Selfridge. The 127th Wing will retire its 15 F-16 aircraft and eight C-130E aircraft, and will convert to A-10 and KC-135R aircraft.

Justification: This recommendation capitalizes on Beale's (7-C2ISR and 33-UAV) high military value and emerging Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) mission. Realigning KC-135 force structure enables Beale to have one primary operational flying mission--manned and unmanned high altitude reconnaissance, balances the Reserve and Air National Guard KC-135 force structure, and retains reserve component manpower and experience for the new Global Hawk mission. The receiver locations for Beale's tankers--Selfridge (57) and McGhee-Tyson (74)--each have above average military value for reserve component bases in the tanker mission. Beale's more modern KC-135R aircraft will replace the older, higher maintenance KC-135E models at McGhee-Tyson and help increase the new ANG tanker mission at Selfridge to an effective-size of 12 aircraft. The resulting KC-135R increase at Selfridge and McGhee-Tyson robusts the tanker force structure into squadron sizes that are more operationally effective.

As a reserve component base, Selfridge ANGB has above average military value as both a tanker installation (57) and fighter installation (70) as rated for those respective mission areas. This recommendation streamlines operations at Selfridge ANGB by realigning the Reserve air refueling mission, currently operating as a tenant unit, and divesting the ANG wing of its retiring force structure. The ANG wing's older, less capable C-130E and F-16 aircraft will retire and be replaced with Reserve KC-135R aircraft from Selfridge and Beale, and 15 A-10 aircraft realigned by the recommended closures of W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI, and NAS Willow Grove, PN. Reorganizing the flying operations under one component (ANG) will maximize organizational effectiveness and allow the installation to accommodate two effectively sized squadrons. The 927th Air Refueling Wing will realign to associate with the 6th Air Mobility Wing at MacDill Air Force Base, FL, to capture reserve experience in the region and enhance that unit's capability.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$45.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$34.6M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$3.9M, with a payback expected in 14 years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$6.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 312 jobs (179 direct jobs and 133 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 period in the Yuba City, CA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.5 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 52 jobs (18 direct jobs and 34 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 period in the Warren-Farmington Hills-Troy, MI, economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of the community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$0.3M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

March Air Reserve Base, CA

Recommendation: Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA. The 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will distribute its nine KC-135R aircraft to the 452d Air Mobility Wing (AFR), March Air Reserve Base (four aircraft); the 157th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Pease International Tradeport Air Guard Station, NH (three aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (one aircraft); and the 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, KS (one aircraft). The 163d Air Refueling Wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place.

Justification: This recommendation realigns aircraft and organizationally optimizes March Air Reserve Base. With the highest military value (16) of all air reserve component bases for the tanker mission, March Air Reserve Base is retained and streamlined from two wing organizational structures to one reserve component flying mission with a more effectively sized KC-135 unit of 12 aircraft. This action distributes the remaining Air National Guard force structure at March to the higher-ranking active installation, McConnell (15), and two ANG

installations, McGhee-Tyson (74) and Pease (105). McGhee-Tyson, though rated lower in military value, receives one aircraft due to military judgment to robust the squadron to a more effective size of 12 aircraft. Military judgment also placed additional force structure at Pease to support the Northeast Tanker Task Force and also robust the squadron to a more effective size of 12 aircraft. All receiver installations are increased in operational capability with the additional aircraft because of their proximity to air refueling missions. March's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained and experienced Air National Guard personnel.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$10.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$1.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.8M, with a payback expected in five years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$15.5M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 201 jobs (111 direct jobs and 90 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 period in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.01 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of the community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$0.4M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Onizuka Air Force Station, CA

Recommendation: Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA. Relocate the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN) mission and tenant Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) Defense Satellite Communication System (DSCS) mission and equipment to Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA.

Justification: This recommendation consolidates satellite command and control operations while reducing excess infrastructure. Onizuka AFS (124) hosts the AFSCN Second Node and scheduling backup mission, but has no primary assigned Air Force Space Command operational mission. Onizuka AFS also supports classified tenant missions that are anticipated to phase out during the BRAC 2005 timeframe. Schriever Air Force Base, CO (1) ranked highest in military value for satellite operations, but hosts the AFSCN Primary Node. Vandenberg Air Force Base (2) currently hosts one of the AFSCN remote tracking stations. An Air Force Space Command policy directive on backup satellite control operations prescribes the requirements for backup operations and geographical separation to preclude simultaneous degradation of both primary and secondary nodes from natural or man-made threats. During major command capacity briefings to Headquarters Air Force, Onizuka AFS was identified as having seismic and anti-terrorism/force protection constraints, with no buildable land to mitigate these. Vandenberg Air Force Base offers better protection for the DSCS Sun East and Sun West antenna complexes, which are designated a Protection-Level 1 resource.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$123.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$45.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$25.9M, with a payback expected in five years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$211.0M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 393 jobs (278 direct jobs and 115 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging, marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.04M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Air Guard Station, MD

Recommendation: Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT. The A-10s assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission. Realign Barnes Air Guard Station, MA; Selfridge ANGB, MI; Shaw Air Force Base, SC; and Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, MD, by relocating base-level TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance to Bradley, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Bradley for TF-34 engines.

Justification: Barnes (97) and Bradley (98) are located approximately 12 miles apart. The Air Force placed one full squadron at Barnes because it ranked higher in military value. By combining the two units into one squadron the Air Force retains the trained A-10 pilots and maintenance technicians in the area and creates an optimum-sized and more effective squadron. The recommendation to close Otis ANGB, MA, generated a requirement to build an air sovereignty alert (ASA) site in the region. The Air Force priced an alert facility at both Barnes and Bradley, and chose Bradley on the basis of lower cost. The Bradley ECS elements remain in place to support the ASA mission.

Establishing a CIRF at Bradley for TF-34 engine maintenance complements the realignment of the A-10 fleet. The CIRF at Bradley will consolidate TF-34 engine maintenance for ANG A-10 aircraft from Barnes, Selfridge, Martin State and active duty aircraft at Spangdahlem, Germany. Establishing this CIRF at Bradley rather than at Barnes avoids relocation of a hush house facility at an estimated cost of \$3.5M, and avoids construction of additional 18,000 square feet of maintenance facilities already existing at Bradley and that will be available.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$3.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$6.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.0M with a payback expected in two years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$25.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 154 jobs (92 direct jobs and 62 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Hartford-West-East Hartford, CT, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 7 jobs (4 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Warren-Farmington Hills-Troy, MI, economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 43 jobs (25 direct jobs and 18 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Sumter, SC, economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 8 jobs (4 direct jobs and 4 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Baltimore-Towson, MD, economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or waste management. Impacts of costs include \$0.6M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

New Castle Airport Air Guard Station, DE

Recommendation: Realign New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), DE. Distribute the wing's eight C-130H aircraft to the 145th Airlift Wing (ANG), Charlotte/Douglas International Airport (IAP) AGS, NC (four aircraft), and 165th Airlift Wing (ANG), Savannah IAP AGS, GA (four aircraft). Move flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) to McGuire Air Force Base, NJ (Aeromedical Squadron), and Dover Air Force Base, DE (aerial port and fire fighters). Other ECS remains in place at New Castle.

Justification: This recommendation makes experienced Airmen from New Castle (120) available for employment at these nearby installations. Military value was the predominant consideration; New Castle had a low military value ranking and was near other bases keeping or gaining aircraft. Charlotte (33) and Savannah (77) were selected to receive aircraft because of higher military value rankings and avoiding conversion training costs. The Air Force also considered active / Air National Guard / Air Force Reserve manning mix, recruiting, cost factors (to include cost avoidance), environmental factors, and base capacity in its analysis of this recommendation.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$15.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$29.1M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$9.6M, with a payback period expected in one year. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$120.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 250 jobs (148 direct jobs and 102 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Wilmington, DE-MD-NJ, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: Review of community attributes indicates there are no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Impacts of costs include \$0.08M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Robins Air Force Base, GA

Recommendation: Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA. The 19th Air Refueling Group's KC-135R aircraft will be distributed to the 22nd Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, KS (nine aircraft), and to backup aircraft inventory (three aircraft). The 202d Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), a geographically separated unit at Middle Georgia Regional Airport, will be relocated into available space at Robins Air Force Base.

Justification: This recommendation realigns active duty KC-135R aircraft from Robins (18) to McConnell (15), a base higher in military value for the tanker mission and with available capacity to receive the additional aircraft at no cost. This consolidation increases McConnell's active duty tanker squadrons to optimum size. This recommendation also enables the Air National Guard to transfer its KC-135R aircraft based at McConnell to Forbes Field AGS, KS (35), retaining one of the higher-ranking air reserve component tanker bases. The vacated infrastructure and capacity resulting from the realignment of the tenant 19th Air Refueling Group

will accommodate U.S. Navy aircraft realigning to Robins from Naval Air Station Atlanta. The Navy will pay any costs to reconfigure the AF facility for their use. By realigning geographically separated units onto Robins, the Air Force can use excess capacity and reduce leased facilities in the community. This recommendation does not affect the blended active duty/Air National Guard Air Control Wing at Robins, which remains the major operational flying mission at Robins.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$6.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$31.9M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$15.0M, with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$175.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 795 jobs (471 direct jobs and 324 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 period in the Warner Robins, GA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 1.2 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Impacts of costs include \$0.4M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID

Recommendation: Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station (AGS), ID. Distribute the four C-130H aircraft of the 124th Wing (ANG) to the 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne, WY. The new, larger unit at Cheyenne will create an active duty/ ANG association.

Justification: Currently, Boise (66-SOF/CSAR, 66-airlift) operates a mix of C-130 and A-10 aircraft. These aircraft have very different missions. This recommendation realigns Boise to

operate only A-10s and distributes its C-130 aircraft to Cheyenne (118-airlift). Boise is a valuable A-10 base because of its proximity to air-to-ground ranges with scoreable strafing and bombing, threat emitters, and integrated air combat training. In turn, Cheyenne is robusted to a larger, more effective C-130 squadron size. Additionally, Cheyenne's proximity to an active duty Air Force installation (F.E. Warren Air Force Base) allows it to host an active/ANG associate unit.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$2.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$1.6M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$0.3M, with payback expected in 8 years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$1.7M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 159 jobs (84 direct jobs and 75 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Boise City-Nampa, ID, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.3M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK

Recommendation: Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID. Distribute the 366th Fighter Wing assigned F-15Cs (18 aircraft) to the 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (nine aircraft), to the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport AGS, FL (six aircraft), and to retirement (three aircraft). The 366th Fighter Wing will distribute assigned F-16 Block 52 aircraft to the 169th Fighter Wing McEntire AGS, SC (nine aircraft), the 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (five aircraft), and to backup inventory (four aircraft). Realign Nellis Air Force

Base. The 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, will distribute F-16 Block 42 aircraft to the 138th Fighter Wing Tulsa International Airport AGS, OK (three aircraft), and retire the remaining F-16 Block 42 aircraft (15 aircraft). The 57th Wing also will distribute F-16 Block 32 aircraft (six aircraft) to the 144th Fighter Wing Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA, and to retirement (one aircraft). Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base. The 366th Fighter Wing, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, will receive F-15E aircraft from the 3d Wing, Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (18 aircraft), and attrition reserve (three aircraft).

Justification: Military value was the predominant consideration in moving the F-15Es from Elmendorf (36) to Mountain Home (23) and F-16s to Nellis (12) and McEntire (48). Additionally, realigning the eight F-16 models and four F-16 engine types weighed in the final F-16 force structure laydown. Mountain Home currently operates several types of aircraft; this recommendation realigns Mountain Home to fly only F-15Es, streamlining operations at a location that is well suited for air-to-ground, low-level and air-to-air flight training. This recommendation also aligns common versions of F-16s and F-15Cs.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$74.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$21.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$37.8M with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$389.0M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential decrease of 833 jobs (528 direct jobs and 305 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Mountain Home, ID, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 5.8 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential decrease of 1,388 jobs (802 direct jobs and 586 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Anchorage, AK, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.7 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Nellis Air Force Base is in a National Ambient Air Quality Standards nonattainment area for carbon monoxide (serious), particulate matter (PM10, serious), and ozone (8-hr, subpart 1). A preliminary assessment indicates that a conformity determination may be required to verify that positive conformity can be achieved. Costs to mitigate this potential impact have been included in the payback calculation and this is not expected to be an impediment to the implementation of this recommendation. There are also potential impacts to

air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$1.9M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Capital Air Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN

Recommendation: Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL. Distribute the 183d Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN, (15 aircraft). The 122d Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements, the Illinois ANG State Headquarters, and the 217th Engineering Installation Squadron remain in place. Realign Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN. The 181st Fighter Wing's F-16s are distributed to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN (nine aircraft), and retirement (six aircraft). The 181st Fighter wing's ECS elements remain in place. Realign Dane County Regional Air Guard Station/Truax Field, WI; Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD; Des Moines Air Guard Station, IA; Fort Wayne Air Guard Station, IN; and Lackland Air Force Base, TX; by relocating base-level F-110 intermediate maintenance to Capital, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines.

Justification: Capital (115) and Hulman (119) were both ranked low in military value by the fighter MCI. Although somewhat lower (130) the ANG recommended Fort Wayne be retained because of its record of recruiting and its proximity to Hulman--allowing the experienced airmen there to remain available to the Indiana ANG. This recommendation also helps align common versions of the F-16.

Establishing a CIRF at Capital consolidates F110 engine intermediate maintenance for F-16 aircraft from five air reserve component units, and compliments other Air Force CIRF recommendations. The Capital CIRF is centrally located in proximity to the serviced installations, and utilizes Capital's experienced people and existing facilities as part of an Air Force effort to standardize stateside and deployed intermediate-level maintenance concepts.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$19.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$13.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.0M with a payback expected in 13 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$6.3M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 269 jobs (163 direct jobs and 106 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Springfield, IL, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 232 jobs (136 direct jobs and 96 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Terre Haute, IN, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.3 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 6 jobs (4 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Des Moines, IA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4 jobs (3 direct jobs and 1 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Madison, WI, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (5 direct jobs and 4 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the San Antonio, TX, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 6 jobs (4 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Sioux Falls, SD, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.8M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC

actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA

Recommendation: Realign NAS New Orleans ARS, LA. Distribute the 926th Fighter Wing's A-10 aircraft to the 442d Fighter Wing (AFR), Whiteman Air Force Base, MO (nine aircraft), and the 917th Wing (AFR) at Barksdale Air Force Base, LA (six aircraft). The 442 wing HQ element realigns to Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and the wing Expeditionary Combat Support realigns to Buckley Air Force Base, CO.

Justification: Both Whiteman (28) and Barksdale (33) bases have a higher military value for the A-10 operational mission than New Orleans (49). These realignments bring the units at Whiteman and Barksdale to optimal size. Additionally, the Barksdale A-10 unit provides close air support to the U.S. Army's Joint Readiness Training Center, one of the nation's premier joint training opportunities. Finally, realigning these A-10s to reserve units helped keep the active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve force structure mix constant.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$50.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$32.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$11.3M, with a payback expected in five years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$80.7M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 625 jobs (312 direct jobs and 313 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.5M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC

actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

**Andrews Air Force Base, MD, Will Rogers Air Guard Station, OK,
Tinker Air Force Base, OK, and Randolph Air Force Base TX**

Recommendation: Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD, by relocating the Air Force Flight Standards Agency (AFFSA) and its two C-21 aircraft to Will Rogers World Airport Air Guard Station, OK. Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the USAF Advanced Instrument School (AIS) to Will Rogers Air Guard Station. Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK, by relocating the Global Air Traffic Operations Program Office (GATOPO) to Will Rogers Air Guard Station. Realign Will Rogers Air Guard Station by relocating the 137th Airlift Wing (ANG) to Tinker Air Force Base and associate with the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR). The 137th's C-130H aircraft are distributed to the 136th Airlift Wing (ANG), Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX (4 aircraft), and 139th Airlift Wing (ANG), Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air Guard Station, MO (4 aircraft). The aerial port squadron at Will Rogers moves to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, the Aeromedical Squadron and fire fighters move to Rosecrans AGB. Other elements of the 137th's Expeditionary Combat Support remain in place at Will Rogers.

Justification: Consolidating AFFSA, AIS, and GATOPO at Will Rogers World Airport creates synergy between the Air Force administrative aviation functions and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) located at Will Rogers World. Associating the ANG operation at Will Rogers (64-airlift) with the AFR operation at Tinker (4-tanker) consolidates and streamlines Air Force reserve component operations in Oklahoma City at a base of high military value. Additionally, this realignment creates two larger C-130 squadrons at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth (53) and Rosecrans Air Guard Station (114) from three under sized squadrons. Finally, this recommendation moves federal assets out of the National Capital Region, reducing the nation's vulnerability.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$21.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$12.2M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$7.5M, with a payback period expected in two years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$83.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 191 jobs (115 direct jobs and 76 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 105 jobs (33 direct jobs and 72 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the

Oklahoma City, OK, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 29 jobs (16 direct jobs and 13 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the San Antonio, TX, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$0.4M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Martin State Air Guard Station, MD

Recommendation: Realign Martin State Air Guard Station (AGS), MD. Distribute the eight C-130J aircraft of the 175th Wing (ANG) to the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands AGS, CA (four aircraft), and 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport AGS, RI (four aircraft). The Aerial Port Squadron will move to Andrews Air Force Base, MD. The 143rd and 146th Airlift Wings will each retire two C-130E aircraft (total of four).

Justification: Martin State (140) had a low military value ranking. This recommendation moves C-130Js to Channel Islands AGS (96), and Quonset State (125), both of which rank higher in military value and already operate the J-model C-130--avoiding conversion training costs. Additionally, this recommendation creates to right sized C-130J squadrons. The Aerial Port Squadron is realigned to a nearby base with a robust airlift mission, retaining these skilled and highly trained ANG personnel.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$9.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$13.7M. Annual recurring savings after implementation

are \$8.7M, with payback expected in one year. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$97.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 229 jobs (119 direct jobs and 110 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Baltimore-Towson, MD, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or waste management. Impacts of costs include \$0.09M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO, and Atlantic City Air Guard Station, NJ

Recommendation: Close Otis ANGB, MA. The 102d Fighter Wing's F-15s will be distributed to the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, FL (three aircraft), and 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ (12 aircraft). The 253d Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT. Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.

Realign Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, St. Louis, MO. The 131st Fighter Wing's F-15s (15 aircraft) will distribute to the 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (nine aircraft), and 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ (six aircraft). Realign Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ. The 177th Fighter Wing's F-16s will be distributed to the 158th Fighter Wing, Burlington International Airport Air Guard Station, VT (three aircraft), and retire (12 aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place. Firefighter positions move

to Scott Air Force Base, IL. The 157th Air Operations Group (AOG) and the 218th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) will relocate from Jefferson Barracks geographically separated unit (GSU) into space at Lambert International. Jefferson Barracks real property accountability will transfer to the Army.

Justification: The Air Force distributed reserve component F-15C force structure to bases with higher military value than Otis (88) and Lambert-St. Louis (127). The F-15C aircraft are realigned to Nellis (13), Jacksonville Air Guard Station (24), and Atlantic City Air Guard Station (61). The Nellis bound aircraft will help form an enhanced aggressor squadron for Operation RED FLAG and the Atlantic City bound aircraft will provide expanded capability for the Homeland Defense mission.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$103.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$12.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$33.6M with a payback expected in three years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$336.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 827 jobs (505 direct jobs and 322 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Barnstable Town, MA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.6 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 510 jobs (249 direct jobs and 261 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the St. Louis, MS-IL, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Nellis Air Force Base is in a National Ambient Air Quality Standards nonattainment area for carbon monoxide (serious), particulate matter (PM10, serious), and ozone (8-hr, subpart 1). A preliminary assessment indicates that a conformity determination may be required to verify that positive conformity can be achieved. Costs to mitigate this potential impact have been included in the payback calculation and this is not expected to be an impediment to the implementation of this recommendation. There are also potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or

water resources. Impacts of costs include \$3.1M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI

Recommendation: Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI. Distribute the 110th Fighter Wing's A-10s (15 aircraft) to the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge ANGB, MI.

Justification: The Air Force placed one squadron at Selfridge (62) because it is significantly higher in military value than Kellogg (122). The Air Force retired the older F-16s from Selfridge and combined the two A-10 units into one squadron at Selfridge to retain trained and skilled Michigan ANG Airmen from both locations.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department to implement this recommendation is \$8.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$46.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$12.7M with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$166.8M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 441 jobs (274 direct jobs and 167 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Battle Creek, MI, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.6 percent of economic area employment.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.5M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN

Recommendation: Realign Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN, by retiring the 148th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft).

Justification: Duluth (136) ranked low in military value. The reduction in F-16 force structure and the need to align common versions of the F-16 at the same bases argued for realigning Duluth to an ASA site using aircraft assigned elsewhere and operating from Duluth on rotational basis as tasked by US Northern Command. The 148th Fighter Wing's expeditionary combat support will remain at Duluth supporting the air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$2.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$0.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$0.8M with a payback expected in five years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$7.8M.

Economic Impact on Communities: This recommendation will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Duluth, MN-WI, Metropolitan Statistical economic area. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are no anticipated impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for the costs of environmental restoration, environmental compliance, or waste management activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Key Field Air Guard Station, MS

Recommendation: Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS. Distribute the 186th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 128th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), General Mitchell Air Guard Station, WI (three aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (three aircraft); and 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, ME (two aircraft). One aircraft will revert to backup aircraft inventory. The 186th Air Refueling Wing's fire fighter positions move to the 172d Air

Wing at Jackson International Airport, MS, and the expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place.

Justification: Receiver locations General Mitchell (86) and McGhee-Tyson (74) ranked higher in military value rating for the tanker mission than Key Field (92). Bangor (123) also received aircraft within this recommendation. Military judgment argued for the increased unit size at Bangor because of its critical role as host base for Northeast Tanker Task Force support to the transatlantic air bridge. Key Field's newer KC-135R aircraft help replace McGhee-Tyson's older, higher maintenance KC-135E models, and help robust the unit size. The remainder of Key Field's realigned aircraft help increase the squadron size at General Mitchell and maintain critical backup aircraft inventory levels. Bangor, McGhee-Tyson, and General Mitchell gain additional KC-135 aircraft to their maximum available capacity, increasing both effectiveness and unit capability. Key Field's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained, experienced Airmen.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$10.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$6.9M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$0.9M, with a payback expected in 13 years. The net present value of the cost to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$2.5M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 339 jobs (175 direct jobs and 164 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Meridian, MS, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.6 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of the community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.1M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT

Recommendation: Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT. Distribute the 120th Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 187th Fighter Wing, Dannelly Field Air Guard Station, AL (three aircraft); the 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (three aircraft); and retire (nine aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements remain in place.

Justification: Great Falls (117) ranked low in military value. The reduction in F-16 force structure and the need to align common versions of the F-16 at the same bases argued for realigning F-16s out of Great Falls. The F-16s realign to Dannelly (60) and Des Moines (137). Although Des Moines was somewhat lower in military value ranking than Great Falls, the realignment to Des Moines creates a more effective unit of 18 aircraft. The wing's ECS will remain in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained, experienced Air National Guard personnel.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$9.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$0.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.8M with a payback expected in four years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$18.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 174 jobs (107 direct jobs and 67 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Great Falls, MT, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.4 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support forces, missions, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.4M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV

Recommendation: Realign Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV. Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 152d Airlift Wing (ANG) to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, AR. Flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) moves to Channel Islands Air Guard Station, CA (aerial port), and Fresno Air Guard Station, CA (fire fighters). The remaining ECS elements and the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) remain in place.

Justification: This recommendation distributes C-130 force structure to a higher military value base. Because of limitations to land and ramp space, Reno was unable to expand beyond 10 C-130s. This recommendation realigns Reno's (101) C-130s to the Air National Guard at Little Rock Air Force Base (17), where a larger, more effective squadron size is possible. This larger squadron at Little Rock also creates the opportunity for an association between active duty and the Air National Guard, optimizing aircraft utilization.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$22.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$12.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$3.6M, with a payback expected in 9 years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$22.7M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 263 jobs (147 direct jobs and 116 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Reno-Sparks, NV, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support forces, missions and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$0.09M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Cannon Air Force Base, NM

Recommendation: Close Cannon Air Force Base, NM. Distribute the 27th Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 115th Fighter Wing, Dane County Regional Airport, Truax Field Air Guard Station, WI (three aircraft); 114th Fighter Wing, Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD (three aircraft); 150th Fighter Wing, Kirtland Air Force Base, NM (three aircraft); 113th Wing, Andrews Air Force Base, MD (nine aircraft); 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (seven aircraft), the 388th Wing at Hill Air Force Base, UT (six aircraft), and backup inventory (29 aircraft).

Justification: Cannon has a unique F-16 force structure mix. The base has one F-16 Block 50 squadron, one F-16 Block 40 squadron, and one F-16 Block 30 squadron. All active duty Block 50 bases have higher military value than Cannon. Cannon's Block 50s move to backup inventory using standard Air Force programming percentages for fighters. Cannon's F-16 Block 40s move to Nellis Air Force Base (seven aircraft) and Hill Air Force Base (six aircraft to right size the wing at 72 aircraft) and to backup inventory (11 aircraft). Nellis (12) and Hill (14) have a higher military value than Cannon (50). The remaining squadron of F-16 Block 30s (18 aircraft) are distributed to Air National Guard units at Kirtland Air Force Base, NM (16), Andrews Air Force Base, MD (21), Joe Foss Air Guard Station, SD (112), and Dane-Truax Air Guard Station, WI (122). These moves sustain the active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve force mix by replacing aircraft that retire in the 2025 Force Structure Plan.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$90.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$815.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$200.5M with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$2,706.8M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4,780 jobs (2,824 direct jobs and 1,956 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Clovis, NM, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 20.5 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Nellis Air Force Base is in a National Ambient Air Quality Standards nonattainment area for carbon monoxide (serious), particulate matter (PM10, serious), and ozone (8-hr, subpart 1). A preliminary assessment indicates that a conformity determination may be required to verify that positive conformity can be achieved. Costs to mitigate this potential impact have been included in the payback calculation and this is not expected to be an impediment to the implementation of this recommendation. There are also potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water

resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$2.8M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY

Recommendation: Close Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station (ARS), NY. Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 914th Airlift Wing (AFR) to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR. The 914th's headquarters moves to Langley Air Force Base, VA, the Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) realigns to the 310th Space Group (AFR) at Schriever Air Force Base, CO, and the Civil Engineering Squadron moves to Lackland Air Force Base, TX. Also at Niagara, distribute the eight KC-135R aircraft of the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, ME. The 101st will subsequently retire its eight KC-135E aircraft and no Air Force aircraft remain at Niagara.

Justification: This recommendation distributes C-130 force structure to Little Rock (17-airlift), a base with higher military value. These transfers move C-130 force structure from the Air Force Reserve to the active duty--addressing a documented imbalance in the active/reserve manning mix for C-130s. Additionally, this recommendation distributes more capable KC-135R aircraft to Bangor (123), replacing the older, less capable KC-135E aircraft. Bangor supports the Northeast Tanker Task Force and the Atlantic air bridge.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$65.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$5.3M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$20.1M, with a payback period expected in two years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$199.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,072 jobs (642 direct jobs and 430 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY, metropolitan statistical economic area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: Review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$0.3M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY

Recommendation: Realign Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station (Air Guard Station), NY. The 109th Airlift Wing (ANG) will transfer four C-130H aircraft to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, AR.

Justification: This recommendation distributes C-130 force structure to Little Rock (17), which has higher military value. Adding aircraft to the ANG unit at Little Rock creates a larger, more effective squadron. The LC-130 aircraft (ski-equipped) remain at Schenectady (117).

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$3.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$3.3M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$ 0.6M with payback expected in eight years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$2.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 39 jobs (19 direct jobs and 20 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: Review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Impacts of costs include

\$0.04M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, and Yeager Air Guard Station, WV

Recommendation: Realign Pope Air Force Base (Air Force Base), NC. Distribute the 43d Airlift Wing's C-130E aircraft (25 aircraft) to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; realign the 23d Fighter Group's A-10 aircraft (36 aircraft) to Moody Air Force Base, GA; transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43rd Medical Group and establish a medical squadron. At Little Rock Air Force Base, AR, realign eight C-130E aircraft to backup inventory; retire 27 C-130Es; realign one C-130J aircraft to the 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, RI; two C-130Js to the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands Air Guard Station, CA; and transfer four C-130Js from the 314th Airlift Wing (AD) to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base.

Realign Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), WV, by realigning eight C-130H aircraft to Pope/Fort Bragg to form a 16 aircraft Air Force Reserve/active duty associate unit, and by relocating flying-related expeditionary combat support (ECS) to Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport/Shepherd Field AGS (aerial port and fire fighters). Close Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), PA, and relocate 911th Airlift Wing's (AFRC) eight C-130H aircraft to Pope/Fort Bragg to form a 16 aircraft Air Force Reserve/active duty associate unit. Relocate AFRC operations and maintenance manpower to Pope/Fort Bragg. Relocate flight related ECS (aeromedical squadron) to Youngstown-Warren Regional APT ARS. Relocate all remaining Pittsburgh ECS and headquarters manpower to Offutt Air Force Base, NE. Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected.

Justification: Downsizing Pope Air Force Base takes advantage of mission-specific consolidation opportunities to reduce operational costs, maintenance costs and the manpower footprint. The smaller manpower footprint facilitates transfer of the installation to the Army. Active duty C-130s and A-10s will move to Little Rock (17-airlift) and Moody (11-SOF/CSAR), respectively, to consolidate force structure at those two bases and enable Army recommendations at Pope. At Little Rock, older aircraft are retired or converted to back-up inventory and J-model C-130s are aligned under the Air National Guard. Little Rock grows to become the single major active duty C-130 unit, streamlining maintenance and operation of this aging weapon system. At Pope, the synergistic, multi-service relationship will continue between Army airborne and Air Force airlift forces with the creation of an active duty/Reserve associate unit. The C-130 unit remains as an Army tenant on an expanded Fort Bragg. With the disestablishment of the 43rd Medical Group, the AF will maintain the required manpower to provide primary care, flight and occupational medicine to support the Air Force active duty military members. The Army will maintain the required manpower necessary to provide primary care, flight, and occupational medicine to support the Army active duty military members. The Army will provide ancillary

and specialty medical services for all assigned Army and Air Force military members (lab, x-ray, pharmacy, etc).

The major command's capacity briefing reported Pittsburgh ARS land constraints prevented the installation from hosting more than 10 C-130 aircraft and Yeager AGS cannot support more than eight C-130s. Careful analysis of mission capability indicates that it is more appropriate to robust the proposed airlift mission at Fort Bragg to an optimal 16 aircraft C-130 squadron, which provides greater military value and offers unique opportunities for Jointness.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$218.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$652.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$197.0M, with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$2,515.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 7,840 jobs (4,700 direct jobs and 3,140 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Fayetteville, NC, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 4.0 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 246 jobs (156 direct jobs and 90 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Charleston, WV, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 581 jobs (322 direct jobs and 259 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Pittsburgh, PA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of the community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support forces, missions and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$1.3M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC

actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND

Recommendation: Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), ND. Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, IL (12 aircraft), which retires its eight KC-135E aircraft; the 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour-Johnson AFB, NC (eight aircraft), which will host an active duty associate unit; the 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, FL (four aircraft), which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, MI; the 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, HI (four aircraft), which will host an active duty associate unit; and the 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, KS (eight aircraft), which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling Group (AFR). Grand Forks will remain an active Air Force installation with a new active duty/Air National Guard association unit created in anticipation of emerging missions at Grand Forks.

Realign McConnell Air National Guard (ANG) Base by relocating the 184th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) nine KC-135R aircraft to the 190th Air Refueling Wing at Forbes Field AGS, KS, which will retire its eight assigned KC-135E aircraft. The 184th Air Refueling Wing's operations and maintenance manpower will transfer with the aircraft to Forbes, while the wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain at McConnell.

Justification: Grand Forks (40-tanker) ranked lowest in military value of all active duty KC-135 bases. However, of Northern tier bases, Grand Forks ranked highest in military value for the UAV mission (43-UAV). Military judgment argued for a continued strategic presence in the north central U.S. (Grand Forks is one of the last remaining active military installations in the region). Military judgment also indicated the potential for emerging missions in homeland defense, particularly for border states. Therefore, Grand Forks is retained as an active installation, but realigned to distribute its KC-135R force structure to bases with higher value for the tanker mission--MacDill (36), McConnell (15), Seymour Johnson (25), and Scott (38). The additional aircraft at MacDill optimize the unit size, establish a new active duty/Air Force Reserve association to enhance unit capability, and preserve sufficient capacity for future beddown of the next generation tanker aircraft. Scott receives KC-135R model aircraft to replace older, higher maintenance KC-135E models, capture Scott's existing capacity, and increase its capability by robusting the ANG squadron. The additional aircraft at Seymour Johnson optimize the squadron, increase the wing's capability, and establish another new active duty/Air Force Reserve unit association. Additional aircraft at McConnell capitalize on available excess capacity at no cost and optimize three squadrons for greater total wing capability. The Air Force used military judgment in moving force structure from Grand Forks to Hickam (87), concluding that Hickam's strategic location argued for a more robust global mobility capability in the western Pacific. Increasing tanker force structure at Hickam robusts the unit and establishes an active duty/Air Force Reserve association to maximize Reserve participation. Realigning ANG KC-135R aircraft from McConnell to Forbes (35) replaces aging, higher

maintenance KC-135E aircraft with newer models while retaining the experienced personnel from one of the highest-ranking reserve component tanker bases.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$131.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$322.5M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$173.3M, with payback expected in one year. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$1,982.0 million.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4,929 jobs (2,645 direct jobs and 2,284 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Grand Forks, ND-MN, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 7.4 percent of economic area employment.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$1.2M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND

Recommendation: Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND. The 119th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support elements remain in place.

Justification: Hector (125) ranked low in military value. The reduction in F-16 force structure and the need to align common versions of the F-16 at the same bases argued for realigning Hector to allow its aircraft to retire without a flying mission backfill.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$1.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$3.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.0M with a payback expected in two years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$12.9M.

Economic Impact on Communities: This recommendation will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Fargo, ND-MN, Metropolitan Statistical economic area. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are no anticipated impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for the costs of environmental restoration, environmental compliance, or waste management activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH

Recommendation: Close Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), OH. Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) to the 908th Airlift Wing (AFR), Maxwell Air Force Base, AL (four aircraft), and the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR (four aircraft). Flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) moves to Louisville International Airport AGS, KY (aerial port) and Toledo Express Airport AGS, OH (fire fighters).

Justification: This recommendation distributes C-130 aircraft to two bases with higher military value, Little Rock Air Force Base (17) and Maxwell Air Force Base (21). The addition of aircraft at Maxwell Air Force Base creates an optimally sized Reserve Component squadron. Additionally, these transfers move C-130 force structure from the Air National Guard to the Air Force Reserve and active duty--addressing a documented imbalance in the active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve manning mix for C-130s.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$33.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$3.1M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$8.7M, with a payback period expected in three years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$86.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 528 jobs (234 direct jobs and 294 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Mansfield, OH, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which

is 0.7 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Impacts of costs include \$0.2M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH

Recommendation: Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH. Distribute the 178th Fighter Wing's F-16 aircraft to the 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (nine aircraft); the 140th Wing (ANG), Buckley Air Force Base, CO (three aircraft) and 149th Fighter Wing (ANG), Lackland Air Force Base, TX (six aircraft), but retain The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements, the 251st Combat Communications Group (ANG) and 269th Combat Communications Squadron (ANG) in place, and relocate the wing's firefighter positions will move to Rickenbacker Air Guard Station, OH.

Justification: The decision to realign Springfield-Beckley's F-16s and not replace force structure at Springfield-Beckley is based on considerations of military value and all other available information. Buckley (64) and Lackland (47) have higher military value than Springfield-Beckley (128), and Buckley has a role in the Homeland Defense mission. This recommendation optimizes the squadron size at Lackland, the only ANG F-16 Flying Training Unit. While not currently tasked with a Homeland Defense role, Des Moines (137) is located within the specified response timing criteria of a Homeland Security site of interest. The 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station will assume a role in the air sovereignty mission.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$11.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$8.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after

implementation are \$0.9M with a payback expected in 17 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$0.7M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 440 jobs (291 direct jobs and 149 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Dayton-Springfield, OH, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.7 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the community to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.3M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR

Recommendation: Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR. Realign the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) by distributing the wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Tinker Air Force Base, OK (four aircraft); the 190th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Forbes Field Air Guard Station, KS (three aircraft); and by reverting one aircraft to backup inventory. Operations and maintenance manpower for four aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing is realigned with the aircraft to Tinker Air Force Base. The 939th Air Refueling Wing's remaining manpower, to include expeditionary combat support, is realigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA. Realign the 142d Fighter Wing (ANG) by distributing the wing's F-15 aircraft to the 177th Fighter Wing (ANG), Atlantic City, NJ (six aircraft) and the 159th Fighter Wing (ANG), New Orleans ARS, LA (nine aircraft). The 142d Fighter Wing's expeditionary combat support elements, along with the 244th and 272d Combat Communications Squadrons (ANG), will remain at Portland and Portland will continue to support a Homeland Defense alert commitment. The 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR) at Portland is realigned to McChord Air Force Base, WA, with no aircraft involved. The 214th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), a geographically separated unit at Jackson Barracks, LA, is relocated onto available facilities at New Orleans.

Justification: This recommendation realigns Portland's KC-135R tanker aircraft to Forbes Field and Tinker, installations with higher military value. Tinker (4) and Forbes (35) ranked higher than Portland (71) for the tanker mission, and both installations remain operationally effective due to their proximity to air refueling missions. This recommendation will robust the Reserve squadron size at Tinker and Air National Guard squadron size at Forbes, increasing these units' capability. An Air National Guard and Reserve KC-135 unit association will be established at Tinker to access Reserve experience and maximize regional Reserve participation in the aerial refueling mission. This recommendation will also ensure critical KC-135 backup aircraft inventory levels are preserved.

This recommendation also realigns Portland's F-15 fighter aircraft to an installation of higher military value. Atlantic City (61) ranks higher than Portland (77) for the fighter mission, and realigning Portland's F-15 aircraft to Atlantic City helps create an optimum-sized fighter squadron (24 Primary Aircraft Assigned). While New Orleans (79) ranks slightly below Portland for the fighter mission, the Air Force used military judgment in realigning Portland's remaining F-15 aircraft to New Orleans. New Orleans has above average military value for reserve component bases, and realigning aircraft from Portland creates another optimum-sized fighter squadron at New Orleans. Although the ANG will continue to support an alert commitment at Portland, the Air Force determined it is also a priority to support North American Defense Command (NORAD) and United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) air sovereignty alert requirements at Atlantic City and New Orleans. Creating effective sized squadrons at these reserve component locations ensures the Air Force can maintain trained, experienced pilots and maintenance technicians, and is able to fulfill its Homeland Defense alert requirements. Portland's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained, experienced Airmen.

By relocating the geographically separated Air National Guard squadron onto New Orleans, the Air Force best utilizes available facilities on the installation while reducing the cost to the government to lease facilities in the community.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$85.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$36.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation is \$14.0M, with a payback expected in seven years. The net present value of the savings to the Department over 20 years is \$100.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,018 jobs (564 direct jobs and 454 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and

recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.1M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Ellington Air Guard Station, TX

Recommendation: Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX. The 147th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) will retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place. Ellington retains the capability to support the Homeland Defense mission. The 272d Engineering Installation Squadron, an ANG geographically separated unit moves into available space on Ellington.

Justification: Ellington (80) ranked low in military value. The reduction in F-16 force structure and the need to align common versions of the F-16 at the same bases argued for allowing Ellington's F-16s to retire in place with no fighter mission backfill. Ellington is realigned to preserve the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert (ASA) site using aircraft assigned elsewhere and operating from Ellington on a rotational basis as tasked by US Northern Command. In a related recommendation, the Lackland Air Force Base, Texas Air National Guard F-16 initial training unit is increased in size to capitalize on Ellington's trained pilots and maintainers.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$1.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$0.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$0.4M with a payback expected in five years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$3.6M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 5 jobs (3 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 in the Houston-Baytown-Sugar Land, TX, Metropolitan Statistical economic area,

which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are no anticipated impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for the costs of environmental restoration, environmental compliance, or waste management activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Lackland Air Force Base, TX

Recommendation: Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX. Relocate the Standard Air Munitions Package (STAMP)/Standard Tank, Rack, Adaptor, and Pylon Packages (STRAPP) function from Lackland Air Force Base, Medina Annex to McConnell Air Force Base, KS, and transfer the mission to the Air National Guard.

Justification: This recommendation enables Air Force Total Force participation by converting one of two Air Force STAMP/STRAPP missions from active duty to the Air National Guard. Lackland Air Force Base, Medina Annex is one of two STAMP mission locations within the Air Force; Hill Air Force Base, UT is the other. This action will still retain two geographically separated munitions sites to support the Air Force's Air Expeditionary Force construct, yet reduce the active duty manpower requirement. Current munitions out-load operations from Medina Annex to the airhead at Lackland (the former Kelly Air Force Base airfield) pose transportation challenges in that explosives shipments are moved over local and interstate highways, increasing the security threat. The Air Force does not fully control the Lackland airfield, thus access and future encroachment cannot be assured. McConnell Air Force Base has co-located munitions storage and hot-cargo handling capability on the base, enhancing out-load effectiveness with little projected interference on existing missions. The base has sufficient 1.1 net explosive weight munitions storage capacity in existing structures that supported a former bomb wing mission, and ANG personnel at McConnell currently perform a function similar to the active duty STAMP mission. Because of this existing capability, mission conversion is expected to require fewer additional full-time ANG personnel at McConnell than active duty personnel at Medina.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$8.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the

implementation period is a savings of \$4.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.9M, with a payback expected in two years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$32.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 198 jobs (107 direct jobs and 91 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the San Antonio, TX, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$0.02M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Hill Air Force Base, UT, Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Luke Air Force Base, AZ, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV

Recommendation: Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT. Distribute the 419th Fighter Wing F-16s to the 482d Fighter Wing, Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL (six aircraft) and the 301st Fighter Wing, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX (nine aircraft). The AFMC F-16s at Hill will remain in place. Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA; Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; and Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating base-level LANTIRN intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTIRN) pods at Hill. Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV, by relocating base-level F110 engine intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a CIRF for F110 engines at Hill.

Justification: The Air Force distributed Reserve aircraft to Homestead Air Reserve Base (31) to create an optimum sized squadron that supports the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert mission. The remaining Reserve aircraft are distributed to the only other remaining Reserve F-16 squadron at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth (58). This laydown keeps the

active/Air National Guard/ Air Force Reserve force structure mix constant. Creating CIRFs for LANTIRN pods and F110 engines establishes Hill as a maintenance workload center for these commodities. This recommendation complements other CIRF recommendations as part of an Air Force effort to standardize stateside and deployed intermediate-level maintenance concepts, and will increase maintenance productivity and support to the warfighter.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$28.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$8.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$8.1M with a payback expected in four years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$85.9M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 245 jobs (121 direct jobs and 124 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Ogden-Clearfield, UT, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4 jobs (2 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Bakersfield, CA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 65 jobs (41 direct jobs and 24 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Mountain Home, ID, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.5 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 53 jobs (30 direct jobs and 23 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Phoenix-Scottsdale-Mesa, AZ, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 31 jobs (19 direct jobs and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Las Vegas-Paradise, NV, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates there are no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support forces, missions, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$1.0M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Langley Air Force Base, VA

Recommendation: Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA. Realign base-level F-15 avionics intermediate maintenance from Langley Air Force Base to Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, by establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, for F-15 avionics.

Justification: This recommendation standardizes stateside and deployed intermediate-level maintenance concepts, and complements other CIRF recommendations made by the Air Force. It will increase maintenance productivity and support to the warfighter by consolidating and smoothing dispersed, random workflows. As a result of other recommendations, Tyndall is expected to have two full squadrons (48 F-22s) as compared to only one squadron (24 F-15s) at Langley.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$1.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$1.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$0.7M, with a payback expected in three years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$8.3M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 39 jobs (19 direct jobs and 20 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; threatened and

endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.2M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, and Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA

Recommendation: Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA. Distribute the 192d Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (six aircraft); 482d Fighter Wing Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL (three aircraft) and to backup inventory (six aircraft). Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station real property accountability will transfer to the Department of the Army. The 192d Fighter Wing's manpower will associate with the 1st Fighter Wing. Realign Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA. The F-16 aircraft currently assigned to the 132d Fighter Wing at Des Moines are redistributed to the 180th Fighter Wing, Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station, OH (nine aircraft) and 138th Fighter Wing, Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, OK (six aircraft).

Justification: Prior to BRAC 2005, the USAF announced a plan for the 192d Fighter Wing (ANG) to associate at Langley Air Force Base. This announcement was made. To accommodate the association and the F-16 force structure plan, the Air Force distributed the F-16s from Richmond to other F-16 bases using military value and judgment. The F-16s from Richmond (49) are distributed to Des Moines (137) and Homestead (31) to enable the capability to support the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert mission. Des Moines' F-16s are distributed to Toledo (123) and Tulsa (114) to support the Homeland Defense Air Sovereignty Alert mission and to consolidate the precision-guided weapon employment capability that exists in the Air National Guard.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$24.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$11.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.5M with a payback expected in 10 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$13.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 219 jobs (126 direct jobs and 93 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Richmond, VA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 191 jobs (110 direct jobs and 81 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Des Moines, IA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. Impacts of costs include \$0.1M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Fairchild Air Force Base, WA

Recommendation: Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA. The 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will associate with the 92d Air Refueling Wing at Fairchild Air Force Base, and the 141st Air Refueling Wing's eight KC-135R aircraft are distributed to the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, IA. The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242d Combat Communications Squadron, which are ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated into available facilities at Fairchild Air Force Base.

Justification: This recommendation realigns aircraft and streamlines operations at Fairchild by associating the Air National Guard KC-135 wing with the active duty wing. Fairchild Air Force Base (17) ranked just behind McConnell Air Force Base as the active duty tanker base with highest military value for a tanker mission. This realignment preserves remaining capacity for the next generation tanker aircraft, while maintaining the ANG experience and recruiting potential within the region. In distributing KC-135R force structure to Sioux Gateway Air Guard Station (67), the Air Force applied military judgment in replacing aging, higher maintenance KC-135E force structure at Sioux Gateway with newer models to increase the unit's capability and retain trained, experienced aircrews and maintenance technicians. By relocating two geographically separated units onto Fairchild, the Air Force best uses its available resources while reducing the cost to the government of leased facilities.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$6.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$1.6M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$1.0M, with a payback expected in seven years. The net present value savings to the Department over 20 years is \$8.3M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 413 jobs (198 direct jobs and 215 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 period in the Spokane, WA, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to air quality; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; waste management; or water resources. No impacts are anticipated for the costs of environmental restoration, environmental compliance, or waste management activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI

Recommendation: Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station (ARS). Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 440th Airlift Wing to the 94th Airlift Wing (AFR), Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (four aircraft) and to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR (four aircraft). Realign the 440th Airlift Wing's operations, maintenance and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) manpower to Fort Bragg, NC. Air National Guard units at Mitchell are unaffected by this recommendation.

Justification: This recommendation distributes C-130 aircraft to two bases of higher military value, Little Rock Air Force Base (17) and Dobbins Air Reserve Base (71). Adding aircraft at Little Rock and Dobbins optimizes squadron size, creating larger, more effective squadrons. Additionally, these transfers move C-130 force structure from the Air Force Reserve to the active duty—addressing a documented imbalance in the active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve manning mix for C-130s.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$38.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$14.3M. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$6.5M, with payback expected in five years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$50.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 617 jobs (346 direct jobs and 271 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$0.4M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Air Force Logistics Support Centers

Recommendation: Realign Altus Air Force Base, OK; Hickam Air Force Base, HI; Hurlburt Field, FL; Langley Air Force Base, VA; Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; Luke Air Force Base, AZ; and Scott Air Force Base, IL. Establish Air Force Logistics Support Centers (LSCs) at Langley Air Force Base and Scott Air Force Base by combining five major command (MAJCOM) Regional Supply Squadrons (RSS) into two LSCs.

Combat Air Forces (CAF): Establish a CAF LSC at Langley Air Force Base by realigning RSS positions from Hickam Air Force Base and Sembach, Germany (non-BRAC programmatic) as well as base-level Logistics Readiness Squadron (LRS) positions from Luke Air Force Base.

Mobility Air Forces (MAF): Establish a MAF LSC at Scott Air Force Base by realigning RSS positions from Hurlburt Field and Sembach (non-BRAC programmatic) and LRS positions from Little Rock Air Force Base and Altus Air Force Base.

Justification: This recommendation is a transformational opportunity consistent with eLog21 initiatives that will standardize Air Force materiel management command and control. This recommendation realigns RSS manpower (from three MAJCOM locations) and base-level LRS manpower (from three installations) into two LSCs in support of Combat Air Forces and Mobility Air Forces. Consolidation will provide a seamless transition from peace to war for 3,012 aircraft and weapons systems associated with CAF/MAF forces and the Airmen that use them. It also provides a single point of contact to the warfighter, whether at home station or deployed. This recommendation will also result in the disestablishment of the Air Force Special Operations Command Regional Supply Squadron, Pacific Air Forces Regional Supply Squadron, and the United States Air Forces in Europe Regional Supply Squadron.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$9.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$19.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$6.1M with a payback expected in one year. The net present value to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$77.0M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 26 jobs (16 direct jobs and 10 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Altus, OK, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 269 jobs (151 direct jobs and 118 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Honolulu, HI, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 98 jobs (54 direct jobs and 44 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, FL, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 28 jobs (16 direct jobs and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 28 jobs (16 direct jobs and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or noise. Impacts of costs include \$0.08M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

F100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities

Recommendation: Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA; Tyndall Air Force Base, FL; and Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, FL. Establish a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for F100 engines at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, NC by realigning base-level F100 engine intermediate maintenance from Langley Air Force Base. Establish a CIRF for F100 engines at New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA (Air National Guard unit) by realigning base-level F100 engine intermediate maintenance from Tyndall Air Force Base and Jacksonville Air Guard Station.

Justification: This recommendation standardizes stateside and deployed intermediate-level maintenance concepts, and compliments other CIRF recommendations made by the Air Force. These CIRFs increase maintenance productivity and support to the warfighter by consolidating dispersed and random workflows, improving reliability-centered maintenance. Realigning F100 engine maintenance from Langley and establishing an eastern region CIRF at Seymour Johnson anticipates the installation as a maintenance workload center for F-15 engines. Seymour Johnson is projected to have up to 87 F-15 aircraft as compared to only 24 F-15 aircraft at Langley. Realigning F100 engine maintenance from Tyndall and Jacksonville into a CIRF at New Orleans (ANG unit) establishes a southeast region CIRF that will service F100 engines for up to 96 F-15 aircraft of active duty and Air National Guard aircraft, complimenting other Air Force recommendations that increase New Orleans and Jacksonville to an optimum 24 aircraft squadron size. The Air Force considered both New Orleans and Jacksonville for the southeast CIRF, but analysis indicated New Orleans would require less construction than Jacksonville due to existing maintenance facilities. A CIRF at New Orleans can also potentially capitalize on capacity and recruitment of experienced maintenance technicians as a result of the recommended realignment of the New Orleans Reserve A-10 mission.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$9.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the

implementation period is a cost of \$3.8M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.1M, with a payback expected in nine years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$7.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 66 jobs (32 direct jobs and 34 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 66 jobs (33 direct jobs and 33 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Panama City-Lynn Haven, FL, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 14 jobs (6 direct jobs and 8 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Jacksonville, FL, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$0.4M in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.

Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group

Summary of Selection Process

Introduction

The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel & Readiness) chaired the Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group (E&T JCSG). The E&T JCSG principals included senior members from each Military Department (MILDEP), the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), and the Joint Staff. The E&T JCSG was chartered to review DoD common business-oriented education and training functions, which included flight training, professional development education, specialized skill training, and range activities.

E&T JCSG Responsibilities and Strategy

The E&T JCSG was responsible for comprehensive analyses of assigned functions, an evaluation of alternatives, and the development and documentation of realignment and closure recommendations for submission to the Secretary of Defense. In developing its analytical process, the JCSG established internal policies and procedures consistent with DoD policy memoranda, the force structure plan and installation inventory; BRAC selection criteria; and the requirements of Public Law 101-510, as amended. To facilitate the group's efforts, categories of functions to be evaluated were developed, and the JCSG was organized into subgroups corresponding to these functions. A flag officer or civilian equivalent chaired each subgroup. Each Service and OSD appointed members to each subgroup. This structure provided an effective framework to evaluate the potential of cross-service, joint, and transformational opportunities to improve DoD's education and training programs.

The basic premise of the E&T JCSG was to ensure availability of world-class training to enhance readiness. The overarching strategies of the E&T JCSG included advancing joint and Total Force capabilities; eliminating redundancy, duplication, and excess capacity; achieving synergies; reducing costs by increasing effectiveness, efficiency, and interoperability; and exploiting best business practices. Operational strategies were then developed for evaluating functions performed by each subgroup. The subgroups, functions, and strategies are as follows:

• Flight Training

- Functions
 - Undergraduate fixed wing pilot training
 - Undergraduate rotary wing pilot training
 - Navigator/Naval Flight Officer

- Joint Strike Fighter initial training site, and
- Unmanned Aerial Vehicle operators.

▪ Operational Strategy

- Move toward fewer, more joint bases
- Position DOD to conduct similar UFT across services with common aircraft
- Enhance jointness while preserving Service-unique training and culture.

• Professional Development Education

▪ Functions

- Professional Military Education,
- Joint Professional Military Education,
- Other full-time education programs, and
- Leader development.

▪ Operational Strategy

- Transfer appropriate functions to the private sector,
- Create Joint Center of Excellence for common educational functions, and
- Balance joint and Service competencies within the professional military education spectrum.

• Ranges

▪ Functions

- Unit, interoperable, and joint ranges,
- Training support enablers for training ranges,
- Test and Evaluation ranges, and
- Simulation Centers.

▪ Operational Strategy

- Establish cross-functional/Service regional range complexes,
- Preserve irreplaceable, one-of-a-kind facilities, and
- Create new range capabilities for emerging joint needs.

- **Specialized Skill Training**

- Functions
 - Initial skill training,
 - Skill progression training, and
 - Functional training.
- Operational Strategy
 - Create Centers of Excellence for common training functions,
 - Rely on private sector for appropriate technical training, and
 - Preserve opportunities for continuing Service acculturation.

The E&T JCSG Analytical Process

The JCSG performed a detailed analysis of existing education and training capacity using certified data and developed recommendations that best satisfied current and future DoD requirements. The JCSG used military value as the primary consideration, while balancing other selection criteria and the future force structure to evaluate and document realignment and closure recommendations. Each subgroup calculated capacity for each function and sub-function using defined attributes and metrics. Questions, formulas, and filters were developed and tested for validity, adequacy, and quality. The Military Departments/Agencies issued controlled data calls, in question format, to their installations and the installations provided certified answers back to the JCSG via the Military Departments/Agencies. Each E&T subgroup analyzed the capacity at the installations, which included a review of potential surge requirements. Responses identified locations where the functions were performed which defined the full scope for each function. Subgroups assessed military value for each function using targeted installation lists. Military value data call questions allowed a value assessment of a facility's capability to perform specific functions based upon BRAC selection criteria 1-4. These criteria deal directly with a facility's mission capability, condition, potential for future contingencies, and cost of operation. The process allowed the subgroup to calculate the military value of facilities performing similar education and training functions. The results arrayed facilities performing similar functions in terms of military value. At each step, the DoD Inspector General (DoD IG) independently validated the data's adequacy and quality. Each subgroup identified strategy-based, data-supported realignment or closure scenarios. After scenarios were developed, the E&T JCSG applied criteria 5-8, using DoD BRAC standard procedures and/or models.

The E&T JCSG subgroups generated 295 ideas, which were refined into 164 proposals. The group narrowed the 164 proposals to 64 declared scenarios using a deliberative process. After detailed analysis, the E&T JCSG forwarded 17 fully developed candidate recommendations for consideration. The Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) disapproved two candidate

recommendations, and the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC) disapproved two. During JCSG and MILDEP integration of candidate recommendations, four E&T candidate recommendations were rolled into Military Department recommendations resulting in nine E&T JCSG recommendations.

The recommendations approved by the Secretary of Defense follow:

Recommendations and Justifications

Aviation Logistics School

Recommendation: Realign Fort Eustis by relocating the Aviation Logistics School and consolidating it with the Aviation Center and School at Fort Rucker.

Justification: This recommendation consolidates Aviation training and doctrine development at a single location. Consolidating Aviation Logistics training with the Aviation Center and School fosters consistency, standardization and training proficiency. It consolidates both Aviation skill level I producing courses at one location, which allows the Army to reduce the total number of Military Occupational Skills (MOS) training locations (lessening the TRADOC footprint). Additionally, it enhances military value, supports the Army's force structure plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address future unforeseen requirements. It improves training capabilities while eliminating excess capacity at institutional training installations. This provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost. This recommendation supports Army Transformation by collocating institutional training, MTOE units, RDT&E organizations and other TDA units in large numbers on single installations to support force stabilization and engage training.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$492.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$348.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$42.9M with a payback expected in 13 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$77.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 5,000 jobs (2,410 direct jobs and 2,590 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA, metropolitan statistical area, which is 0.5 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.4M for environmental compliance activities. This cost was included

in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Combat Service Support Center

Recommendation: Realign Fort Eustis, VA, by relocating the Transportation Center and School to Fort Lee, VA. Realign Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD by relocating the Ordnance Center and School to Fort Lee, VA. Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, by relocating the Missile and Munitions Center to Fort Lee, VA. Consolidate the Transportation Center and School and the Ordnance Center and School with the Quartermaster Center & School, the Army Logistic Management College, and Combined Arms Support Command, to establish a Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA.

Justification: This recommendation consolidates Combat Service Support (CSS) training and doctrine development at a single installation, which promotes training effectiveness and functional efficiencies. The moves advance the Maneuver Support Center (MANSCEN) model, currently in place at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, which consolidates the Military Police, Engineer, and Chemical Centers and Schools. This recommendation improves the MANSCEN concept by consolidating functionally related Branch Centers & Schools. It enhances military value, supports the Army's force structure plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address future unforeseen requirements. It improves training capabilities while eliminating excess capacity at institutional training installations. This provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost. This recommendation supports Army Transformation by collocating institutional training, MTOE units, RDT&E organizations, and other TDA units in large numbers on single installations to support force stabilization and engage training.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$754.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a savings of \$352.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$131.8M with a payback expected in 6 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$934.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 3,516 jobs (1,709 direct jobs and 1,807 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC, metropolitan economic area, which is 0.4 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 7,386 jobs (4,200 direct jobs and 3,186 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Baltimore-Towson, MD, metropolitan economic area, which is 0.5 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 2,120 jobs (1,443 direct jobs and 677 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Huntsville, AL, metropolitan economic area, which is 0.9 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation may impact air quality at Fort Lee. However, noise caused by Ordnance School operations may result in significant impacts at Fort Lee. A noise analysis and mitigation may be required. This recommendation will have some impact on water resources at Fort Lee due to the increased demand from incoming personnel. This recommendation may require upgrade of wastewater treatment plan. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or wetlands. The recommendation will require spending approximately \$1.2M for environmental compliance activities. This cost was included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training

Recommendation: Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the Transportation Management training to Fort Lee, VA.

Justification: Eliminates redundancy. "Train as we fight; jointly." Consolidates like schools while preserving service unique culture. Although Lackland Air Force Base, TX, has a higher military value than Fort Lee, VA, it is the military judgment of the JCSG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of transportation training produces the greatest overall Military Value to the Department. Uses Inter-service Training Review Organization (ITRO) as the baseline.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$1.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$5.8M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation is \$1.3M with a payback expected in one year. The net present value of the costs and Department savings over 20 years is a savings of \$18.0M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 260 jobs (155 direct jobs and 105 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the San Antonio, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: Review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resources areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation requires spending approximately \$0.1M for environmental compliance activities. This cost was included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training

Recommendation: Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Culinary Training to Fort Lee, VA, establishing it as a Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.

Justification: Consolidates Culinary Training at the installation with the largest Service requirement. Eliminates redundancy and costs. Trains the Services culinary training under Inter-service Training Review Organization (ITRO). It is the military judgment of the JCSG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of culinary training produces the greatest overall military value to the Department, through increased training efficiency at a lower cost.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$5.0. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$2.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation is \$1.4M with a payback expected in four years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$16.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 471 jobs (291 direct jobs and 180 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the San Antonio, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resources areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. The recommendation will require spending \$0.1M for environmental compliance activities. This cost was included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training & Education

Recommendation: Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, AL; Naval Air Station Meridian, MS; and Naval Station Newport, RI, by relocating religious training and education to Fort Jackson, SC, establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education.

Justification: Consolidation at Fort Jackson, SC, creates a synergistic benefit by having each Services' officer and enlisted programs conducted in close proximity to operational forces. Realized savings result from consolidation and alignment of similar officer and enlisted educational activities and the merging of common support functions. This recommendation supports the following DoD transformational options: 1) establish center of excellence for joint education and training by combining like schools; and 2) establish joint officer and enlisted specialized skills training.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$1.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings \$4.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation is \$0.8M, with a payback expected in one year. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$11.9M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 88 jobs (39 direct jobs and 49 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 32 jobs (17 direct jobs and 15 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Meridian, MS, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 37 jobs (22 direct jobs and 15 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Montgomery, AL, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation will have a minimal impact on air quality at Fort Jackson. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resources areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.3M for waste management and environmental compliance activities. This cost was included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site

Recommendation: Realign Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Marine Corps' portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, VA, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots, operations, and maintenance support personnel to stand up the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of front-line and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of front-line and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Department of the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

Justification: This recommendation establishes Eglin Air Force Base, FL as an Initial Joint Training Site that teaches entry-level aviators and maintenance technicians how to safely operate and maintain the new Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) (F-35) aircraft. The Department is scheduled to take delivery of the F-35 beginning in 2008. This joint basing arrangement will allow the Inter-service Training Review Organization (ITRO) process to establish a DoD baseline program in a consolidated/joint school with curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a faculty and staff that brings a "Train as we fight; jointly" national perspective to the learning process.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$199.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$209.6M. Annual recurring costs to the Department after implementation are \$3.3M with no payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$226.3M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 888 jobs (392 direct jobs and 496 indirect jobs) over 2008-2011 in the Pensacola-Ferry, Pass-Brent, FL, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.4 percent of economic area employment. Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 85 jobs (48 direct jobs and 37 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 82 jobs (43 direct jobs and 39 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 69 jobs (33 direct jobs and 36 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 487 jobs (295 direct jobs and 192 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the Wichita Falls, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.5 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation may require a significant air permit revision for Eglin Air Force Base. Additional operations at Eglin Air Force Base could impact cultural, archeological, or historic sites, which would then impact operations. DoD will need to re-evaluate Eglin Air Force Base noise contours as a result of the change in mission. This recommendation will require Endangered Species Act Consultation for all T&E species at Eglin. This recommendation may require modifying the hazardous waste program and on-installation water treatment works permits. Additional operations may impact wetlands at Eglin. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or water resources. This recommendation will require approximately \$1.0M for waste management and environmental compliance activities. This cost was included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the cost of environmental restoration, waste management, or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Net Fires Center

Recommendation: Realign Fort Bliss, TX, by relocating the Air Defense Artillery (ADA) Center & School to Fort Sill, OK. Consolidate the Air Defense Artillery Center & School with the Field Artillery Center & School to establish a Net Fires Center.

Justification: This recommendation consolidates Net Fires training and doctrine development at a single location. The moves advance the Maneuver Support Center (MANSCEN) model, currently in place at Ft. Leonard Wood, which consolidated the Military Police, Engineer, and Chemical Centers and Schools. This recommendation improves the MANSCEN concept by consolidating functionally related Branch Centers & Schools, which fosters consistency, standardization, and training proficiency. It also facilitates task force stabilization, by combining operational forces with institutional training. In addition, it consolidates both ADA and Field Artillery skill level 1 courses at one location, which allows the Army to reduce the total number of Military Occupational Skills training locations (reducing the TRADOC footprint). Additionally, it enhances military value, supports the Army's force structure plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address future unforeseen requirements. It improves training capabilities while eliminating excess capacity at institutional training installations. This provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost. This recommendation supports Army Transformation by collocating institutional training, Modification Table of organization and Equipment (MTOE) units, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) organizations and other TDA units in large numbers on single installations to support force stabilization and engage training.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$247.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$93.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$42.6M with a payback expected in 6 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$319.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 6,020 jobs (3,369 direct jobs and 2,651 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the El Paso, TX, metropolitan economic area, which is 1.9 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the community to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Development of a Programmatic Agreement will be necessary at Fort Sill to formalize mitigation measures and restrictions and evaluations to determine significance of cultural and historical resources. Tribal/government-to-government consultations may be required. A Noise Analysis and continuous monitoring efforts will likely be required at Fort Sill. Additional operations at Fort Sill may impact the Black-capped Vireo, possibly leading to restrictions on operations. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required at Fort Sill to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA Water Quality Standards. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.4M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, MO

Recommendation: Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating Army Prime Power School training to Fort Leonard Wood, MO.

Justification: The United States Army Prime Power School courses taught at Fort Belvoir, VA, are Engineer Branch courses. The United States Army Engineer Center at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, serves as the Service engineer proponent. The common-core phase of engineer courses are already taught at Fort Leonard Wood, MO. This realignment consolidates engineer courses at Fort Leonard Wood, MO. Consolidate like schools while preserving service unique culture. The United States Army Engineer School trains other services under Inter-service Training Review Organization (ITRO).

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$5.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$3.8M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation is \$0.5M with a payback expected in 16 years. The net present value of the costs and Department savings over 20 years is a savings of \$0.9M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 170 jobs (102 direct jobs and 68 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV, Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: Review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resources areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require no spending for environmental compliance activities. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training

Recommendation: Realign Moody Air Force Base, GA, as follows: relocate the Primary Phase of Fixed-wing Pilot Training to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Randolph Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; and relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Undergraduate Navigator Training to Naval Air Station, Pensacola, FL.

Justification: This recommendation will realign and consolidate USAF's primary phase of undergraduate flight training functions to reduce excess/unused basing capacity to eliminate redundancy, enhance jointness for UNT/Naval Flight Officer (NFO) training, reduce excess capacity, and improve military value.

The basing arrangement that flows from this recommendation will allow the Inter-service Training Review Organization (ITRO) process to establish a DoD baseline program in UNT/NFO with curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a

faculty and staff that brings a "Train as we fight; jointly" national perspective to the learning process.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$71.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$1.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$18.3M with a payback expected in four years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$174.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,079 jobs (571 direct jobs and 508 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the San Antonio, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,170 jobs (702 direct jobs and 468 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 in the Valdosta, GA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 1.3 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation may require significant air permit revisions for Columbus, Laughlin, Vance, and Sheppard Air Force Bases. This recommendation may impact cultural, archeological, or historical resources at Columbus, Sheppard, and Laughlin Air Force Bases. DoD will need to re-evaluate noise contours for Columbus, Laughlin, Vance, Sheppard, and Pensacola. Additional operations at Sheppard may impact threatened and endangered species and/or critical habitat. May need to modify the hazardous waste program for Columbus, Laughlin, Vance, and Sheppard Air Force Bases. Additional operations at Columbus, Laughlin, Vance, and Sheppard Air Force Bases may impact wetlands, which may restrict operations. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or water resources. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$2.3M for waste management and environmental compliance activities. This cost was included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the cost of environmental restoration, waste management, or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the bases in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.



Aircraft Moves

F-16

| Installation | MDS | Blk | Current PAA | Move | To |
|-----------------------------------|------|-----|-------------|------------------|--|
| Atlantic City IAP AGS, NJ | F-16 | 25 | 15 | 12 3 | Retirement Burlington AGS, VT |
| Cannon AFB, NM | F-16 | 30 | 18 | 9 3 3 3 | Andrews AFB, MD (ANG) Truax Field AGS, WI Kirtland AFB, MN (ANG) Joe Foss AGS, SD |
| Cannon AFB, NM | F-16 | 40 | 24 | 11 7 6 | Backup Inventory Nellis AFB, NV Hill AFB, UT |
| Cannon AFB, NM | F-16 | 50 | 18 | 18 | Backup Inventory |
| Capital Apt (Springfield) AGS, IL | F-16 | 30 | 15 | 15 | Fort Wayne |
| Des Moines IAP AGS, IA | F-16 | 42 | 15 | 9 6 | Toledo AGS, OH Tulsa IAP AGS, OK |
| Duluth IAP AGS, MN | F-16 | 25 | 15 | 15 | Retirement |
| Eielson AFB, AK | F-16 | 40 | 18 | 18 | Nellis AFB, NV |
| Ellington Field AGS, TX | F-16 | 25 | 15 | 15 | Retirement |
| Fort Smith Reg Apt AGS, AR | F-16 | 32 | 15 | 8 7 | Retirement Fresno AGS, CA |
| Fort Wayne IAP AGS, IN | F-16 | 25 | 15 | 15 | Retirement |
| Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA | F-16 | 25 | 15 | 15 | Retirement |
| Great Falls IAP AGS, MT | F-16 | 30 | 15 | 9 3 3 | Retirement Dannelly Field AGS, AL Des Moines AGS, IA |



Aircraft Moves

F-16

| Installation | MDS | Blk | Current PAA | Move | To |
|-----------------------------|------|-----|-------------|------|------------------------|
| Hector IAP AGS, ND | F-16 | 15 | 15 | 15 | Retirement |
| Hill AFB, UT (AFR unit) | F-16 | 30 | 15 | 9 | Carswell ARS, TX |
| | | | | 6 | Homestead ARB, FL |
| Hulman Reg Apt AGS, IN | F-16 | 30 | 15 | 9 | Fort Wayne AGS, IN |
| | | | | 6 | Retirement |
| Luke AFB, AZ | F-16 | 25 | 79 | 13 | Retirement |
| Luke AFB, AZ | F-16 | 32 | 11 | 11 | Fresno AGS, CA |
| Luke AFB, AZ | F-16 | 42 | 76 | 24 | Retirement |
| Mountain Home AFB, ID | F-16 | 52 | 18 | 9 | McEntire AGS, SC |
| | | | | 5 | Nellis AFB, NV |
| | | | | 4 | Backup Inventory |
| Nellis AFB, NV | F-16 | 32 | 7 | 6 | Fresno AGS, CA |
| | | | | 1 | Retirement |
| Nellis AFB, NV | F-16 | 42 | 18 | 15 | Retirement |
| | | | | 3 | Tulsa AGS, OK |
| Richmond IAP AGS, VA | F-16 | 30 | 15 | 6 | Des Moines AGS, IA |
| | | | | 6 | Backup Inventory |
| | | | | 3 | Homestead ARB, FL |
| Selfridge ANGB, MI | F-16 | 30 | 15 | 15 | Retirement |
| Springfield-Beckley AGS, OH | F-16 | 30 | 18 | 9 | Des Moines AGS, IA |
| | | | | 6 | Lackland AFB, TX (ANG) |
| | | | | 3 | Buckley AFB, CO (ANG) |



Aircraft Moves

C-130

| Installation | MDS | Current PAA | Move | To |
|-------------------------------|--------|-------------|------|-------------------------|
| Boise AGS, ID | C-130H | 4 | 4 | Cheyenne AGS, WY |
| Channel Islands AGS, CA | C-130E | 2 | 2 | Retirement |
| Dyess AFB, TX | C-130H | 32 | 24 | Little Rock AFB, AR |
| | | | 4 | Elmendorf AFB, AK (ANG) |
| | | | 4 | Peterson AFB, CO (AFR) |
| Gen Mitchell ARS, WI | C-130H | 8 | 4 | Dobbins ARB, GA |
| | | | 4 | Little Rock AFB, AR |
| Kulis AGS, AK | C-130H | 8 | 8 | Elmendorf |
| Little Rock AFB, AR | C-130E | 35 | 27 | Retirement |
| | | | 8 | BAI |
| Little Rock AFB, AR | C-130J | 7 | 2 | Channel Islands AGS, CA |
| | | | 1 | Quonset St AGS, RI |
| Mansfield-Lahm AGS, OH | C-130H | 8 | 4 | Little Rock AFB, AR |
| | | | 4 | Maxwell AFB, AL (AFR) |
| Martin State Apt AGS, MD | C-130J | 8 | 4 | Channel Islands AGS, CA |
| | | | 4 | Quonset St AGS, RI |
| Nashville AGS, TN | C-130H | 8 | 4 | Greater Peoria AGS, IL |
| | | | 4 | Louisville IAP AGS, KY |
| New Castle Co Apt AGS, DE | C-130H | 8 | 4 | Charlotte AGS, NC |
| | | | 4 | Savannah AGS, GA |
| Niagara Falls ARS, NY | C-130H | 8 | 8 | Little Rock AFB, AR |
| Pittsburgh ARS, PA | C-130H | 8 | 8 | Pope/Ft Bragg, NC (AFR) |
| Pope AFB, NC | C-130E | 25 | 25 | Little Rock AFB, AR |
| Quonset St Apt AGS, RI | C-130E | 2 | 2 | Retirement |
| Reno-Tahoe AGS, NV | C-130H | 8 | 8 | Little Rock AFB, AR |
| Schenectady Co Apt AGS, NY | C-130H | 4 | 4 | Little Rock AFB, AR |
| Selfridge ANGB, MI | C-130E | 8 | 8 | Retirement |
| Will Rogers World Apt AGS, OK | C-130H | 8 | 4 | Rosecrans AGS, MO |
| | | | 4 | Carswell ARS, TX |
| Willow Grove JRB, PA (AFR) | C-130E | 8 | 8 | Retirement |
| Yeager Apt AGS, WV | C-130H | 8 | 8 | Pope/Ft Bragg, NC (AFR) |



Aircraft Moves

KC-135

| Installation | MDS | Current PAA | Move | To |
|--------------------------------------|---------|-------------|------------------------|--|
| Bangor IAP AGS, ME | KC-135E | 8 | 8 | Retirement |
| Beale AFB, CA (AFR unit) | KC-135R | 8 | 4 4 | Selfridge ANGB, MI (ANG) McGee Tyson AGS, TN |
| Birmingham IAP AGS, AL | KC-135R | 8 | 4 2 2 | McGee Tyson AGS, TN Bangor AGS, ME Phoenix Sky Harbor AGS, AZ |
| Fairchild AFB, WA (ANG unit) | KC-135R | 8 | 8 | Sioux Gateway AGS, IA |
| Forbes Field AGS, KS | KC-135E | 8 | 8 | Retirement |
| Grand Forks AFB, ND | KC-135R | 36 | 12 8 8 4 4 | Scott AFB, IL (ANG) Seymour Johnson AFB, NC (AFR) McConnell AFB, KS Hickam AFB, HI (ANG) MacDill AFB, FL |
| Key Field AGS, MS | KC-135R | 9 | 3 3 2 1 | McGee Tyson AGS, TN Gen Mitchell AGS, WI Bangor AGS, ME Backup Inventory |
| March ARB, CA (ANG unit) | KC-135R | 9 | 4 3 1 1 | March ARB, CA (AFR) Pease AGS, NH McGee Tyson AGS, TN McConnell AFB, KS |
| McConnell AFB, KS (ANG unit) | KC-135R | 9 | 9 | Forbes Field AGS, KS |
| McGee Tyson APT AGS, TN | KC-135E | 8 | 8 | Retirement |
| McGuire AFB, NJ (AFR unit) | KC-135E | 16 | 16 | Retirement |
| Niagara Falls IAP ARS, NY (ANG unit) | KC-135R | 8 | 8 | Bangor AGS, ME |
| Portland IAP AGS, OR | KC-135R | 8 | 4 3 1 | Tinker AFB, OK (AFR) Forbes Field AGS, KS Backup Inventory |
| Robins AFB, GA | KC-135R | 12 | 9 3 | McConnell AFB, KS Backup Inventory |
| Scott AFB, IL (ANG Unit) | KC-135E | 8 | 8 | Retirement |
| Selfridge ANGB, MI (AFR unit) | KC-135R | 8 | 8 | Selfridge ANGB, MI (ANG) |
| Sioux Gateway APT AGS, IA | KC-135E | 8 | 8 | Retirement |



Aircraft Moves

F-15 C/E

| Installation | MDS | Current PAA | Move | To |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------------|--|
| Elmendorf AFB, AK | F-15E | 18 | 18 | Mountain Home AFB, ID |
| Elmendorf AFB, AK | F-15C | 42 | 24 | Langley AFB, VA |
| Lambert - St. Louis IAP AGS, MO | F-15C | 15 | 9 6 | Nellis AFB, NV Atlantic City IAP AGS, NJ |
| Mountain Home AFB, ID | F-15C | 18 | 9 6 3 | Nellis AFB, NV Jacksonville AGS, FL Retirement |
| Otis ANGB, MA | F-15C | 15 | 12 3 | Atlantic City IAP AGS Jacksonville AGS, FL |
| Portland IAP AGS, OR | F-15C | 15 | 9 6 | New Orleans, LA (ANG) Atlantic City AGS, NJ |

TOTAL COBRA ONE-TIME COST REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 1/3
 Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:25 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

(All values in 2005 Constant Dollars)

| Category | Cost | Sub-Total |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| ----- | ---- | ----- |
| Construction | | |
| Military Construction | 249,067,000 | |
| Total - Construction | | 249,067,000 |
| Personnel | | |
| Civilian RIF | 5,912,020 | |
| Civilian Early Retirement | 419,615 | |
| Eliminated Military PCS | 6,303,035 | |
| Unemployment | 458,453 | |
| Total - Personnel | | 13,093,122 |
| Overhead | | |
| Program Management Cost | 9,525,563 | |
| Support Contract Termination | 11,133,000 | |
| Mothball / Shutdown | 663,120 | |
| Total - Overhead | | 21,321,683 |
| Moving | | |
| Civilian Moving | 3,118,864 | |
| Civilian PPP | 2,236,248 | |
| Military Moving | 5,901,679 | |
| Freight | 1,868,687 | |
| Information Technologies | 8,962,800 | |
| One-Time Moving Costs | 11,776,000 | |
| Total - Moving | | 33,864,278 |
| Other | | |
| HAP / RSE | 1,845,246 | |
| Environmental Mitigation Costs | 2,111,000 | |
| Mission Contract Startup and Termination | 0 | |
| One-Time Unique Costs | 45,614,200 | |
| Total - Other | | 49,570,446 |
| ----- | | |
| Total One-Time Costs | | 366,916,529 |
| ----- | | |
| One-Time Savings | | |
| Military Construction Cost Avoidances | 0 | |
| Military Moving | 3,619,859 | |
| One-Time Moving Savings | 0 | |
| Environmental Mitigation Savings | 0 | |
| One-Time Unique Savings | 0 | |
| ----- | | |
| Total One-Time Savings | | 3,619,859 |
| ----- | | |
| Total Net One-Time Costs | | 363,296,671 |

COBRA ONE-TIME COST REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 2/3
 Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:25 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

Base: Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM)
 (All values in 2005 Constant Dollars)

| Category | Cost | Sub-Total |
|--|------------|------------|
| ----- | ---- | ----- |
| Construction | | |
| Military Construction | 0 | |
| Total - Construction | | 0 |
| Personnel | | |
| Civilian RIF | 5,912,020 | |
| Civilian Early Retirement | 419,615 | |
| Eliminated Military PCS | 6,303,035 | |
| Unemployment | 458,453 | |
| Total - Personnel | | 13,093,122 |
| Overhead | | |
| Program Management Cost | 9,525,563 | |
| Support Contract Termination | 11,133,000 | |
| Mothball / Shutdown | 663,120 | |
| Total - Overhead | | 21,321,683 |
| Moving | | |
| Civilian Moving | 3,118,864 | |
| Civilian PPP | 2,236,248 | |
| Military Moving | 5,901,679 | |
| Freight | 1,868,687 | |
| Information Technologies | 410,800 | |
| One-Time Moving Costs | 11,776,000 | |
| Total - Moving | | 25,312,278 |
| Other | | |
| HAP / RSE | 1,845,246 | |
| Environmental Mitigation Costs | 1,150,000 | |
| Mission Contract Startup and Termination | 0 | |
| One-Time Unique Costs | 577,200 | |
| Total - Other | | 3,572,446 |
| ----- | | |
| Total One-Time Costs | | 63,299,529 |
| ----- | | |
| One-Time Savings | | |
| Military Construction Cost Avoidances | 0 | |
| Military Moving | 3,619,859 | |
| One-Time Moving Savings | 0 | |
| Environmental Mitigation Savings | 0 | |
| One-Time Unique Savings | 0 | |
| ----- | | |
| Total One-Time Savings | | 3,619,859 |
| ----- | | |
| Total Net One-Time Costs | | 59,679,671 |

COBRA ONE-TIME COST REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 3/3
 Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:25 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

Base: Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ)
 (All values in 2005 Constant Dollars)

| Category | Cost | Sub-Total |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| ----- | ---- | ----- |
| Construction | | |
| Military Construction | 249,067,000 | |
| Total - Construction | | 249,067,000 |
| Personnel | | |
| Civilian RTF | 0 | |
| Civilian Early Retirement | 0 | |
| Eliminated Military PCS | 0 | |
| Unemployment | 0 | |
| Total - Personnel | | 0 |
| Overhead | | |
| Program Management Cost | 0 | |
| Support Contract Termination | 0 | |
| Mothball / Shutdown | 0 | |
| Total - Overhead | | 0 |
| Moving | | |
| Civilian Moving | 0 | |
| Civilian PPP | 0 | |
| Military Moving | 0 | |
| Freight | 0 | |
| Information Technologies | 8,552,000 | |
| One-Time Moving Costs | 0 | |
| Total - Moving | | 8,552,000 |
| Other | | |
| HAP / RSE | 0 | |
| Environmental Mitigation Costs | 961,000 | |
| Mission Contract Startup and Termination | 0 | |
| One-Time Unique Costs | 45,037,000 | |
| Total - Other | | 45,998,000 |
| ----- | | |
| Total One-Time Costs | | 303,617,000 |
| ----- | | |
| One-Time Savings | | |
| Military Construction Cost Avoidances | 0 | |
| Military Moving | 0 | |
| One-Time Moving Savings | 0 | |
| Environmental Mitigation Savings | 0 | |
| One-Time Unique Savings | 0 | |
| ----- | | |
| Total One-Time Savings | | 0 |
| ----- | | |
| Total Net One-Time Costs | | 303,617,000 |

COBRA SUSTAINMENT/RECAP/BOS/HOUSING CHANGE REPORT (COBRA v6.10)
 Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:23 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

| Net Change(\$K) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total | Beyond |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Sustain Change | 0 | 2,265 | 2,265 | -9,964 | -9,964 | -9,964 | -25,361 | -12,122 |
| Recap Change | -14,495 | -12,437 | -12,437 | -12,437 | -12,437 | -12,437 | -76,679 | -12,437 |
| BOS Change | 0 | 0 | -5,488 | -14,664 | -14,664 | -14,664 | -49,482 | -14,664 |
| Housing Change | 0 | 0 | 0 | -8,719 | -17,439 | -17,439 | -43,597 | -17,439 |
| TOTAL CHANGES | -14,495 | -10,172 | -15,660 | -45,784 | -54,504 | -54,504 | -195,119 | -56,662 |

| Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM) | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Net Change(\$K) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total | Beyond |
| Sustain Change | 0 | 0 | 0 | -12,229 | -12,229 | -12,229 | -36,687 | -14,387 |
| Recap Change | -14,495 | -14,495 | -14,495 | -14,495 | -14,495 | -14,495 | -86,971 | -14,495 |
| BOS Change | 0 | 0 | -11,358 | -20,534 | -20,534 | -20,534 | -72,959 | -20,534 |
| Housing Change | 0 | 0 | 0 | -8,719 | -17,439 | -17,439 | -43,597 | -17,439 |
| TOTAL CHANGES | -14,495 | -14,495 | -25,853 | -55,977 | -64,697 | -64,697 | -240,214 | -66,855 |

| Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ) | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Net Change(\$K) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total | Beyond |
| Sustain Change | 0 | 2,265 | 2,265 | 2,265 | 2,265 | 2,265 | 11,326 | 2,265 |
| Recap Change | 0 | 2,058 | 2,058 | 2,058 | 2,058 | 2,058 | 10,292 | 2,058 |
| BOS Change | 0 | 0 | 5,869 | 5,869 | 5,869 | 5,869 | 23,477 | 5,869 |
| Housing Change | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL CHANGES | 0 | 4,323 | 10,193 | 10,193 | 10,193 | 10,193 | 45,095 | 10,193 |

TOTAL COBRA PERSONNEL IMPACT REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 1/3
 Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:13 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

| | Rate | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-------------------------------------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS REALIGNING OUT | | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| Early Retirement* | 8.10% | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Regular Retirement* | 1.67% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Civilian Turnover* | 9.16% | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Civs Not Moving (RIFs)* | 6.00% | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Civilians Moving (the remainder) | | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| Civilian Positions Available | | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS ELIMINATED | | 0 | 0 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 309 |
| Early Retirement | 8.10% | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Regular Retirement | 1.67% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Civilian Turnover | 9.16% | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Civs Not Moving (RIFs)* | 6.00% | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Priority Placement# | 39.97% | 0 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| Civilians Available to Move | | 0 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| Civilians Moving | | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Civilian RIFs (the remainder) | | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS REALIGNING IN | | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| Civilians Moving | | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| New Civilians Hired | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Civilian Additions | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN EARLY RETIREMENTS | | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN RIFS | | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN PRIORITY PLACEMENTS# | | 0 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN NEW HIRES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Early Retirements, Regular Retirements, Civilian Turnover, and Civilians Not Willing to Move are not applicable for moves under fifty miles.

Not all Priority Placements involve a Permanent Change of Station. The rate of PPP placements involving a PCS is 50.70%

COBRA PERSONNEL IMPACT REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 2/3

Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:19 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

| Base: Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM) Rate | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-------------------------------------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS REALIGNING OUT | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| Early Retirement* | 8.10% | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Regular Retirement* | 1.67% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Civilian Turnover* | 9.16% | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Civs Not Moving (RIFs)* | 6.00% | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Civilians Moving (the remainder) | | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| Civilian Positions Available | | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS ELIMINATED | 0 | 0 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 309 |
| Early Retirement | 8.10% | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Regular Retirement | 1.67% | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Civilian Turnover | 9.16% | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Civs Not Moving (RIFs)* | 6.00% | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Priority Placement# | 39.97% | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| Civilians Available to Move | | 0 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| Civilians Moving | | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Civilian RIFs (the remainder) | | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS REALIGNING IN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilians Moving | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Civilians Hired | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Civilian Additions | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN EARLY RETIRMENTS | | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN RIFs | | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN PRIORITY PLACEMENTS# | | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN NEW HIRES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Early Retirements, Regular Retirements, Civilian Turnover, and Civilians Not Willing to Move are not applicable for moves under fifty miles.

Not all Priority Placements involve a Permanent Change of Station. The rate of PPP placements involving a PCS is 50.70%

COBRA PERSONNEL IMPACT REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 3/3
 Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:19 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

| Base: Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ) | Rate | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-------------------------------------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS REALIGNING OUT | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Early Retirement* | 8.10% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regular Retirement* | 1.67% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilian Turnover* | 9.16% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civs Not Moving (RIFs)* | 6.00% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilians Moving (the remainder) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilian Positions Available | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS ELIMINATED | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Early Retirement | 8.10% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regular Retirement | 1.67% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilian Turnover | 9.16% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civs Not Moving (RIFs)* | 6.00% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Priority Placement# | 39.97% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilians Available to Move | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilians Moving | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilian RIFs (the remainder) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CIVILIAN POSITIONS REALIGNING IN | | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| Civilians Moving | | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| New Civilians Hired | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Civilian Additions | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN EARLY RETIRMENTS | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN RIFS | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN PRIORITY PLACEMENTS# | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL CIVILIAN NEW HIRES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Early Retirements, Regular Retirements, Civilian Turnover, and Civilians Not Willing to Move are not applicable for moves under fifty miles.

Not all Priority Placements involve a Permanent Change of Station. The rate of PPP placements involving a PCS is 50.70%

COBRA TOTAL PERSONNEL SUMMARY REPORT (COBRA v6.10)
 Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:17 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

TOTAL SCENARIO POPULATION (FY 2005):

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 998 | 7,600 | 10 | 769 |

TOTAL PROGRAMMED INSTALLATION (NON-BRAC) CHANGES, ENTIRE SCENARIO:

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Officers | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Enlisted | 40 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilians | 64 | 1 | -5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| TOTAL | 112 | 46 | -5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |

TOTAL SCENARIO POPULATION (FY 2005, Prior to BRAC Action):

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1,018 | 7,673 | 10 | 829 |

TOTAL PERSONNEL REALIGNMENTS, ENTIRE SCENARIO):

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| Officers | 0 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| Enlisted | 0 | 0 | 1,704 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,704 |
| Students | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Civilians | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2,054 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,054 |

TOTAL SCENARIO POSITION CHANGES, ENTIRE SCENARIO:

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|--------|------|------|------|--------|
| Officers | 0 | 0 | -115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -115 |
| Enlisted | 0 | 0 | -1,275 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1,275 |
| Civilians | 0 | 0 | -309 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -309 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | -1,699 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1,699 |

TOTAL SCENARIO POPULATION (After BRAC Action):

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 903 | 6,398 | 10 | 520 |

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

PERSONNEL SUMMARY FOR: Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM)

BASE POPULATION (FY 2005):

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 329 | 3,017 | 7 | 399 |

PROGRAMMED INSTALLATION (NON-BRAC) CHANGES FOR: Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM)

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Officers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Enlisted | -38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -38 |
| Students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilians | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| TOTAL | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

BASE POPULATION (Prior to BRAC Action) FOR: Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM)

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 329 | 2,979 | 7 | 438 |

PERSONNEL REALIGNMENTS:

To Base: Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ)

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| Officers | 0 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| Enlisted | 0 | 0 | 1,704 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,704 |
| Students | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Civilians | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2,054 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,054 |

TOTAL PERSONNEL REALIGNMENTS (Out of Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM)):

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| Officers | 0 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| Enlisted | 0 | 0 | 1,704 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,704 |
| Students | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Civilians | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2,054 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,054 |

SCENARIO POSITION CHANGES FOR: Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM)

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|--------|------|------|------|--------|
| Officers | 0 | 0 | -115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -115 |
| Enlisted | 0 | 0 | -1,275 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1,275 |
| Civilians | 0 | 0 | -309 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -309 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | -1,699 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1,699 |

BASE POPULATION (After BRAC Action) FOR: Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM)

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

PERSONNEL SUMMARY FOR: Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ)

BASE POPULATION (FY 2005):

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 669 | 4,583 | 3 | 370 |

PROGRAMMED INSTALLATION (NON-BRAC) CHANGES FOR: Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ)

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Officers | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Enlisted | 78 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civilians | 25 | 1 | -5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

COBRA PERSONNEL SUMMARY REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 3
 Data As Of 8/13/2005 9:07:16 AM, Report Created 8/13/2005 9:08:17 AM

Department : USAF
 Scenario File : A:\USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey.CBR
 Option Pkg Name: USAF 0018V3 (200.3) Close Ellsworth DBCRC Site Survey
 Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

BASE POPULATION (Prior to BRAC Action) FOR: Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ)

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| 689 | 4,694 | 3 | 391 |

PERSONNEL REALIGNMENTS:

From Base: Ellsworth AFB, SD (FXBM)

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| Officers | 0 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| Enlisted | 0 | 0 | 1,704 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,704 |
| Students | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Civilians | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2,054 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,054 |

TOTAL PERSONNEL REALIGNMENTS (Into Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ)):

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
|-----------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| Officers | 0 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| Enlisted | 0 | 0 | 1,704 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,704 |
| Students | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Civilians | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2,054 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,054 |

BASE POPULATION (After BRAC Action) FOR: Dyess AFB, TX (FNWZ)

| Officers | Enlisted | Students | Civilians |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| 903 | 6,398 | 10 | 520 |