DCN 1118

BRAC 95 Undergraduate Pilot Training Joint Cross-Service Group

Book 1

Joint Cross-Service Group on Undergraduate Pilot Training

Table of Contents

1. Process Summary - Book 1

2. Internal Control Plan - Book 1

3. Analytical Framework - Book 1

   A. Data Calls: 4/5/94 and 8/29/94 - Book 1

   B. Data Call Responses - Books 2 - 14

   C. Functional Values - Book 1

   D. Capacity - Resource Analysis - Book 1

4. Analytical Tool Outputs/Runs (Included in Section 6: Meeting Minutes from 10/21/94 to 11/21/94) - Book 1

5. Alternatives Transmitted to the Military Departments - Book 1

6. JCSG Meeting Minutes - Book 15

SECTION ONE

SUMMARY

BRAC 95 Joint Cross-Service Group on Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT)

Functional Analysis Process Summary

Executive Summary

Section 1. Introduction/Background

The overall objective of the UPT Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) was to provide feasible UPT base realignment and closure alternatives for consideration by the Military Departments and OSD. Inherent in achieving this objective was the Secretary's guidance to "strive to: retain in only one Service militarily unique capabilities used by two or more Services; consolidate workload across the Services to reduce capacity; and assign operational units from more than one Service to a single base." The following key concerns drove the alternative development process:

- Ensure the Department retains enough capacity to train quality aircrews in numbers sufficient to meet the requirements of our military strategy.

- Enhance safe and efficient training operations by making sure training functions at each base are compatible.

- Minimize, to the extent possible, the long-term costs of basing infrastructure and the near-term costs of transition from current to future basing structures.

- Retain, to the extent practical, as much "inherent value" as possible in the proposed basing alternatives, in terms of both overall military capability (i.e., military value) and flight training functions (i.e., functional value).

Finally, the alternatives proposed should be consistent with DoD policies on cross-service - "joint"- flight training and should be compatible with safe, effective, and efficient training practices.

Section 2. Joint Cross-Service Functional Analysis Process Summary

The JCSG, chaired by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness, was comprised of representatives from each Military Department and pertinent OSD offices. A joint study team (JST) directly supported the JCSG and included personnel with BRAC and aviation operational expertise. The JCSG closely supervised the JST's work and development of products, providing detailed direction and step-by-step approval throughout the process.

The overall analytical framework consisted of first establishing the project's scope, followed by development of data standards, data collection, policy constraint determination, data reduction and modeling, model output and model based analysis, and generation of alternative basing options.

Data standardization was the process "capstone." Standards were developed which allowed equitable measurement across the three Military Departments despite their different missions, training practices, and Service culture.

The JCSG strictly followed the Joint Internal Control Plan in conducting its activities. Internal controls were maintained with participation on a by-name, in-writing, and need-to-know basis. All data collected was formally tasked through the Military Department BRAC offices, and only certified data provided in response to official JCSG tasking was used in the analysis. The JCSG briefed both the BRAC 95 Steering Group and Review Group at key stages throughout its analytical process obtaining both validation and approval of its efforts and concurrence with future plans.

The JCSG used certified data to determine relative merit/functional value for each UPT function (e.g., flight screening, primary pilot, airlift/tanker, etc.) at each potential site and the capacity of each site by function. Policy considerations were incorporated into the process. A linear programming optimization model was used as a tool to enable the JCSG to focus on a set of rational alternatives. Constraints derived from policy imperatives and military judgment were also applied to the model, further limiting the plausible alternatives. Finally, additional analysis, using the modeling efforts as a baseline, was used to develop three alternatives. An effort was made to reduce moves of functions to new sites and to consolidate functions at the minimum number of sites feasible.

The alternatives, which proposed closure of three, four and five UPT sites respectively, were delivered to the Military Departments. The Military Departments recommended closing two and realigning one of the five sites identified in the JCSG's alternatives. Functionally, three UPT sites would be closed by the Military Departments' recommendations.

Section 3. Description of Functional Analyses Summary

The JCSG on UPT first determined the scope of its work and the installations to be considered in its analyses (Appendix 1). An extensive data call was then developed to collect standardized data from the Military Departments to facilitate analysis of both training capacity and military/functional value. In developing the data call, the JCSG chose to be comprehensive with respect to the level of detail and breadth of data required. A key consideration was the necessity to ensure compatibility of data across the three Military Departments. Where appropriate, tables and specific formulas were provided with the questions to ensure uniformity of response.

The UPT JCSG developed ten functional categories (e.g., flight screening, primary pilot, airlift tanker, etc.) based on training practices, training pipelines, and policies. It was determined that non-UPT functions performed at some of the installations would be considered through the combined analyses of functional value and installation military value conducted by the JCSG and the Military Departments, respectively, in the "iterative" process. Next a site/function constraint matrix was developed based on military judgment, to avoid analysis of illogical alternatives (Appendix 2).

The JCSG developed thirteen Measures of Merit (e.g., airfields, airspace and flight training areas, weather, etc.) for each of the ten functional areas. Each measure of merit for each functional area was linked to specific data call questions. A total of 100 points was assigned to each functional area. A weighted distribution of points, based on specific rationale, was then made among the thirteen measures of merit for each function. The primary pilot training function was used as the baseline for the other more-advanced functions in determining the point distribution. Finally, questions were developed which facilitated the assignment of points for each measure. Once again these questions were weighted (assigned varying point values) based on specific rationale developed with sound military judgment. Data sheets were compiled for each function at each site and loaded into the weighted multi-criterion Decision Pad (D-Pad) model which aggregated the data and assigned each site a rating from 0.0 to 10.0 for up to ten functions. Sites were not rated for functions excluded by the site/function constraint matrix. The JCSG reviewed and approved functional value data (generated by D-Pad) and delivered it to the Military Departments.

A Capacity Analysis Matrix was developed to capture the critical resource factors (e.g., airfield ops, airspace, ground training, etc.) inherent in UPT. Each factor was then measured for 1) historical use to determine a rational baseline, 2) requirements -- programmed training and graduates per year, 3) required capacity, 4) maximum available capacity, and 5) excess capacity. Additionally, the pertinent Data Call questions and any formulas used in the analysis were annotated on the Matrix. A copy of the Capacity Analysis Matrix is provided at Appendix 3. It should be noted that training sorties, hangars, maintenance, supply/storage, housing and messing were eliminated from the final capacity analysis computations (rationale at Appendix 3). Federal Aviation (FAA) standards provided the basis to determine the site capacities for airfield operations. Finally, helicopter airfield operations were normalized with fixed-wing airfield operation on a 5.4 to 1 ratio for comparative purposes.

Several key non-BRAC policy considerations were integrated into the analysis. The planned acquisition of the Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS) was overlaid on the JCSG's process from the outset. A key component of this policy was a runway length requirement for JPATS of 5,000 ft. The Deputy Secretary of Defense approved the "Joint Fixed-Wing Training Initiative" in September 1994, allowing the inclusion of several additional policy changes in the JCSG's analysis. Among these were joint navigator training, joint electronic warfare officer training, USN training for all multi-engine prop pilots, and USAF training for all multi-engine jet pilots. Finally, it was resolved that the external non-BRAC policies of 1) separate flight screening for Air Force pilots, 2) fixed-wing training for USN, USMC, and USAF

helicopter pilots, and 3) mix of trainer aircraft (e.g., JPATS and T-34C's) would remain as currently practiced or planned. Lastly, the JCSG anticipated that the issue of retention of two helicopter training centers (NAS Whiting Field and AATC Fort Rucker) or function collocation (and potential consolidation) at one site would be addressed in the final BRAC process.

Results of the capacity and functional value analyses were combined to form the "Resource Table" (Appendix 4) which was used for all follow-on analyses. Resources were determined by both site capacities and as a requirement per student. The Resource Table was adjusted to normalize airfield operations between light and heavy trainer aircraft.

Military values for the installations in the UPT category were received from the Military Departments for incorporation into the JCSG's analyses -- in particular for use in the Optimization Model. Of the twelve installations in the UPT category, only three sites were given less than the highest value, on a scale of 1 to 3.

The linear programming "Optimization" Model was used by the JCSG as a tool to limit the number of feasible site-closure alternatives to a minimum set of reasonable alternatives. Model based analyses commenced with an unconstrained functional value or "MAXFV" run. Termed "unconstrained," because no relative military values, costs, operational considerations, or joint training initiatives were figured into the computation, the results had limited value. This model run did derive the theoretical highest possible functional value. It also validated expectations, given relative functional values and capacities for the various sites (helicopter function accommodated at Fort Rucker, flight screening function migrated from the Air Force Academy and Hondo Municipal Airport to Reese AFB, etc.).

Next the model was run for minimum sites or "MINSITE" with a five percent weight on functional value and three initial rules: 1) flight screening would not be performed/collocated with any other function, 2) primary and advanced NAV/NFO, advanced NFO strike, and advanced NFO panel functions would be joint/single-sited, and 3) no function would be spread or fractionalized smaller than a "notional" smallest squadron.

A "sensitivity analysis" was conducted to refine the potential feasible solutions based on potential site closures (long-term cost savings) and number of function moves to new sites (short-term costs). This sensitivity analysis (Appendix 5) established benchmarks for comparisons with model runs that included military value considerations.

Model runs were then undertaken which minimized the number of sites while maximizing military value (MINNMV). "Best," "second best," and "third best" outcomes were derived. Based on evaluation of the results, a fourth rule was established: flight screening was limited to the Air Force Academy and Hondo sites and the primary pilot function was limited to four sites.

MINNMV was run again with this fourth rule applied and named MIN PRIME. It closed three sites and required eight functional moves to new sites. The JCSG decided to use MIN PRIME results as the basis for a three-site closure alternative.

Next, using MIN PRIME results as a baseline, the model was run again after first transferring the airspace and outlying field generated airfield operations capacity from two of the three closed sites in the baseline to remaining sites in close proximity. This model run, named MIN PRIME 2, closed four sites and required nine functional moves to new sites.

Using the four-site closure results of MIN PRIME 2 as a baseline, an analytical excursion, which closed five sites, was developed. Once again, utilization of outlying fields from a closed site to increase the airfield operations capacity of a remaining site was the key enabling factor.

Finally, the three-, four-, and five-site closure options were analytically scrubbed with an emphasis on minimizing functional moves and consolidating functions at single sites. A three-, four-, and five-site closure alternative, along with an illustrative scenario for each resulted (Section 4 below). The JCSG approved the alternatives and delivered them to the Military Departments for their assessment. A copy of the alternatives is provided at Section 4.

The Military Departments' assessments and subsequent site closure/realignment recommendations were among those proposed in the JCSG's alternatives. Their recommendations closed or realigned three of the potential five sites indicated for potential closure by the JCSG's analyses. One site was retained based on DoN COBRA-generated cost estimates that indicated high closure costs with a 15-year return on investment. A second site was retained to address a Service concern to ensure sufficient capacity to accommodate requirements outside the scope of the JCSG's analysis.

Section 4. Joint Cross-Service Functional Alternatives (Attached)

Appendices

1. **Statement of Scope and Listing of Installations in Category**
2. **Site/Function Constraint Matrix**
3. **Capacity Analysis Matrix**
4. **"Resource Table"**
5. **Sensitivity Analysis - Site Closures vs. Minimum Moves**

Category Scope Rationale

Installations in the UPT category include all DoD flight programs which support and facilitate selection and training of pilots, naval flight officers, and navigators to the point of awarding "Wings"

Installations in Category

• Columbus	AFB	MS
• Corpus Christi	NAS	TX
• Fort Rucker	AATC	AL
• Kingsville	NAS	TX
• Laughlin	AFB	TX
• Meridian	NAS	MS
• Pensacola	NAS	FL
• Randolph*	AFB	TX
• Reese	AFB	TX
• Sheppard	AFB	TX
• Vance	AFB	OK
• Whiting Field	NAS	FL

* Includes Enhanced Flight Screening sites at Hondo, TX and the Air Force Academy

[redacted]

SITE / FUNCTION CONSTRAINT MATRIX

FUNCTION	SERVICE	A/C	RUCKER	WHITING	CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RAN	SHEP	VANCE	REESE	LAU	COL
FLT SCREENING	USAF	T-3												
PRIMARY PILOT	USN USAF	T-34 T-37 JPATS	X (2)											
AIRLIFT/TANKER	USAF	T-1	X (1)	X (1)										
MARITIME/ INT E-2/C-2	USN USAF	T-44	X (2)											
STRIKE/ ADV E-2/C-2	USN	T-2 TA-4 T-45	X (1)	X (1)										
BOMBER/ FIGHTER	USAF	T-38	X (1)	X (1)	X (1)									
HELO	USN USAF USA	TH-57 UH-1 TH-67 OH-58			X (2)		X (2)	X (2)	X (2)	X (2)	X (2)	X (2)	X (2)	X (2)
PRIM & INT NAV/NFO	USN USAF	T-34 T-39	X (2)											
WSO STRIKE	USN USAF	T-39 T-2								X (3)	X (3)	X (3)	X (3)	
PANEL NAV	USN USAF	T-43	X (1)	X (1)										

(1) Runway length constraints based on model design series of training aircraft (FY 2001 requirements)
(2) Lack of suitable outlying fields (one or more for indicated fixed-wing programs, two or more for helo)
(3) Too far from water (greater than 200 NM to working area)

[redacted]

TO BE VERIFIED UPON RECEIPT OF CERTIFIED DATA

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

FACTORS	HISTORICAL	REQUIREMENTS: PROG'MED TRAINING (SYLLABI) (A)	REQUIREMENTS: PROG'MED GRADS (B)	REQUIRED CAPACITY (AxB)	MAX AVAILABLE CAPACITY (C)	EXCESS CAPACITY (C-(AxB))
TRAINING SORTIES	SORTIES/ GRAD SYLLABUS •OVERHEAD PG 6 # 5 PG 14 #2	SORTIES/ GRAD •MAJCOM PG 9 # 2	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR PG 4 #1 & 2	SORTIES/ YEAR	SORTIES/ YEAR PG 18 # 16	SORTIES/ YEAR
AIRFIELD OPS	OPS/SORTIE •TRAFFIC CNT PG 17 # 10 •TOT # SORTIES PG 14 # 2	OPS/GRAD •MAJCOM PG 9 # 2 X =	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	OPS/YEAR	OPS/YEAR PG 17 # 9	OPS/YEAR
AIRSPACE BLOCK •OBF x AL Ty AIRCRAFT	BLOCKS AVAILABLE BLOCK HOURS AVAILABLE SYLLABUS •OVERHEAD •MX PG 22 # 1	AIRSPACE BLOCK HRS GRAD •MAJCOM PG 9 # 1	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	AIRSPACE BLOCK HRS YEAR	AIRSPACE BLOCK HRS YEAR PG 22 # 1	AIRSPACE BLOCK HRS YEAR
GROUND TRAINING	FACILITIES AVAILABLE FACILITY HOURS AVAIL/YEAR •SYLL + ATT/INT •CLASSROOMS •SIMULATORS •LIFE SPT TNG	FACILITY HRS GRAD •MAJCOM PG 10 # 1	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	FACILITY HRS YEAR	FACILITY HRS YEAR PG 25 # 1 PG 27 # 8	FACILITY HRS YEAR

CAPACITY ANALYSIS (CONT)

FACILITY FACTORS	HISTORICAL	REQUIREMENTS: PROG'MED TRAINING (SYLLABI) (A)	REQUIREMENTS: PROG'MED GRADS (B)	REQUIRED CAPACITY (AxB)	MAX AVAILABLE CAPACITY (C)	EXCESS CAPACITY (C-(AxB))
RAMPS/ APRONS/ TAXIWAYS	TOT FP USED # OF AIRCRAFT SUPPORTED FP / AIRCRAFT REQ PG 28 # 1	AIRCRAFT (GRAD/YEAR) PG 28 # 1 PG 4 # 1	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR PG 4 #1 & 2	AIRCRAFT	TOT FP AVAIL / FP / AIRCRAFT = AIRCRAFT PG 28 # 2	AIRCRAFT
HANGARS	HANGARS USED MX DOCK/HANGAR AIRCRAFT/MX DOCK	AIRCRAFT (GRAD/YEAR)	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	AIRCRAFT	AIC X X AIRCRAFT PG 29 # 4	AIRCRAFT
MAINTENANCE	FACILITIES USED # OF AIRCRAFT SUPPORTED AIRCRAFT / FACILITY REQ	AIRCRAFT (GRAD/YEAR)	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	AIRCRAFT	AIC X = AIRCRAFT PG 29 # 6	AIRCRAFT
SUPPLY/ STORAGE	TOT FP USED # OF AIRCRAFT SUPPORTED FP / AIRCRAFT REQ	AIRCRAFT (GRAD/YEAR)	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	AIRCRAFT	TOT FP AVAIL / FP / AIRCRAFT = AIRCRAFT PG 30 # 8	AIRCRAFT
HOUSING	CAPACITY USED STUDENTS/DAY PG 31 # 1	STUDENTS/DAY PG 4 # 1		STUDENTS/DAY	STUDENTS/DAY PG 32 # 5	STUDENTS/DAY
MESSING	CAPACITY USED STUDENTS/DAY PG 32 # 3	STUDENTS/DAY PG 4 # 1		STUDENTS/DAY	STUDENTS/DAY PG 32 # 5	STUDENTS/DAY

10/20/99

CAPACITY ANALYSIS FORMULATIONS

PROVIDED BELOW ARE THE FORMULAS USED IN THE COMPUTATION OF CAPACITY ANALYSIS DATA. THESE FORMULAS STANDARDIZE TO THE BEST EXTENT POSSIBLE THE DATA OF ALL SERVICES.

1. TRAINING SORTIES = AIRFIELD OPERATIONS AT THE MAIN BASE DIVIDED BY TWO (TWO IS THE BASE LINE NUMBER DERIVED FROM ONE TAKE-OFF AND ONE LANDING PER SORTIE AT HOME BASE).

2. DAYLIGHT AIRFIELD OPERATIONS = (FAA AIRFIELD OPERATIONS MODEL)(WEATHER FACTOR)(242)(12) FAA MODEL IS BASED ON RUNWAY CONFIGURATION. WEATHER FACTOR IS BASED ON HISTORICAL DATA FROM EACH INSTALLATION. 242 IS THE NUMBER OF TRAINING DAYS. 12 IS THE NUMBER OF TRAINING HOURS IN ONE DAY. AIRFIELD OPERATIONS INCLUDES ALL OUTLYING FIELDS. NAVAL NUMBERS ARE BASED ON A WEATHER FACTOR INCORPORATED IN THE FAA MODEL. FOR WHITING FIELD THE RUNWAY OPERATIONS ARE BASED ON JPATS. THE HEAVIER WEIGHT OF NAVY AIRCRAFT CONSTRAINS OPERATIONS AT NAVAL AIR STATIONS RESULTING IN A LOWER AIRFIELD OPERATIONS CAPACITY.

3. AIRSPACE

FUNCTIONAL VALUE AIRSPACE = (AVAILABLE AIRSPACE WITHIN 100 NAUTICAL MILES OF THE MAIN FIELD TO INCLUDE ATCAA, BUT NOT WARNING AREAS FOR PRIMARY, PRINFO AND FLT SCREENING. ALL OTHER FUNCTIONS INCLUDE WARNING AREAS)(SQUARE NAUTICAL MILES) (ALTITUDE/6080). 6080 IS THE CONVERSION FACTOR OF FEET TO NAUTICAL MILES.

CAPACITY ANALYSIS AIRSPACE

BLOCK HOURS AVAILABLE = (BLOCKS OF CURRENTLY USED AIRSPACE) (12 HOURS PER DAY) (242 DAYS PER YEAR). BLOCKS OF AIRSPACE WERE DETERMINED BY SUMMING THE SQ NM OF CURRENTLY USED AIRSPACE AND DIVIDING IT INTO ADVANCED (200 SQ NM X 12000') AND PRIMARY (100 SQ NM X 5000') BLOCKS. (EXCEPTION: CORPUS CHRISTI WAS GIVEN CREDIT FOR W-228 BECAUSE THEY CONTROL/SCHEDULE THIS AIRSPACE) PRIMARY AND ADVANCED BLOCKS WERE DOUBLE STACKED WHERE POSSIBLE. THE CAPACITY NUMBERS REFLECT THE ADVANCED AIRSPACE BLOCKS CAPACITY. (EXCEPTIONS: NAS WHITING, HONDO, AND USAFA HAVE NO ADVANCED AIRSPACE BLOCKS; THEREFORE, PRIMARY AIRSPACE CAPACITY WAS USED)

4. GROUND TRAINING CLASS ROOM HOURS PER YEAR = DESIGN CAPACITY (IN TERMS OF STUDENTS) (8 HOURS PER DAY)(242 TRAINING DAYS) 8 HOURS IS A STANDARD TRAINING DAY. 242 IS THE STANDARDIZED TRAINING YEAR.

5. GROUND TRAINING SIMULATORS = (DESIGN STUDENT CAPACITY)(16 HRS PER DAY)(242 DAYS PER YEAR) 16 HOURS BASED ON AN AVERAGE AVAILABILITY OF SIMULATORS

6. RAMPS = (TOTAL NUMBER OF USABLE SQUARE YARDS OF PARKING SPACE)(.80) 80% IS BASED ON ACCESS REQUIREMENTS TO GET TO MAIN

TAXIWAY. (REFERENCE PENSACOLA CAPACITY ANALYSIS DATA CALL 19, FACILITIES, PARA D, QUESTION 3)

Rationale for Elimination of Capacity Measures 10/13/94

Training Sorties

Training sorties do not capture maximum airfield capacity. A sortie is a training event which contains as a subset additional manuevers which include touch and go's, full stop and missed approach landings. Maximum airfield operations require a full accounting of the total number of operations. Sorties do not capture that. A better measure of an airfields' maximum generated capacity is the total number of operations (take-offs, landings, touch and go's, etc.) that can be accomplished over a set period of time.

Hangars

Hangars are not required for the parking of aircraft or for most of the required maintenance in UPT. Accordingly, hangars are not a meaningful capacity constraint.

Maintenance/Supply/Storage

All maintenance on training aircraft is accomplished by contractors. Therefore, the capacity is more a function of the contract and the contractors capabilities than the base maintenance/supply/storage facilities.

Housing and Messing

Base housing is not a capacity constraint because it ignores the availability of off-base housing and current demographics for aviators under training. Messing facilities for military officers no longer exist.

11/10/94
12/17/94 Updated

	Columbus	Corpus Christi	Ft Rucker	Kingsville	Laughlin	Meridian	Pensacola	Randolph	Reese	Sheppard	Vance	Whiting Field	Hondo	USAFA	
Site Military Value															
Functions for UPT	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	DoD Requireme
Flight Screening	6.6	6.4	6.9	6.7	6.8	6.5	6.1	5.7	6.2	6.2	6.6	6.6	5.4	3.9	2,073
Primary Pilot	6.8	6.7	X2	7.0	7.0	6.8	6.4	6.7	6.0	6.3	6.8	6.6	0.0	0.0	2,493
Airlift/Tanker	6.3	6.5	X1	7.7	5.8	6.6	7.8	6.5	5.9	6.5	6.7	X1	0.0	0.0	752
Inter E2/C2, Adv Maritime	6.7	7.5	X2	7.6	6.5	6.6	7.5	6.4	5.9	6.5	6.8	7.4	0.0	0.0	273
Adv E2/C2, Strike	6.0	6.2	X1	7.3	5.4	6.3	7.6	6.0	5.7	6.2	5.3	X1	0.0	0.0	372
Adv Bomber/Fighter	6.4	X1	X1	7.3	5.5	6.8	7.8	6.8	5.6	6.3	5.5	X1	0.0	0.0	619
Helicopter	X2	X2	8.9	X2	X2	X2	6.5	X2	X2	X2	X2	7.2	0.0	0.0	1,481
Primary NFO, Inter NFO	6.9	6.7	X2	7.0	7.1	6.8	6.4	7.1	6.2	6.2	6.8	6.4	0.0	0.0	718
Adv NFO Strike	6.6	6.9	6.7	7.4	X3	6.5	7.6	6.1	X3	X3	X3	7.0	0.0	0.0	312
Adv NFO Panel	7.6	5.9	X1	7.2	6.8	7.0	7.6	6.9	7.2	7.7	7.5	X1	0.0	0.0	222

X1 - Runway length constraints; X2 - Lack of outlying fields; X3 - Too far from water

Resources	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap
Airfield Ops	784,371	752,136	7,441,016	389,136	787,572	389,136	270,072	619,768	686,547	646,988	685,390	865,392	554,664	651,630
Airspace	116,973	315,810	0	253,418	218,889	128,879	181,790	49,494	106,925	166,922	114,708	147,888	43,560	49,368
Ground Training Classroom	542,080	464,640	5,523,408	859,584	193,600	406,560	3,915,544	696,960	696,960	348,480	373,648	554,400	116,160	77,440
Ground Training Simulators	77,440	46,464	212,960	61,952	61,952	54,208	135,520	92,928	61,952	92,928	61,952	104,544	0	0
Aprons	209,840	540,367	392,726	240,614	217,378	241,166	299,395	501,946	282,496	394,125	223,645	386,667	251,200	46,122
* Normalized Airfield Ops	—	—	—	537,008	—	537,008	326,547	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Resources per student	Flight Screening	Primary Pilot	Airlift/Tanker	Inter E2/C2, Adv Maritime	Adv E2/C2, Strike	Adv Bomber/Fighter	Helicopter	Primary NFO, Inter NFO	Adv NFO Strike	Adv NFO Panel	
Training Sorties	24	94	88	44	166	132	137	33	70	13	Maximum requirements where duplicate training
Airfield Ops	526	1,156	405	496	1,393	926	1,288	248	280	39	"
Airspace	6	32	61	21	97	75	N/A	37	53	0	"
Ground Training Classroom	14	213	186	202	196	156	965	371	144	304	"
Ground Training Simulators	0	27	42	30	98	29	32	44	53	80	"
Aprons	18.81	181.92	357.60	190.01	303.45	357.35	190.62	60.31	239.59	201.00	"
* Normalized Airfield Ops	—	—	—	—	1922	—	—	—	386	54	

#Aircraft/student	0.0555	0.2274	0.2384	0.2088	0.3817	0.5105	0.2681	0.1058	0.1346	0.0402
SQ YDS/Aircraft	339	800	1,500	910	795	700	711	570	1,780	5,000
# Aircraft Required	113	567	179	57	142	316	397	76	42	9

No copies to be made without express permission of JCSG UPT Chairman

* Normalized Light/Heavy aircraft → Airfield Ops

11/10/94

STUDENT RESOURCE CALCULATION

Reference: (a) CNO ltr 1542, ser N889JG/4U61666 dated 20 July 1994

Flight Screening (T-3)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Hondo Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from the Hondo Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2 and Facilities paragraphs A.2 and A.10. Operations were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Traffic Count (Fac A.10)} \times \text{Sorties/Student (M. R. B.2)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.2)}}$$

c. Airspace - Taken from the Hondo Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1. This number was divided by two to account for the fact that the requirement for primary airspace is half that for advanced airspace.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - Taken from the Hondo Capacity Analysis Mission Requirements, paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Hondo and USAFA Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1 Hondo \& USAFA)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Primary Pilot (T-34 and T-37)

a. Training Sorties - The JPATS syllabus requirement of 65 sorties was accepted as the standard number of syllabus sorties. USAF overhead on primary training is 60% while USN overhead is 30%. The JCS working group agreed to use an average overhead value of 45% which leads to a total sortie requirement of 94 (65 sorties + .45 x 65).

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from the Whiting Field Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2 and Facilities paragraphs A.2 and A.10 using the T-34 data (see spreadsheet). Operations were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Traffic Count (Fac A.10)} \times \text{Sorties/Student (M. R. B.2)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.2)}}$$

$$= 12.3 \text{ ops/sortie}$$

Total ops = 94 sorties X 12.3 ops/sorties = 1156 operations

c. Airspace - The average block hours required were taken from the USAF Capacity Analysis data calls, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1. USAF block hour requirements were used because the current USAF syllabus more closely resembles the JPATS syllabus. This number was divided by two to account for the fact that the requirement for primary airspace is half that for advanced airspace.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The average Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the amendments to USAF Capacity Analysis data calls, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1. USAF requirements were used because the current USAF syllabus more closely resembles the JPATS syllabus.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. For USAF, SY/aircraft data for all aircraft, was taken from Randolf AFB

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Airlift/Tanker (T-1)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2. Reese AFB was used because they are the only ones fuly functional in Airlift/Tanker training.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2 and Facilities paragraphs A.2 and A.10 (see spreadsheet). Operations were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Traffic Count (Fac A.10)} \times \text{Sorties/Student (M. R. B.2)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.2)}}$$

c. Airspace - Taken from the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the amendments to the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. SY/aircraft data was taken from Randolf AFB which provides this data for all USAF training aircraft.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Intermediate E2/C2 and Advance Maritime (T-44)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Corpus Christi Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from Corpus Christi Navy Capacity Analysis (Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph b.3. Advanced Maritime requirement was used because it was higher.

c. Airspace - Taken from the Corpus Christi Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the Corpus Christi Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Corpus Christi Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up). SY/aircraft data was taken from NAVFAC P-80 which provides this data for all USN training aircraft. Advanced Maritime PTR requirements were taken from reference (a) and intermediate E2/C2 were taken from the Corpus Christi Navy Capacity Analysis (Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph A.3.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirements.}}$$

Advance E2/C2 and Strike (T-45)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Kingsville Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2. NAS Kingsville was used because they are the only ones fully functional in T-45 training.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from Kingsville Navy Capacity Analysis (Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph b.3.

c. Airspace - Taken from the Kingsville Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the Kingsville Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Kingsville Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and Facilities paragraph D.3. Navy PTR requirements were taken from reference (a).

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Advance Fighter/Bomber (T-38)

a. Training Sorties - Used an average value taken from Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Used an average value taken from Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2 and Facilities paragraphs A.2 and A.10 (see spreadsheet). Operations were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Traffic Count (Fac A.10) X Sorties/Student (M. R. B.2)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.2)}}$$

c. Airspace - Used an average value taken from Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - For the Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required, used an average value taken from the amended Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance data calls, Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. SY/aircraft data was taken from Randolf AFB which provides this data for all USAF training aircraft.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Helicopter

a. Training Sorties - Used an average value taken from Fort Rucker and Whiting Field Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Used an average value taken from Whiting Field (USN Capacity Analysis, Data Call 2, Mission Requirements, paragraph b.3) and Fort Ruckers Capacity Analysis Facilities paragraphs A.13 and A.16. Fort Rucker ops were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Operations (Fac A.13)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.16)}}$$

c. Airspace - Not Required for Helo training.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - For the Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required, used an average value taken from the Fort Rucker Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1. Fort Rucker had more extensive ground training requirements than did Whiting field.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from Whiting Field and Fort Rucker Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. For USN, SY/aircraft data was taken from NAVFAC P-80 which provides this data for all USN training aircraft. Navy PTR requirements were taken from reference (a).

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Primary and Intermediate NFO (T-34)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from Pensacola Navy Capacity Analysis (Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph b.3.

c. Airspace - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1. This number was divided by two to account for the fact that the requirement for primary airspace is half that for advanced airspace.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up). SY/aircraft data was taken from NAVFAC P-80 which provides this data for all USN training aircraft. Primary and Intermediate NFO PTR requirements were taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis (USN Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph A.3.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirements.}}$$

Advance NFO Strike (T-39/T-2)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2. Used the Radar Intercept Officer (RIO) track because it is the longest.

b. Airfield Ops - Multiplied the number of required training sorties by 4 ops/sorties. Used military judgement to arrive at 4 ops/sortie - pilots are already trained and therefore don't need to practice take-offs and landings. One additional touch and go was included with each sortie.

c. Airspace - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1. Summed the RIO in special use airspace.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1. Used the RIO track.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up). SY/aircraft data was taken from NAVFAC P-80 which provides this data for all USN training aircraft. Navy PTR requirements were taken from reference (a).

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirements.}}$$

Advance NFO Panel (T-43)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Randolf Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Multiplied the number of sorties by 3 ops/sortie. Used military judgement to arrive at 3 ops/sortie - pilots are already trained and therefore don't need to practice take-offs and landings. One additional touch and go was included for every other sortie.

c. Airspace - All work is done in Airways and MTR's

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator

hours required were taken from the amendments to the Randolf Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Randolf Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. SY/aircraft data was taken from Randolf AFB which provides this data for all USAF training aircraft.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

MINSITES Sensitivity Analysis

OSD Copy

	# moves	# SITES	FV
Max	4	9	68.4
	3	10	70.99
	2	10	69.6
	1	10	67.2
	0	11	68.9

Produced by Tri-Dept BRAC Team

SECTION TWO

INTERNAL CONTROL PLAN

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
3300 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3300

NOMIC SECURITY

13 APR 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIRPERSONS, BRAC 95 JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS

SUBJECT: Internal Control Plan for Managing the Identification of DoD Cross-Service Opportunities as Part of the DoD 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Process

The attached Internal Control Plan contains a description of the management controls that will guide and regulate Department of Defense use of Joint Cross-Service Groups as part of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC-95) process. The management controls described in this Internal Control Plan provide a basis for monitoring the BRAC-95 process and complying with the statutory requirements set forth in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended by Public Law 102-190 and Public Law 103-160, and policy guidance issued by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on 7 January 1994.

This Internal Control Plan is effective immediately and may be supplemented, as necessary, to enhance management control. Joint Cross-Service Group supplementary guidance is subject to approval by the Chairman of the BRAC 95 Steering Group.

Robert E. Bayer
Acting Chairman
BRAC 95 Steering Group

Attachment

Internal Control Plan for Managing the Identification of DoD Cross-Service Opportunities as Part of the DoD 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Process (BRAC-95)

Background

With certain exceptions, the exclusive procedures by which the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) may pursue realignment or closure of military installations inside the United States are contained in Part A, Title XXIX of Public Law 101-510, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990; as amended by Public Law 102-190 and Public Law 103-160; hereafter referred to as the Base Closure Act. The Base Closure Act also includes a provision for the President to appoint independent Base Closure and Realignment Commissions to review the Secretary of Defense's recommendations in calendar years 1991, 1993, and 1995.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense (DEPSECDEF), in a memorandum dated 7 January 1994, set forth guidance, policy, procedures, authorities and responsibilities for recommending bases for realignment or closure for submission to the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The DEPSECDEF guidance included a requirement for the establishment of BRAC-95 Joint Cross-Service Groups in six areas with significant potential for cross-service impacts in BRAC-95.

Five of the Joint Cross-Service Groups are functional areas encompassing Depot Maintenance, Test and Evaluation, Laboratories, Military Treatment Facilities including Graduate Medical Education, and Undergraduate Pilot Training. These functional groups should, where operationally and cost effective, strive to: retain in only one Service militarily unique capabilities used by two or more Services; consolidate workload across the Services to reduce capacity; and assign operational units from more than one Service to a single base. A sixth Joint Cross-Service Group was formed as a Joint Economic Impact Group to establish guidelines for measuring economic impacts. The five functional area joint cross-service groups have been tasked by the DEPSECDEF to:

- determine the common support functions and bases to be addressed by each cross-service group:
- establish the guidelines, standards, assumptions, measures of merit, data elements and milestone schedules for DoD Component conduct of cross-service analyses of common support functions;
- oversee DoD Component cross-service analyses of these common support functions;
- identify necessary outsourcing policies and make recommendations regarding those policies;

- review excess capacity analyses;
- develop closure or realignment alternatives and numerical excess reduction targets for consideration in such analyses; and
- analyze cross-service tradeoffs.

The economic impact joint cross-service group has been tasked by the DEPSECDEF to:

- establish the guidelines for measuring economic impact and, if practicable, cumulative economic impact; to analyze DoD Component recommendations under those guidelines; and
- develop a process for analyzing alternative closures or realignments necessitated by cumulative economic impact considerations, if necessary.

The DEPSECDEF directed the BRAC-95 Joint Cross-Service Groups to complete the above analytical design tasks and issue guidance to the DoD Components, after review by the BRAC-95 Review Group, no later than 31 March 1994. The BRAC-95 Review Group reviewed and approved the guidance on March 30, 1994.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this Internal Control Plan is to provide a consistent set of management controls for all Joint Cross-Service Groups and to meet the requirements established by the DEPSECDEF regarding the DoD Component cross-service analyses of all assets within each category, as annunciated in his Memorandum of 7 January 1994. More specifically, the DEPSECDEF directed the Joint Cross-Service Groups to develop and implement an Internal Control Plan to ensure the accuracy of data collection for conducting base realignment or closure assessments. At a minimum this Internal Control Plan includes:

- Uniform guidance defining data and information requirements and sources;
- Systems for verifying the accuracy of data and information at all levels of command;
- Documentation justifying changes made to data received from subordinate commands;
- Procedures to check the accuracy of the analyses made from the data and information; and
- Assessment by auditors of the adequacy of this Internal Control Plan.

In addition to the above requirements, DEPSECDEF requires that the Internal Control Plan incorporate certification procedures required by the Base Closure Acts. The Joint Cross-Service Groups will not be gathering original data and information , but will specify the data and information required to be gathered by Military Departments and Defense Agencies. Therefore, all data and information provided to the Joint Cross-Service Groups for purposes of analysis and decision making are required to be certified as accurate and complete by the Military Departments and Defense Agencies in accordance with their respective BRAC-95 Internal Control Plans.

Responsibilities

The BRAC-95 Steering Group will oversee implementation and adherence to this Internal Control Plan by the Joint Cross-Service Groups. The basic goal of this Internal Control Plan is to ensure consistency in the data gathered and used, application of selection criteria, methodology and reports to the SECDEF and subsequently to the 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

The Secretaries of the Military Departments, the OSD Secretariats, and the Directors of the Defense Agencies are responsible for providing staff resources to the Joint Cross-Service Groups. The Chairs of the individual Joint Cross-Service Groups are responsible for ensuring that the members of the Groups are fully aware of the management controls presented in this Internal Control Plan. Team members are responsible for implementing and adhering to the controls while also reporting to the Chairs any noted control violations or weaknesses identified during the collection and analysis of data. The Chairs of the Joint Cross-Service Groups are authorized to implement further guidance to control the functioning of their respective Groups in a way as to meet the intent of this Internal Control Plan.

Internal Control Mechanisms

The objective of the internal control mechanisms to be employed by the Joint Cross-Service Groups is to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and integrity of the information upon which the SECDEF recommendations for closures and realignments will be based. The two principal mechanisms are organization and documentation.

Organization Controls.

Under the oversight and guidance of the DEPSECDEF, there are four groups/organizations within the DoD which have primary responsibility for assisting the SECDEF to identify cross-service asset sharing opportunities. To ensure the integrity of the selection process, the four groups/organizations are to be separated by distinct functional boundaries and levels of decision making authority. The Chair and membership for each Joint Cross-Service Group have already been determined and assigned by the DEPSECDEF. Individual members to the Groups have also been appointed by the OSD Secretariats, the Secretaries of the Military Departments and the Directors of the Defense Agencies.

BRAC-95 Review Group. The BRAC-95 Review Group is empowered to develop recommendations to the SECDEF regarding cross-service tradeoffs and asset sharing opportunities. Only the BRAC-95 Review Group, the Secretaries of the Military Departments, and the Heads of Defense Agencies are empowered to make specific closure or realignment recommendations to the SECDEF. The BRAC-95 Review Group is responsible for ensuring that fair and complete cross-service analyses were conducted and considered for every recommendation made to the SECDEF involving cross-service tradeoffs or asset sharing. This includes overseeing the work of the Steering Group and making decisions regarding definitions, assumptions, measures of merit, excess capacity, military value, return on investment, and other impacts deemed appropriate.

BRAC-95 Steering Group. The BRAC-95 Steering Group is a subordinate organization to the BRAC-95 Review Group. It will oversee the actions of the Joint Cross-Service Groups. The results of such direction and evaluations will be periodically reported to the BRAC-95 Review Group. The BRAC-95 Steering Group will rely on the Joint Cross-Service Groups to review cross-service analyses and potential cross-service tradeoffs, cross-service asset sharing and closure or realignment opportunities. The use of private sector contractors, or any other private or public organization, to conduct such analyses will not be permitted unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of the BRAC-95 Steering Group. Private contractors and outside groups will not be used to perform any independent analysis relating to capacity analysis, military value, return on investment, and other impacts that may eventually be provided to the BRAC-95 Review Group.

BRAC-95 Joint Cross-Service Groups. The basic purpose of the Joint Cross-Service Groups is to oversee and guide the Military Departments and the Defense Agencies in conducting fair cross-service analyses and in developing recommended alternatives for consideration by the DoD Components. The Joint Cross-Service Groups have been established to identify cross-service tradeoff opportunities that will maximize the military value and cost effectiveness of operating the entire DoD infrastructure of specified functional areas. The Joint Cross-Service Group are subordinate to the direction and guidance of the BRAC-95 Steering Group. Other OSD elements, Military Departments, or Defense Agencies will not direct any particular data collection or analysis effort for a Joint Cross-Service Group unless such direction has been authorized by a Group. The Joint Cross-Service Groups may employ any internal organization or subgroup to accomplish their tasks, but such subgroups shall comply with the terms of this Internal Control Plan. The membership of any internal organizations or subgroups employed shall be documented in the official records of the Joint Cross-Service Groups. The Joint Cross-Service Groups are responsible for protecting the integrity of the BRAC-95 by preventing either the improper dissemination or collection of BRAC-95 data and information.

Inspector General, DoD. The Inspector General, DoD will advise the BRAC-95 Steering Group and the Joint Cross-Service Groups on the implementation of this Internal Control Plan. As such, auditors from the Office of the Inspector General, DoD will be available to review the activities of the Joint Cross-Service Groups to ensure such activities comply with the requirements of the Internal Control Plan.

Documentation Controls.

All significant events in the DoD BRAC-95 process will be recorded and clearly documented to ensure the integrity of the process performed by the Joint Cross-Service Groups. Furthermore, controls will be implemented to ensure that the data and information used by the Joint Cross-Service Groups to identify opportunities for cross-service tradeoffs or recommended alternatives is certified for accuracy and completeness, and that the information is used consistently throughout the BRAC-95 process. To protect the integrity of the BRAC-95 documentation prepared, handled, or processed by the Joint Cross-Service Groups the following control elements will be adhered to:

Data and Information Collection. Data and information utilized for analyses and/or decision making by the Joint Cross-Service Group will be obtained from the Military Departments and the Defense Agencies. The mechanism for requesting data from the Military Departments and the Defense Agencies will be in the form of information requests issued to the Military Departments and Defense Agencies by the Joint Cross-Service Groups. The Joint Cross-Service Groups will coordinate milestones for responding to their information requests with the respective BRAC-95 organizations of each Military Department and impacted Defense Agencies. The Military Departments and Defense Agencies will use their BRAC-95 internal control mechanisms for collecting the requested information and ensuring such information collected is certified for accuracy and completeness before it is submitted to the Joint Cross-Service Groups. Information used by the Joint Cross-Service Groups to establish measures of merit for assessments of military value, and determining methods for conducting capacity analysis is not required to be certified. However, only certified data and information will be used to make decisions on prospective basing alternatives to the Secretaries of the Military Departments.

Certification. The statutory requirements for certification were enacted by the Base Closure Act. More specifically, all information used to make closure and realignment recommendations submitted to the SECDEF and the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission must be certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief. The preparation of responses to the information requests by the Military Departments and the Defense Agencies will adhere to the BRAC-95 certification procedures and the internal control plans implemented for those entities.

Any electronic data files or magnetic media forwarded to the Joint Cross-Service by the Military Departments or Defense Agencies must be accompanied with a complete certified "hard copy" document of the entire data file or magnetic media. The Joint Cross-Service Groups will verify that a complete certified copy is obtained from the Military Departments or Defense Agencies and make such documentation and electronic data available for independent audit validation.

Data and information gathered from authoritative or official sources external to DoD (such as Bureau of Labor Statistics national employment data) need not be certified by the originating source. BRAC documentation which includes such data or information is subject to certification requirements. In such cases, the documentation will identify the authoritative

source used. Data and information gathered from existing data bases or reporting systems of such authoritative sources can reasonably be expected to be accurate and complete. Data and information, however, which is generated from scratch, outside of existing data bases or reporting systems by authoritative sources does not by itself lead to a presumption that the data and information is accurate and complete. Use of such data is therefore subject to certification by the originating source.

Record Keeping. Minutes will be maintained of formal meetings of the Joint Cross-Service Groups and will record who was in attendance and a synopsis of items discussed and deliberated upon. Responsibility for producing and maintaining these minutes will be determined by the Chair of each Group. The Chairs will be responsible for overseeing and enforcing certification procedures to ensure that any information and data collected and used by the Joint Cross-Service Groups are certified for accuracy and completeness. The responsibility for safeguarding BRAC-95 information and data rests with the Chairs of the Joint Cross-Service Groups. Records of meetings of sub-working groups are not required as their work product must be presented and approved by the pertinent Joint Cross-Service Group.

Oral Briefings. From time to time, the Joint Cross-Service Groups may receive formal and informal briefings from inside and outside the Federal Government. To ensure a record of all information provided to the Joint Cross-Service Group is maintained, the content of all oral briefings presented at formal meetings must be captured in the minutes. All briefing slides presented will be attached to the minutes recorded for the meeting.

Outside Studies. During the BRAC-95 process, studies and reports may be brought to the attention of a Joint Cross-Service Group that originated outside of the BRAC-95 process and address such things as assessment of facilities, military value, and/or capacity. Such studies may be useful in developing policies or suggesting methods for making measurements or evaluations. However, recommendations regarding actions at specific installations must not be developed using data from such studies. Data and information used to make BRAC 95 recommendations must be gathered by the Military Departments and Defense Agencies and certified as provided earlier.

Technical Experts. Technical experts from within DoD may be used to support both the development and/or the refinement of the analytical efforts of the Joint Cross-Service Groups. When technical experts provide information or data that a Joint Cross-Service Group considers relevant and appropriate for analyses, the experts shall be requested to submit that information or data in writing with the required certification. The use of technical experts will be communicated, either orally or in writing, to the BRAC-95 Steering Group. Technical experts will be granted only limited access to BRAC-95 data and information that will allow them to assist the Joint Cross-Service Groups in the development and/or refinement of analytical efforts. Upon completion of their efforts, technical experts will be advised not to release or discuss any BRAC-95 data or information outside of the Joint Cross-Service Groups.

Access to BRAC-95 Files

To protect the integrity of the DoD BRAC-95 process, all files, data and materials relating to that process are deemed sensitive and internal to DoD. Any dissemination of such data or other materials outside of the established BRAC 95 organizational framework shall be made only upon the express authorization of the Chairman of the BRAC-95 Steering Group. Pending forwarding to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission by SECDEF of his recommendations for closure or realignment of military installations, requests under the Freedom of Information Act for release of DoD BRAC-95 data and materials should be denied on the basis that both are predecisional and are internal government memoranda. This does not apply to basic policy memoranda, such as the Deputy Secretary's January 7, 1994, "Kickoff" memorandum and the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Policy Memorandum One.

The members of the Joint Cross-Service Groups are entrusted to have access to BRAC-95 information and data that originated from either the Military Departments or the Defense Agencies. Consistent with the organization controls set forth in this Internal Control Plan, access will not be granted to any individuals, to include technical experts, without first informing the BRAC-95 Steering Group. Such access carries a responsibility for ensuring that BRAC-95 information and data is treated as sensitive and predecisional. Not only is access restricted to those individuals officially approved to take part in the BRAC-95 Process, care must also be taken to avoid inadvertent dissemination of sensitive BRAC information through either facsimile "FAX" transmissions or electronic "E" mail. Any dissemination of information that is not discussed in this Internal Control Plan will only be made with the approval of the Chairman of the BRAC-95 Steering Group. The members of the Joint Cross-Service Groups are also required to protect the BRAC-95 process from either improper or unofficial disclosures.

Audit Access to Records.

The Base Closure Act includes a requirement that the SECDEF make available to the Comptroller General of the United States, the agency head of the General Accounting Office (GAO), all information and materials used by DoD in making recommendations for closure and realignment. To meet these requirements, the GAO is being provided full and open access to all official BRAC-95 records and documentation. In addition to the full and open access granted to the GAO, such access will be granted to the DoD Inspector General regarding records, data, information and other materials either collected or retained by the Joint Cross-Service Groups. Information requests forwarded by the Joint Cross-Service Groups to the Military Components and Defense Agencies for processing will be subjected to review by the audit agencies cognizant to the Military Components and the Defense Agencies. The audit agencies of the Military Departments, the DoD Inspector General, and the Defense Agencies will coordinate their efforts in a way to avoid audit duplication of the same information, data, and other materials.

Dissemination

The Chairs of the BRAC-95 Joint Cross-Service Groups shall disseminate this Internal Control Plan as widely as possible throughout their organizations. The BRAC-95 Steering Group will be advised of any control violations or weaknesses that are identified through application of this Internal Control Plan or of any modifications that may be needed.

SECTION THREE

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

SECTION THREE (A)

DATA CALLS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-4000

PERSONNEL AND
READINESS

April 5, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

SUBJECT: BRAC 95 JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP ON UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING DATA CALL

The Joint Cross-Service Group on Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) is charged under the aegis of BRAC 95 with consolidating workload, where operationally and cost effective, across the Military Departments to reduce excess undergraduate training capacity for pilots. The purpose of this memorandum is to issue initial guidance to the DoD components to achieve that aim.

The UPT category scope rationale and a listing of installations in this category are provided at attachment one. The capacity and military value data call worksheets are at attachments two and three. Two basic definitions to be used in completion of the data calls are provided at attachment four.

Please certify and submit the requested data, both electronic (disk) and paper copy, in the format provided no later than July 1, 1994. Attachments two and three are being provided in electronic (disk) format separately to each Military Department BRAC Office. My staff point of contact is Mr. Dan Gardner, of the OUSD Readiness and Training Directorate, at (703) 695-6857.

49481

Louis C. Finch
Chairman
Joint Cross-Service Group on Undergraduate Pilot Training

Attachments:
As Stated

Attachment 1

Category Scope Rationale

Installations in the UPT category include all DoD flight programs which support and facilitate selection and training of pilots, naval flight officers, and navigators to the point of awarding "Wings"

Installations in Category

• Columbus	AFB	MS
• Corpus Christi	NAS	TX
• Fort Rucker	AATC	AL
• Kingsville	NAS	TX
• Laughlin	AFB	TX
• Meridian	NAS	MS
• Pensacola	NAS	FL
• Randolph*	AFB	TX
• Reese	AFB	TX
• Sheppard	AFB	TX
• Vance	AFB	OK
• Whiting Field	NAS	FL

* Includes Enhanced Flight Screening sites at Hondo, TX and the Air Force Academy

Attachment 2

CLOSE HOLD

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE

CATEGORY:

UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING

CAPACITY ANALYSIS:
DATA CALL WORK SHEETS

31 March, 1994

The information contained herein is sensitive. Deputy SECDEF guidance restricts the release of data or analysis pertaining to evaluation of military bases for closure or realignment until the SECDEF forwards recommendations to the Base Closure Commission. All individuals handling this information should take steps to protect the material herein from disclosure.

**********If any responses are classified, attach separate classified annex.**********

CLOSE HOLD

Data For Capacity Analysis

Table of Contents

Mission Requirements 4
A. Undergraduate Flight Training (UFT) Throughput/Graduates 4
B. Flight Training 8
C. Flight Training Ground School 10
D. Other Ground Training 11
E. Training Airframes 12
Facilities 14
A. Airfield 14
B. Airspace 22
C. Ground Training 25
D. Aircraft Parking, Maintenance, and Supply 28
Features and Capabilities 31
A. Housing and Messing 31

'ILOT/NFO/NAVIGATOR TRAINING INSTALLATION LISTING:

Title	Location
COLUMBUS	COLUMBUS MS
CORPUS CHRISTI	CORPUS CHRISTI TX
FT RUCKER	FT RUCKER AL
KINGSVILLE	KINGSVILLE TX
LAUGHLIN	DEL RIO TX
MERIDIAN	MERIDIAN MS
PENSACOLA	PENSACOLA FL
RANDOLPH *	UNIVERSAL CITY TX
REESE	LUBBOCK TX
SHEPPARD	WITCHITA FALLS TX
VANCE	ENID OK
WHITING FIELD	MILTON FL

* Includes Enhanced Flight Screening sites at Hondo TX and Air Force Academy CO

Mission Requirements

A. Undergraduate Flight Training (UFT) Throughput/Graduates

1. Using the Base Force Structure as outlined in the JCS memo dated 7 February 1994, re: 1995 Base Realignments and Closures Force Structure Plan, and projected retention rates, give the projected yearly Pilot Training Rate (PTR)/Program Guidance Letter (PGL) requirements by installation for each of the next seven years.

Airfield: _____

Type of Pilot Training by Syllabus * (EXAMPLES)		Output Requirements , Attrition Factors, and Average Daily Student Load (ADSL) (include attrition factors used to establish entries to achieve output) (Output/Attrition Factor(%)/ADSL) By Fiscal Year							
		1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Strike (Intermediate/ Advanced)	USN	960/15%/240**	etc.						
	USMC								
	USCG								
	FMS								
Primary	USN								
	USMC								
	USCG								
	FMS								
	USAF								
Etc.									

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**
**** Example Entry**

Mission requirements (cont.)

A. Undergraduate Flight Training (UFT) Throughput/Graduates (cont.)

2. Using the Base Force Structure as outlined in the JCS memo dated 7 February 1994, re: 1995 Base Realignments and Closures Force Structure Plan and projected retention rates, give the projected yearly NFO Training Rate (NFOTR)/Program Guidance Letter (PGL) Navigator Training requirements by installation for each of the next seven years. Provide any additional sources of NFO/Nav trainees.

Airfield: _____

Type of Navigator Training By Syllabus * (EXAMPLES)		Output Requirements, Attrition Factors, and Average Daily Student Load (ADSL) (include attrition factors used to establish entries to achieve output) (Output/Attrition Factor/ADSL) By Fiscal Year							
		1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Adv. Navigator (NAV)	USN	960/15%/240**							
	FMS								
	NOAA								
SUNT Core	USAF								
	ANG								
	AFRES								
	FMS								
Etc.									

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**
**** Example Entry**

3. Provide the historical attrition data for undergraduate pilot training by syllabus for FY 91-93:

Type of Pilot Training by Syllabus * (EXAMPLES)		Historical Attrition By Fiscal Year		
		1991	1992	1993
Strike (Intermediate/ advance)	USN	20%**		
	USMC			
	USCG			
	FMS			
Primary	USN			
	USMC			
	USCG			
	FMS			
	USAF			
Etc.				

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**
**** Example Entry**

Mission Requirements (cont.)

A. Undergraduate Flight Training Throughput/Graduates (cont.)

4. Provide the historical attrition data for undergraduate Navigator training by syllabus for FY 91-93:

Type of Navigator Training By Syllabus * (EXAMPLES)		Historical Attrition By Fiscal Year		
		1991	1992	1993
Adv Navigator (NAV)	USN	21%**		
	FMS			
	NOAA			
SUNT Core	USAF			
	ANG			
	AFRES			
	FMS			
Etc.				

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**
**** Example Entry**

5. Indicate in the table below the types of undergraduate pilot and NFO training currently conducted at your installation. Also give the number of pilots and NFOs trained in FY 1991, FY 1992, and FY 1993 at your installation.

Syllabus of Training *	Level of Training*	Graduates		
		FY 91	FY 92	FY 93
General	Primary			
Strike	Intermediate			
	Advanced			
SUPT	Primary			
	BF			
	AT			
Etc/				

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

Mission Requirements (cont.)

A. Undergraduate Flight Training (UFT) Throughput/Graduates (cont.)

6. List all other officer training (i.e., non-undergraduate pilot/NFO/Navigator training) by activity conducted at your installation. For each type training, give the actual figure for FY 1993 throughput in terms of the number of students that year, and give the projected figures for FY 94-01. Also give the average daily student load (ADSL) for each activity.

Other Officer Training (Graduates)										
Activity	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	ADSL for FY 1993

Use the following formula to calculate ADSL:

$$\frac{\text{Activity Throughput X Average Number of days each student was aboard}}{\text{Number of Training Days}}$$

7. List all enlisted training conducted at your installation. For each type training, give the actual figure for FY 1993 throughput in terms of the number of students that year, and the projected figures for FY 94-01. Also give the average daily student load (ADSL) for each activity.

Enlisted Training (Graduates)										
Activity	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	ADSL for FY 1993

Use the following formula to calculate ADSL:

$$\frac{\text{Activity Throughput X Average Number of days each student was aboard}}{\text{Number of Training Days}}$$

Mission Requirements (cont.)

3. Flight Training

1. For each syllabus of undergraduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator flight training and aircraft type required for that training, give the number of required sorties per graduate, flight time in the airspace/sortie, the dimensions, and the total number of flight hours required for each type of airspace listed that is used for training in that particular syllabus[Total flight hours = # Sorties x (Flight time per sortie)]. Also include additional types of airspace that could accommodate this training.

Note: For helicopter training, airspace dimensions are given as available airspace.

Syllabus of Training*: _____ **Type Aircraft:** _____

Type of Airspace	# Sorties per Graduate	Flight Time in Airspace / Sortie	Vertical Altitude (1000 ft)	Other Types of Usable Airspace	Avg Size (nm^2)	Total Flight Hours per Graduate
MOA						
PAT						
AW						
ATCAA						
OWA						
OWAW						
WA						
AA						
RA						
RR						
MTR						

Key to types of airspace:
MOAs -- Military Operating Areas
WA -- Warning Areas
AA -- Alert Areas
RA -- Restricted Areas
ATCAA -- Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace
OWAW -- Overwater Airways
RR -- Restricted Areas with Ranges
MTR -- Military Training Routes
AW-- Airways (e.g. corridors to and from training areas)
PAT -- Pattern (e.g. airspace above runways)
OWA -- Overwater Airspace
CLG -- Uncontrolled Airspace

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

Mission Requirements (cont.)

3. Flight Training (cont.)

2. Give the total number of day and night sorties required for each undergraduate/graduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training syllabus and trainer aircraft (and level of training) for student training, overhead, and the total requirement.

Syllabus of Training * (EXAMPLES)	Level (Track) of Pilot Training *	Trainer Aircraft *	Sorties required per graduate					
			Student (syllabus)		Overhead[1]		Total	
			Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night
General	Primary	T-34C						
		JPATS						
Strike	Intermediate	T-2						
		T-45[2]						
	Advanced	TA-4J						
		T-45						
SUPT	Primary	T-37						
	BF	T-38						
	AT	T-1A						
Etc.								

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

3.. Indicate your training weather minimums (ceiling/visiblilty & crosswinds) by aircraft type and syllabus.

Overhead includes extra flights due to unsatisfactory performance, maintenance flights, incomplete flights, instructor training, flights, warm-up flights, and instrument check flights.

2 If requirements for the T-45 are still being derived, give best estimate.

Mission Requirements (cont.)

C. Flight Training Ground School

1. Provide the ground school training requirements for undergraduate/graduate Pilot and NFO/Navigator training facilities (classrooms, simulators, labs, life support facilities, etc.) by Facility Category Code Number (CCN). Include all applicable 171-*xx*, 179-*xx* CCN's and any other CCN where Undergraduate Pilot or NFO/Navigator training occurs. Ensure that the requirements for all types of simulators (cockpit (UTD), instrument (IFT), and motion-based/visual (OFT), etc.) are indicated.

Facility Category Code (CCN): _____

Syllabus of Training * (EXAMPLES)	Level of Training *	Facility Type(s)	Requirement (Hrs/Grad)
General	Primary		
Strike	Intermediate		
	Advanced		
SUPT	Primary		
	Bomber/ Fighter (BF)		
	Airlift/ Tanker (AT)		
Etc.			

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

2. List any additional constraints or limitations to the flight training ground school facilities that impact the training mission.

Mission Requirements (cont.)

D. Other Ground Training

1. By facility Category Code Number (CCN), for facilities in which student pilot or NFO/Navigator training is conducted, provide the usage requirements for **other than** student pilot or NFO/Navigator training. Include all applicable 171-*xx*, 179-*xx* CCN's. Other use made of the facilities must be derived either from course requirements and student throughput (for formal schools/courses of instruction) or that required to maintain readiness (for permanent/support personnel, reserves, etc.).

CCN: _____

Type of Training Facility	User	Type of Training	FY 1993 Requirements		FY 2001 Requirements	
			Hrs/Student	Hrs/Yr	Hrs/Student	Hrs/Yr

2. By facility Category Code Number (CCN), provide the usage requirements for facilities in which student pilot or NFO/Navigator training **is not** conducted. Include all applicable 171-*xx*, 179-*xx* CCN's. This usage must be derived either from course requirements and student throughput (for formal schools/courses of instruction) or that required to maintain readiness (for permanent/support personnel, reserves, etc.).

CCN: _____

Type of Training Facility	User	Type of Training	FY 1993 Requirements		FY 2001 Requirements	
			Hrs/Student	Hrs/Yr	Hrs/Student	Hrs/Yr

Mission Requirements (cont.)

E. Training Airframes

1. Provide the number of aircraft (by type) that will be based at each base for use in undergraduate/graduate pilot and NFO/Navigator training programs in the Fiscal Year indicated; and the number of other aircraft **not used** for training. Project requirements if necessary.

Base: _____

AIRCRAFT USED FOR TRAINING

Aircraft*	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
EXAMPLE T-34/JPATS	**25**	**25**	**25**	**25**	**25**	**20 (JPATS 4)**	**10 (JPATS 10)**	**0 (JPATS 15)**
T-2								
TA-4J								
T-34C								
T-39								
T-43								
T-44								
T-45								
TH-57								
JPATS								

AIRCRAFT NOT USED FOR TRAINING

C-12/C-21								
H-60								

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

Mission Requirements (cont.)

Training Airframes (cont.)

2. Provide the following information for each training airframe used for pilot and NFO/Navigator training:

AIRCRAFT TYPE:_____

FACTOR	VALUE
Utilization Rate (UTE Rate--sorties or hours per month)	
Average Sortie Duration (ASD) (hrs)	
Planned Turn Time (hrs) (Time from landing to takeoff)	
Min Runway Length (ft)	
Preferred Runway Length (ft)	
Min Runway Length for Touch and Go (T/G) (ft)	
Runway Width (ft)	
Required Taxiway Width (ft)	
Weight Bearing Requirement (kips)	
Apron Space Required (ft^2/Aircraft)	
Hangar Space Required (ft^2/Aircraft)	
Navigation Equipment On-Board (GPS?--when?)	

. List any additional constraints or limitations to the training airframes that impact the training mission.

'acilities

A. Airfield

1. Provide the following information for the home field and each OLF that supports undergraduate flight training. (Following 20 Questions.)

Airfield/OLF Name: _____ Location (Lat/Long and nearest town): _____

Syllabi and Level of Training Supported: _____

Ownership: _____ (Air Force/Army/Navy/Civilian)

For OLF: Distance (nm) from home field _____

2. Complete the table below to describe the airfield's **annual operations (sorties flown) by type of aircraft.** Give best estimate of the number of sorties if exact data not available. If sortie totals are derived from estimates, list assumptions.

TYPE AIRCRAFT: _____

		FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Operational Sorties	Undergraduate Training Sorties			
	Graduate Training Sorties			
	Training Support Sorties*			
	Other Sorties			
	TOTAL SORTIES:			
Non-Operational Hours[3]	Standdowns			
	Maintenance			
	Other Events			

***Training Support Sorties include maintenance flights, instructor proficiency/checkrides, etc.**

List below the "other sorties" and "other events" included in the table above:

[3] Hours when the airfield was closed for flight operations.

Facilities (cont.)

1. Airfield (cont.)

3. Indicate in the table below the number of undergraduate/graduate pilots and NFO/Navigators trained in FY 1991, FY 1992, and FY 1993 at your installation by syllabus, by level of training. In the blank FY column select the FY with the greatest output within the last 10 years and indicate the year and show data.

Syllabus of Training *	Level of Training *	Pilots and NFO/Navigators Trained		
		FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Strike	Intermediate			
	Advanced			
Etc.				

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

4. Under normal operations, give the average number of daylight/night **flying hours** per day, and the number of days per year the airfield/OLF is scheduled for undergraduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training. (Do not include weekends.)

	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Average hours (day/night)			
Days per year:			

'acilities (cont.)

A. Airfield (cont.)

5. Enter the percentage of daylight undergraduate/graduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training sorties lost during each of the last three years due to weather, maintenance, operations, other military flights, commercial/civilian flights, or other reasons by aircraft type. Indicate if the sorties lost were from an undergraduate or graduate program.

Aircraft Type:_____ **Undergraduate Training:** (Yes/No)

Factor		Percentage Lost		
		FY 91	FY 92	FY 93
Weather	Primary			
	Intermediate			
	Advanced			
	Etc.*			
Maintenance				
Operations				
Other Military Flights				
Civilian/Commercial Flights				
Other				
	Total			

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

6. List the major factors in the "other" category in the above table.

7. Weather (WX): During the period of record (at least ten years), what was the yearly average:

a. Percentage of time WX at or above 200/1?

b. Percentage of time WX at or above 300/1?

c. Percentage of time WX at or above 500/1?

d. Percentage of time WX at or above 1000/3?

e. Percentage of time WX 3000/5 and above?

f. Percentage of time WX 3000/3 and above?

g. Percentage of time WX 1500/3 and above?

h. Percentage of time crosswind component to the primary runway at or below 15 knots?

Percentage of time crosswind component to the primary runway at or above 25 knots?

Mean number of days of icing in the local flying area?

Facilities (cont.)

A. Airfield (cont.)

8. For each independent runway complex at home field and all OLFs, provide a breakdown of daytime and nighttime airfield usage by type of training (include overhead sorties) for undergraduate flight training over the past year. Use a separate table for each runway complex. (Note: The percentages in each column are of sorties flown and should sum to 100.) (Not applicable for helicopter training.)

Runway Complex Name: _____

Syllabus of Training *	Level of Training * (Aircraft Type)	FY 1993 Airfield Use (Percent)	
		Day	Night
Flight Screening	T-3		
General	Primary (T-34/T-37)		
Strike	Intermediate (T-2/T-45)		
	Advanced (TA-4/T-45)		
Etc.			
	Total	100	100

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

9. Given the current mix of aircraft assigned to your air station, what is the average number of operations per hour this airfield and each OLF can support for each runway complex over a one year period (use the number of training days/year used by your service). This number should take in account reductions in operations due to weather and the times the airfield is closed to undergraduate/graduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training (i.e., calculations should be based on the methodology in the FAA's Airport Capacity and Delay manual). Show how this number was derived.

10. Complete the table below to describe the runway activity to each runway at the home field and all OLFs. Use the FAA Airport Operations Count (traffic count) to determine departures and arrivals:

	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Runway ___ Traffic Count			
Runway ___ Traffic Count			

'acilities (cont.)

\. Airfield (cont.)

11. Give the percent of VFR and IFR flight operations (departures and arrivals) at each airfield and OLF (use the flight operations data for FY91 - FY93):

	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
VFR			
IFR			
Total	100%	100%	100%

Facilities (cont.)

A. Airfield (cont.)

12. Discuss the factors that constrain the number of available student flying hours per day (e.g., AICUZ agreements).

13. Assuming that airfield operations are not constrained by operational funding (personnel support, increased overhead costs, etc.), with the present equipment, physical plant, etc., what additional capacity (in flight operations (traffic count) per hour) could be gained? Provide details and assumptions for all calculations[4].

14. Assuming that airfield operations are not constrained by construction/equipment funds, what additional capacity (in flight operations (traffic count) per hour) could be gained? Provide details, estimated costs, and assumptions for all calculations[5]

15. List and explain the limiting factors that further funding for personnel, equipment, facilities, etc., cannot overcome (e.g., airspace size/availability, AICUZ restrictions, environmental restrictions, land areas).

16. Give the maximum sortie generating capacity per year of your installation given the current aircraft mix and type at your installation, and consistent with the training mission.

Syllabus of Training *	Level (Track) of Pilot Training *	Trainer Aircraft *	Maximum Sorties
General	Primary	T-34C	
		JPATS	
Strike	Intermediate	T-2	
		T-45[6]	
	Advanced	TA-4J	
		T-45	
SUPT	Primary	T-37	
	BF	T-38	
	AT	T-1A	
Etc.			

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

17. Are there any recommendations on how to increase sortie generating capacity and reduce the number of training installations? If so please explain.

---

4 Answer for each independent runway complex at the home field and all OLFs and by aircraft type.

5 Answer for each independent runway complex at the home field and all OLFs and by aircraft type.

6 If requirements for the T-45 are still being derived, give best estimate.

Facilities (cont.)

A. Airfield (cont.)

18. Give the designation, length, width, load bearing capacity, lighting configurations, and landing constraints for each runway at the home field and all OLFs.

Runway/Lane/Pad (Airfield Name & Runway Designation)	Length (ft)	Width (ft)	Load Bearing Capacity (lbs/ft²)	Lighting					Arresting gear type and location	IFR or VFR (I or V) Capable? Night (N) Capable?	Approach Aids (IFR/ VFR)
				F	P	C	N	G			

F -- Full Lighting (approach, runway edge, center, and threshold)
P -- Partial Lighting (less than full)
C -- Carrier Deck Lighting Simulated (embedded)
N -- No Lighting
G -- NVG Lighting

19. In the table below list the available NAVAIDS with published approaches that support the main airfield and/or OLFs. Note any additions/upgrades to be added between now and FY 1997.

Runway Designation	NAVAID	Published Approaches

Facilities (cont.)

A. Airfield (cont.)

20. For the following category codes, provide the unit measure requested and any appropriate comments about the usability of the facility for undergraduate flying training.

CAT CODE	Facility Type	Unit Measure	Quantity	Comments
111	Runways Fixed Wing	SY		
111	Runways Rotor Wing	SY		
111	Landing Pads	SY		
113	Parking Aprons	SY		
113	Access Aprons	SY		
121	Direct Fueling	OL / GM		
121	Truck Fueling	OL / GM		
121	Defueling	OL / GM		
124	Fuel Storage	GA		
136-36 (USN)	Carrier Lighting	EA		
149	Arresting Gear	EA		
421 422(AF)	Ammunition Storage	CF		
425	Open Ammunition Storage	SY		

21. List any additional constraints or limitations to the airfield that impact the training mission.

Facilities (cont.)

3. Airspace

1. Give the number of workable blocks of airspace and type of airspace used by your installation, the average dimensions (n.mi. x n.mi. x ft), and availability in daylight hours/year of these blocks for each syllabus and level of pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training and trainer aircraft. Note that a workable block of airspace must be large enough to support the required training maneuvers/evolutions without encroaching on another block and have an ingress/egress route that does not go through other airspace blocks. (This question is not applicable to helicopter training.)

Syllabus of Training *	Level of Training *	Trainer Aircraft	# Workable Blocks of Airspace	Type of Airspace	Average Block Dimensions	Availability (Hrs/Yr)/ Block
General	Primary	T-34C				
		JPATS				
Strike	Intermediate	T-2C				
		T-45				
		JPATS				
	Advanced	TA-4J				
		T-45				
Etc.						
		Total				

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army chart see Appendix 1.**

Key to types of airspace:

MOAs -- Military Operating Areas
WA -- Warning Areas
AA -- Alert Areas
RA -- Restricted Areas
ATCAA -- Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace
OWAW -- Overwater Airways
RR -- Restricted Areas with Ranges
MTR -- Military Training Routes
AW-- Airways (e.g. corridors to and from training areas)
PAT -- Pattern (e.g. airspace above runways)
OWA -- Overwater Airspace
CLG -- Uncontrolled Airspace

If the transit corridors between training areas and air station limits the number of aircraft that can train currently (i.e., can't safely use all blocks) give this limitation and explain what this number is based on. Break this information out by type and level of training if appropriate.

Facilities (cont.)

3. Airspace (cont.)

3. List all the Special Use Airspace (SUA) (e.g., alert areas, restricted areas, warning areas, and MOAs) and airspace-for-special-use (e.g., ranges and low level training routes) within 100 n.mi. of the installation that are used for flight training. For each airspace provide the following information (seven questions):

a. Provide the type, name, location, size (nmi. x nmi. x ft), available times, airspace controlling activity, scheduling activity, method of scoring/recording, and proximity to airport traffic areas.

b. Is the airspace under radar and/or communications coverage/control? If so, who provides the services?

c. Does the Navy/Air Force/Army own the land below the training airspace under your cognizance? If not, do you control any real property interest? If so, describe the agreements and when these agreements are up for renewal?

d. What is the distance en route?

e. Are there any environmental limitations in or surrounding any of the training areas (air, land or sea) that impede the mission? If so, provide details.

f. Is land, sea, or air encroachment an issue which endangers long term availability of any training areas? If so, provide details.

g. In the event that it became necessary to increase base loading at your installation, does the airspace overlying and adjacent to your installation have the capacity to assume an additional workload? Estimate the percentage of the possible increase in usable airspace. Provide the basis/calculations for these estimates.

Facilities (cont.)

3. Airspace (cont.)

4. Is the available SUA/airspace-for-special-use within 100 n.mi. of your installation sufficient to satisfy all training requirements?

5. If deployments/detachments to other domestic locations are required to satisfy training requirements, provide the following information for each location:

a. Where do these units/squadrons deploy?

b. How far from your installation?

c. Frequency?

d. Reasons for deployment (e.g., adverse weather, airspace saturation, training, versatility, etc.)

e. Annual costs incurred for deployments due to adverse weather?

f. Annual costs incurred for deployments due to airspace non-availability?

g. Annual costs incurred for deployments due to insufficient training versatility (e.g., lack of low level training routes etc.)?

6. List all airspace control measures used for flight training that do not qualify as SUA/airspace-for-special-use and describe the limitations and capabilities of those control measures.

7. For each syllabus of undergraduate/graduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator flight training, state whether you require any specific terrain feature or overwater access for training.

Syllabus of Training *	Terrain Feature or Overwater Requirement

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army syllabus of training list**

8. List any additional constraints or limitations to the airspace that impact the training mission.

ıcilities (cont.)

C. Ground Training

1. By Facility Category Code , complete the following table for all training facilities at the installation in which undergraduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training is conducted. Include all 171-*xx*, 179-*xx* category codes, and any other applicable category codes.

For example: in the category 171-10, a type of training facility is academic instruction classroom. If you have 10 classrooms with a capacity of 25 students per room, the design capacity would be 250. If these classrooms are available 8 hours a day for 300 days a year, the capacity in student hours per year would be 600,000.

Cat Code: _____

Type Training Facility	Total Number	Design Capacity (PN)[7]	Capacity (Student HRS/YR)

2. For the Student HRS/YR value in the preceding table, describe how that entry was derived.

3. Assuming that the ground school training facility is not constrained by operational funding (personnel support, increased overhead costs, etc.), with the present equipment, physical plant, etc., what additional capacity (in student hours) could be gained? Provide details and assumptions for all calculations.

4. Assuming that ground school training facility is not constrained by additional construction/equipment funds, what additional capacity (in student hours) could be gained? Provide details, estimated costs, and assumptions for all calculations[8]

5. List and explain the limiting factors that further funding for personnel, equipment, facilities, etc., cannot overcome.

Design Capacity (PN) is the total number of seats available for students in spaces used for academic instruction; applied ..struction; and seats or positions for operational trainer spaces and training facilities other than buildings, i.e., ranges. Design Capacity (PN) must reflect current use of the facilities.

8 Answer for each independent runway complex at the home field and all OLFs and by aircraft type.

Facilities (cont.)

2. Ground Training (cont.)

6. By Category Code, complete the following table for all training facilities at the installation in which undergraduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training **is not** conducted. Include all 171-*xx*, 179-*xx* category codes, and any other applicable category codes.

For example: in the category 171-10, a type of training facility is academic instruction classroom. If you have 10 classrooms with a capacity of 25 students per room, the design capacity would be 250. If these classrooms are available 8 hours a day for 300 days a year, the capacity in student hours per year would be 600,000.

Cat Code: _____

Type Training Facility	Total Number	Design Capacity (PN)[9]	Capacity (Student HRS/YR)

7. For the Student HRS/YR value in the preceding table, describe how that entry was derived.

---

[9] Design Capacity (PN) is the total number of seats available for students in spaces used for academic instruction; applied instruction; and seats or positions for operational trainer spaces and training facilities other than buildings, i.e., ranges. Design Capacity (PN) must reflect current use of the facilities.

Facilities (cont.)

2. Ground Training (cont.)

8. Assuming that the ground school training facility is not constrained by operational funding (personnel support, increased overhead costs, etc.), with the present equipment, physical plant, etc., what additional capacity (in student hours) could be gained? Provide details and assumptions for all calculations.

9. Assuming that ground school training facility is not constrained by additional construction/equipment funds, what additional capacity (in student hours) could be gained? Provide details, estimated costs, and assumptions for all calculations[10]

10. List and explain the limiting factors that further funding for personnel, equipment, facilities, etc., cannot overcome.

10 Answer for each independent runway complex at the home field and all OLFs and by aircraft type.

Facilities (cont.)

D. Aircraft Parking, Maintenance, and Supply

1. Provide the number of other aircraft (both active and reserve operational squadrons) that are based at your installation. If a squadron has more than one type of aircraft, fill out a separate line for each type.

Squadron	Number of Aircraft (Fiscal Year)								Mission
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	

2. Using the types (and mix) of aircraft currently stationed at your installation, project the maximum number of these aircraft that could be based and parked on your current parking aprons. Use your service specific regulations regarding standard measures, (NAVFAC P-80, etc.).

Aircraft Type	# of Aircraft	Comments

3. Provide the details of your calculations, including your assumptions on the minimum separation between aircraft, folding of aircraft wings, and any obstruction that may limit the placement of aircraft on the parking apron spaces.

'acilities (cont.)

). Aircraft Parking, Maintenance, and Supply (cont.)

4. Using the types (and mix) of aircraft currently stationed at your installation, project the maximum number of these aircraft that could be housed in your hangars. Use your service specific regulations regarding standard measures, (NAVFAC P-80, etc.).

Aircraft Type	# of Aircraft	Comments

Provide the details of your calculations, including your assumptions on the minimum separation between rcraft, folding of aircraft wings and any obstructions that may limit the placement of aircraft in the hangars.

6. Using the types (and mix) of aircraft currently stationed at your installation, project the maximum number of these aircraft that could be maintained at your installation based on availability of maintenance facilities (i.e., maintenance docks, wash racks, NDI facilities, etc.).

Aircraft Type	# of Aircraft	Comments

7. Provide the basis (including source data) of your calculations in enough detail so they can be reproduced.

Describe any maintenance backlogs that your installation currently experiences on a routine basis. List e average backlog times and the reasons for the backlogs (e.g., supply shortfall, insufficient local labor, ver tasking of work stations, space limitations).

acilities (cont.)

D. Aircraft Parking, Maintenance, and Supply (cont.)

9. Using the types (and mix) of aircraft currently stationed at your installation, project the maximum number of these aircraft that could be supported at your installation based on availability of supply/storage facilities.

Aircraft Type	# of Aircraft	Comments

10. Provide the basis (including source data) of your calculations in enough detail so they can be reproduced.

11. List any additional constraints or limitations to the parking, maintenance, and supply facilities that mpact the training mission.

Features and Capabilities

A. Housing and Messing

1. Provide data on the BOQs and BEQs assigned to your current plant account. The desired unit of measure for this capacity is people housed. Differentiate between officer/enlisted/civilian, and include if billeting is for students or permanent party.

Facility Type, Bldg. # & Cat Code	Total No. of Beds	Total No. of Rooms	Total people housed

2. Provide data on the BOQs and BEQs projected to be assigned to your plant account in FY 1997. The desired unit of measure for this capacity is people housed. Differentiate between officer/enlisted/civilian, and include if billeting is for students or permanent party.

Facility Type, Bldg. # & Cat Code	Total No. of Beds	Total No. of Rooms	Total People Housed

Features and Capabilities (cont.)

A. Housing and Messing (cont.)

3. Provide data on the messing facilities assigned to your current plant account.

Facility Type, Bldg. # & Cat Code	Total No. of Beds	Total No. of Rooms	Total People Housed

Replace with table in Q4

4. Provide data on the messing facilities projected to be assigned to your plant account in FY 1997.

Facility Type, Cat Code and Bldg. #	Total Sq. Ft.	Seats	Avg # Noon Meals Served

5. Based upon your installation's on and off-base housing and messing facilities, what average daily student load (ADSL) could you support from FY95 - FY01? Express the daily student load in terms of enlisted, officer, and civilian.

Type Facility	Average Daily Student Load (ADSL)						
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
BOQ							
BEQ							
On-Base Housing							
Off-Base Housing							
Messing							

6. Provide the basis (including source data) of your calculations in enough detail so they can be reproduced.

.st any additional constraints or limitations to the housing and messing facilities that impact the training nission.

Appendix 1

ppendix 1 a

Navy pilot training syllabi with service components trained.

Syllabus of Training	
Strike	USN
	USMC
	FMS
Maritime	USN
	USMC
	USCG
	FMS
	USAF
E2/C2	USN
	USMC
	USCG
	FMS
Rotary	USN
	USMC
	USCG
	FMS

Navy NFO training syllabi with service components trained.

Adv Navigator (NAV)	USN
	FMS
	NOAA
Tact Navigator (TN/BN)	USN
	USMC
Radar Intercept Officer (RIO)	USN
	USMC
Over Water Jet Navigator (OJT)	USN
Airborne Tact Data Systems (ATDS)	USN
	USCG

Navy pilot training syllabi with levels of training and types of aircraft used.

General	Primary	T-34C
		JPATS
Strike	Intermediate	T-2
		T-45[11]
	Advanced	TA-4J
		T-45
E2/C2	Intermediate	T-44
	Advanced	T-45[2]
		T-2
Maritime	Intermediate	T-34C
		JPATS
	Advanced	T-44
Rotary	Intermediate	T-34C
		JPATS
	Advanced	TH-57

Navy NFO syllabi of training with levels of training and types of aircraft used.

General	Primary	T-34/T-2
		JPATS
General	Intermediate	T-34/T-2
NAV	Advanced	T-43
TN/BN	Advanced	T-2
	Advanced	T-39
RIO	Advanced	T-2
	Advanced	T-39
OJN	Advanced	T-2
	Advanced	T-39
ATDS	Advanced	E-2C

Navy list of aircraft used in undergraduate pilot and NFO training.

T-2
TA-4J
T-34C
T-39
T-43
T-44
T-45
TH-57
JPATS

[11] If requirements for the T-45 are still being derived, give best estimate.

Appendix 1 b

Air Force pilot training syllabi with service components trained.

Syllabus of Training	
Flight Screening	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
	USAFA
	FMS
UPT	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
	FMS
SUPT	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
	FMS
	NAVY
SUPT HELO	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
ENJJPT	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
	NATO
BANKED REQ T-38	USAF
BANKED REQ T-1	USAF
FIXED WING QUAL TNG	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
ROTARY WING QUAL	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
AVIATION LEADERSHIP PROGRAM T-37	FMS
UPT T-38 ADVANCED TNG PGM	FMS

INTRO TO FTR FUND (IFF) AT-38	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
	NATO
	FMS
INTRO TO BOMBER FUND (IBF) (NO A/C, SIMS ONLY)	USAF
	AFRES
	ANG
T-43	USAF
	FMS
PILOT INSTR TNG (PIT) T-37	USAF
	FMS
PILOT INSTR TNG (PIT) T-38	USAF
	FMS
PILOT INSTR TNG (PIT) T-1	USAF
T-1 PIT TRANSITION	USAF
PILOT INSTR TNG (PIT) AT-38	USAF
	NATO
ENJJPT PIT T-37	USAF
	NATO
ENJJPT PIT T-38	USAF
	NATO
JET CURRENCY COURSE T-38	USAF
	ANG
	AFRES
MED OFFICER FLT FAM TNG T-37	USAF

Air Force pilot training syllabi with levels of training and types of aircraft used.

Syllabus	Level of Tng	Aircraft
Screening	Accession	T-3A, T-41
UPT	Primary	T-37
	Advanced	T-38
SUPT	Primary	T-37
		JPATS
	Advanced BF	T-38
	Advanced AT	T-1A
	Advanced Helo	UH-1
ENJJPT	Primary	T-37
		JPATS
	Advanced	T-38
Banked Req	Graduate	T-38
Banked Req	Graduate	T-1A
Fixed Wing Qual	Grad Phase 2	T-37
	Phase 3 or	T-1
	Phase 3	T-38
Rotary Wing Qual	Graduate	UH-1
Aviation Ldrshp Pgm	Primary	T-37
Adv Tng Pgm	Advanced	T-38
IFF	Graduate	AT-38
IBF	Graduate	T-1A Sims Only
T-43 Pilot Tng	Graduate	T-43
PIT T-37	Graduate	T-37
PIT T-38	Graduate	T-38
PIT T-1A	Graduate	T-1A
T-1A Transition	Graduate	T-1A
IFF PIT	Graduate	AT-38
ENJJPT T -37 PIT	Graduate	T-37
ENJJPT T-38 PIT	Graduate	T-38
Jet Currency Course	Graduate	T-38
Med Off Flt Fam Tng	Graduate	T-37

Appendix 1 c

Army pilot training syllabi with levels of training and types of aircraft used.

Syllabus	Level of Tng	Aircraft
IERW	Primary	UH-1/TH-67
	Instruments	UH-1/TH-67
	Track	UH-1/OH-58
Graduate	AQC IPC MOI MTP	AH-64
	AQC IPC MOI MTP	CH-47D
	AQC SUP MOI MTP SUP (M)	OH-58D
	AQC IPC MOI MTP	AH-1
	AQC IPC MOI MTP	UH-60
	IPC MOI	OH-58A/C
	IPC NVG RWART RWIC RWQC RWIFEC MOI (CT) MOI (NVG)	UH-1
	FWMEQC FWIPC	U-21
	AQC FLT Refresher	C-12
Euro/NATO	Primary Instru ADINS ADCON C/S	UH-1
Spanish	RWQC TQO IERW NVG IPC	UH-1

Army pilot training syllabi with service components trained.

IERW	USA
	USAF
	USAF (RWQC)
	SPANISH
	EURO/NATO
	FMS
	OTHER
Graduate	USA
	SPANISH
	EURO/NATO
	FMS
	OTHER

Attachment 3

CLOSE HOLD

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE

CATEGORY:

UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING

MILITARY VALUE ANALYSIS:
DATA CALL WORK SHEETS

31 March, 1994

The information contained herein is sensitive. Deputy SECDEF guidance restricts the release of data or analysis pertaining to evaluation of military bases for closure or realignment until the SECDEF forwards recommendations to the Base Closure Commission. All individuals handling this information should take steps to protect the material herein from disclosure.

**********If any responses are classified, attach separate classified annex.**********

CLOSE HOLD

Table of Contents

Mission Requirements 4
A. Training Other Than Undergraduate Pilot and NFO/Navigator Training . 4
B. Operational Squadron Support 5
C. Managed Training Areas 7
D. General Military Support 8
E. Other Support 9
F. Weather 10
Facilities 11
A. Air Space and Flight Training Areas 11
B. Airfields 18
C. Ground Training Facilities 22
D. Aircraft Maintenance Facilities 23
E. Special Military Facilities 25
F. Facility Support Arrangements for Other Services 26
G. Proximity to Operational Mission Areas 27
H. Proximity to Training Areas 27
I. Proximity to Other Support Facilities 28
J. Unique features 29
uture Requirements 30
A. Air Quality 30
B. Encroachment 31
C. Ability for Expansion 37
Manpower Implications 39
A. Quality of Life 39

'ILOT/NFO/NAVIGATOR TRAINING INSTALLATION LISTING:

Title	Location
COLUMBUS	COLUMBUS MS
CORPUS CHRISTI	CORPUS CHRISTI TX
FT RUCKER	FT RUCKER AL
KINGSVILLE	KINGSVILLE TX
LAUGHLIN	DEL RIO TX
MERIDIAN	MERIDIAN MS
PENSACOLA	PENSACOLA FL
RANDOLPH *	UNIVERSAL CITY TX
REESE	LUBBOCK TX
SHEPPARD	WITCHITA FALLS TX
VANCE	ENID OK
WHITING FIELD	MILTON FL

* Includes Enhanced Flight Screening sites at Hondo TX and Air Force Academy CO

lission Requirements

A. Training Other Than Undergraduate Pilot and NFO/Navigator Training

1. List all ground combat units that train at this installation.

Ground Unit/MTOE	Training Function

2. List all other units not previously mentioned (active, reserve, guard, etc.) that train at this installation.

Operational Unit/TDA	Training Function

3. List all requirements the installation or its tenants have to support training of other service components (e.g., ground force training, battle group exercise, etc.)

Forces	Location/ Distance	Type of Support	Frequency

Mission Requirements (cont.)

3. Operational Squadron Support

1. List the operational (active or reserve) or special squadrons based at your installation. Include any programmed additions or deletions through FY 1997. (HQ Air Force will provide for Air Force)

Squadron Name	Aircraft Type(s)	Mission

2. List all other DoD, non-DoD, and other aircraft which are or are programmed (through FY 1997) to be parked or stationed at your installation. (HQ Air Force will provide for Air Force)

Service/Agency/ Custodian	Aircraft Type(s)	Mission

lission Requirements (cont.)

B. Operational Squadron Support (cont.)

3. Provide the average daily number of flight operations conducted by non-training military aircraft assigned to this station and the total number of days during which these operations were conducted. If data is not normally recorded, include estimates (and identify as such). A flight operation is defined as a takeoff, landing, or approach without a landing.

FY	Main Airfield		Auxiliary Field		Auxiliary Field		Auxiliary Field	
	No. Ops	No.[1] Days	No. Ops	No. Days	No. Ops	No. Days	No. Ops	No. Days
1991								
1992								
1993								
1994[2]								

. List deployable aviation support units (e.g., Command & Control, Expeditionary Base Support, and Air Defense) stationed at this installation. For each type unit, give the number assigned, its mission and primary equipment items (e.g., radars, trucks, etc.).

Type of Unit	Number of Units	Mission	Equipment Items

[1]Include only days when the installation operates at normal training levels (Do not include weekends and olidays if the training rate is at minimal levels).

[2]Include FY 1994 data through 31 March 1994.

Mission Requirements (cont.)

. Managed Training Areas

1. List the air-to-ground training ranges, outlying airfields, auxiliary airfields, special use airspace and areas for special use that are actively managed (scheduled or controlled) by the installation.

Managed Training Assets	Management Role

. List other candidate installations (DoD and non-DoD) that could be considered for performing these management duties.

Asset	Installation	Reason for Consideration

Mission Requirements (cont.)

D. General Military Support

1. Does this installation currently support any joint services (i.e., counter-narcotics) air operations? If so, explain.

a. If applicable, give the type and number of aircraft based at your installation that conduct these operations and the total number of sorties flown during FY 1993 in support of these operations.

Aircraft Type	Number of Aircraft	# Sorties Flown in FY 1993

b. If applicable, list special equipment and facility (e.g., radar surveillance systems) at your installation that directly support these operations.

Equipment/Facility	Function

2. Does this installation have a role in national air defense or any other war or peace time defense plans? If so, explain.

lission Requirements (cont.)

D. General Military Support (cont.)

3. Does this installation directly support a military or civilian area control and surveillance mission (e.g., FACSFAC, FAA support)? If so, provide details.

4. Describe the role this installation plays in any logistics support and mobilization plan.

5. List any other military support missions currently conducted at/from this installation (e.g., port of embarkation for personnel, other active duty/reserve personnel or logistics transfer missions).

6. Are any new military missions planned for this installation?

. Other Support

1. Does the installation have a role in a disaster assistance plan, search and rescue, or local evacuation plan? If so, describe.

2. Does the installation provide any direct meteorological support to local civilian, governmental or military agencies? If so, describe.

3. Are any new civilian or other non-DoD missions planned for this installation? If so, describe.

lission Requirements (cont.)

F. Weather

1. What percentage of the time (on average, by month), does the local weather affect training operations and restrict airfield sortie rates. Use the following chart and add any further descriptions on how weather generally impacts airfield and training operations (recurring wind or fog conditions, etc.).

Airfield: _____

Month	% of Hours[3] VMC	% of Hours IMC	% of Hours Below 500 ft Ceilings and 1.0 Mile Visibility	% of All Sorties Rescheduled/Canceled Due to Weather
Jan.				
Feb.				
Mar.				
Apr.				
May				
June				
July				
Aug.				
Sept.				
Oct.				
Nov.				
Dec.				

2. Give the official planning factor for percent of sorties lost due to weather (based on historic data).

3. Do the normal weather conditions at the most frequently used training areas pose a chronic problem for scheduling training sorties? If so, are alternate training areas used? Does the use of alternate training facilities involve relocating aircraft and support personnel to other installations during certain times of the year?

_____

[3]Percentage of total normal operating hours that specified weather conditions were observed (include list of normal operating hours used for this calculation).

acilities

A. Air Space and Flight Training Areas

1. Is mission/training impacted by training area airspace encroachment or other conflict? For example, noise abatement/traffic procedures that limit operations. Explain.

2. Do the MOAs/bombing ranges/other training areas have any scheduling restrictions/limitations?

a. If scheduling problems are encountered, list all reasons.

3. Do you expect more restrictions/limitations to be imposed on the MOAs/bombing ranges/other training areas used by your unit? (Yes or No)

a. If yes, state all reasons.

4. Are there any significant changes/restrictions/limitations being worked that will affect the scheduling of low level routes used by your unit? (Yes or No)

a. If yes, list all changes.

. Excluding airport traffic area, what airspace does the installation schedule/manage? Include any military operating areas, restricted areas, warning areas, low altitude tactical navigation areas, air refueling tracks/anchors, military training routes, and alert areas. List and identify each unit of airspace. Provide MOA and restricted area utilization reports as necessary.

6. If installation does not schedule/manage any airspace, then identify airspace used for local training.

Facilities (cont.)

A. Air Space and Flight Training Areas (cont.)

7. For each piece of airspace, that your installation controls or manages, answer the following questions:

a. Has an environmental analysis (EA, EIS, etc.) been conducted on each airspace? (Yes or No)
- What is the status of each environmental analysis and supplement?
- Were there any problems associated with the analysis?
- Does the current "Description of Proposed Actions/Alternatives" (DOPAA) define your operations, and if it does, was it used for the latest environmental analysis and supersonic waiver if required? Explain any lack of reports.

b. Are there known noise sensitive areas (NSAs) associated with each piece of airspace? (Yes/No)
- List those documented in Flight Information Publication (FLIP) and those you have concerns about.
- Do any of these NSAs affect or threaten the quality of training or mission?

c. Are there any known civilian/commercial encroachments with each piece of airspace? (Yes/No)
- List those for ground or airspace encroachment. (i.e., Public-use airports, parachute operations, gliders, etc.)

d. Are there any planned expansions to your special use airspace? Yes/No (Include new airspace proposals)
- Explain proposal and give status (to include community reactions)
- What was the primary rationale supporting expansion?

e. What type of restrictions exist with each airspace? (i.e., hours of operation, subsonic, altitude restrictions, exercise only, ATC delays, etc.)

f. What is the published availability of each airspace?
- How many hours (average per year for 1990 thru 1993) was the airspace scheduled?
- How many hours were actually used (average per year for 1990 thru 1993, total of all users)?
- State reasons for difference between scheduled and actually used.

g. Is it possible to increase utilization of the airspace? (Yes or No)

h. Can it be expanded in volume and/or hours of use? (Yes or No)

i. Describe the volume or area of the airspace.

j. What percentage of the airspace is usable?

Facilities (cont.)

A. Air Space and Flight Training Areas (cont.)

8. Potential For Growth in Training Airspace (Area)
   a. Is expansion possible? (Yes or No)
      - If yes, give an estimate of the percentage of increase and rationale for your estimate
   b. Will current access remain the same (status quo)? (Yes or No)
   c. Are reductions expected? (Yes or No)
      - If yes, give an estimate of the percentage of decrease and rationale for your estimate
   d. Do current special use airspace and training areas meet all training requirements? (Yes or No)
      - Can some of your training requirements only be met by deployed, off-station training? (Yes or No)
      - If not, what degradation is experienced? Explain/identify

9. Commercial Aviation Impact
   a. Is the installation joint-use (CIVILIAN/MILITARY)? YES/NO.
   b. Identify all of the airfields (to include civilian/commerical/general aviation/uncontrolled) within a 50 mile radius of the installation.
   c. Do civilian/commerical operators or other airspace users pose any scheduling, operational, or environmental constraints or limits on operations? Yes/No (In answering Yes or No, consider ATC, hours f operations, flight tracks/profiles, conflicting traffic with other airports or airspace users, noise sensitive reas, etc.
      - Describe the impact.

Joint Cross-Service Group on Undergraduate Pilot Training

Table of Contents

1. Process Summary - Book 1

2. Internal Control Plan - Book 1

3. Analytical Framework - Book 1

    A. Data Calls: 4/5/94 and 8/29/94 - Book 1

    B. Data Call Responses - Books 2 -

    C. Functional Values - Book 1

    D. Capacity - Resource Analysis - Book 1

4. Analytical Tool Outputs/Runs (Included in Section 6: Meeting Minutes from 10/21/94 to 11/21/94) - Book 1

5. Alternatives Transmitted to the Military Departments - Book 1

6. JCSG Meeting Minutes - Book

Facilities (cont.)

A. Air Space and Flight Training Areas (cont.)

10. List all areas for special use within 100 nmi. of your installation. For each piece of airspace, provide the following data:

Airspace Designator: _____

a. Type of airspace (i.e., warning area, MOA, alert area, restricted area, or MTR)
b. Dimensions (nmi. x nmi. x ft)
c. Distance from main airfield
d. Time en route from main airfield
e. Controlling agency
f. Scheduling agency
g. Are canned/stereo airways needed to access air space?
   - If so, how many?
   - If so, what types (i.e., IFR, VFR, or altitude reservation)?
h. Is the airspace under radar coverage?
   - If so who provides the coverage?
i. Is the airspace under communications coverage?
   - If so who provides the coverage?
j. Number of low level airways (below 18,000 ft) that bisect airspace
k. Number of high altitude airways (above 18,000 ft) that bisect airspace
l. Total number of sorties/movements flown in FY 1990 thru 1993
   - By your service
   - By other services (including reserves and national guard)
m. Total number of available hours in FY 1990 thru 1993
n. Total number of scheduled hours in FY 1990 thru 1993
   - By your service
   - By other services (including reserves and national guard)
o. Total number of hours used
   - By your service
   - By other services (including reserves and national guard)
p. Types of training permitted

'acilities (cont.)

A. Air Space and Flight Training Areas (cont.)

11. List all the Ranges (Controlled/managed by installation) (IF NONE, SKIP TO A. 3.)

Range Name:_____

a. List the range(s) that your installation controls/manages?
b. List the range's (s') associated airspace to include restricted areas, MOAs, etc.
c. What is the distance from the installation to the range(s) (primary target or centroid)?
d. What is the size of the range? (in acres)
- What is the size of the range's(s') impact area(s) (in acres)?
- What is the size of the restricted area in which the range lies (in square miles)?
- What is the altitude ceiling of the range's(s') restricted area(s)?

e. Does the range's(s') shape/location prohibit efficient training or significantly hamper mission accomplishment (i.e., single run-in headings, no pop patterns, etc)?

f. What other type of restrictions exist (i.e., limited hours, exercise only, ceiling precludes high altitude dive bomb deliveries, etc.)?

g. What flying squadron/aviation units are regular users (20 or more range periods per year) of the range(s)? List

h. What is the published availability of the range(s)?
- How many hours (average per year for 1990 thru 1993) was the range(s) scheduled?
- How many hours was the range(s) used (average per year for 1990 thru 1993, total of all users)?
- Utilization (average used/average scheduled x 100 = %)
- Give reasons for non-use.

i. Does the range(s) have full-scale weapons develivery (FSWD)/area scoring weapon system (ASWS) capability? Describe in detail.
- What are the associated FSWD/ASWS restrictions?

j. Does the range(s) have any special weapons capability (shapes, laser-guided, etc.)?
- What are the associated special weapons restrictions?

k. Does the range(s) have electronic warfare capability? Describe (unclassified) in detail.
- What are the associated electronic warfare restrictions?

l. Are there any noise sensitive area (NSAs) associated with the range(s)? List.
- Do any of the NSAs affect or threaten the quality of training? (Explain)

m. Are there commercial/civilian encroachment problems associated with the range(s)? Describe.
- Do any of these encroachments affect or threaten the quality of training? (Explain)

n. Describe problems (if any) with hazardous material/waste/ordnance disposal?

o. What is the status of any MOU/A or Letters of Agreement (LOA) associated with range?
- Is there a prospect of the range having a diminished training capacity when the MOU/A or LOA is renewed? If yes, explain.

p. Is it possible to increase utilization of the range(s) (expand hours, volume)?

q. Are there any planned range real property expansions? Describe.
- What is community reaction to your proposal?

acilities (cont.)

A. Air Space and Flight Training Areas (cont)

12. List all the other air-to-ground training ranges not controled or managed by your installation within 100 nmi. For each range, provide the following data:

Range Name: _____

a. Location (city/county and state and lattitude and longitude)
b. Distance from main airfield
c. Time en route from main airfield
d. Controlling agency
e. Scheduling agency
f. Are canned/stereo airways needed to access air space?
   - If so, how many?
   - If so, what types (i.e., IFR, VFR, or altitude reservation)?
g. Is the airspace under radar coverage?
   - If so who provides the coverage?
h. Is the airspace under communications coverage?
   - If so who provides the coverage?
i. Number of low level airways (below 18,000 ft) that bisect airspace
j. Number of high altitude airways (above 18,000 ft) that bisect airspace
k. Total number of sorties flown in FY 1990 thru 1993
   - By your service
   - By other services (including reserves and national guard)
l. Total number of available hours in FY 1990 thru 1993
m. Total number of scheduled hours in FY 1990 thru 1993
   - By your service
   - By other services (including reserves and national guard)
n. Total number of hours used
   - By your service
   - By other services (including reserves and national guard)
o. Types of training permitted

13. Describe the major air traffic structure (routes, terminal control areas, approaches, etc.) within 50 NM of each air-to-ground range, airspace, and airfield.

14. Are installation operations currently affected by the major air traffic structures (routes, terminal control areas, approaches, etc.) within 50 NM of each air-to-ground range, airspace, and airfield? If so, describe the effect.

acilities (cont.)

A. Air Space and Flight Training Areas (cont)

15. Are there planned changes to the major air traffic structures (routes, terminal control areas, approaches, etc.) in the region? If so, will these changes affect installation operations. Describe the effect.

16. Does the current system of air traffic control (ATC) routes limit aircraft flights between the installation and all associated training areas? If so, describe these limitations.

17. Does the installation experience any ATC delays on a regular basis? If so, describe the recurring causes for these delays and give the average duration.

18. Are there any air traffic control constraints/procedures listed in the current Air Ops manual/AICUZ study that currently, or may in the future, limit installation operations?

19. Does the current airspace which you schedule/control permit advanced fighter training? If not, explain why.

20. Is there airspace within 50 NM which permits advanced fighter training?

21. Does the current airspace configuration permit advanced helicopter training? If not, explain why.

22. Does the airspace configuration prohibit other types of undergraduate pilot training? If so, explain why.

23. For each syllabus of undergraduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator flight training, state whether you require any specific terrain feature or overwater access for training.

Syllabus of Training *	Terrain Feature or Overwater Requirement

*** Use appropriate Navy, Air Force, or Army syllabus of training list**

Facilities (cont.)

B. Airfields

1. For the main airfield(s) and each auxiliary and outlying field/staging base, provide the following data

Airfield Name: _____

a. Location (city/county and state and lattitude and longitude)
b. Distance from main field:
c. Does the airfield have more than one runway complex that can conduct independent (i.e., concurrent) flight operations?
d. Does the airfield have parallel or dual offset runways?
   - If the airfield has parallel or dual offset runways; do they permit dual IFR flight operations?
e. Does the airfield have full-length parallel taxiways?
f. Does the airfield have high speed taxiways?
g. Does the airfield have a crosswind runway?
h. If conditions force the use of this runway, does the airfield lose flight ops capacity?
i. How much capacity is lost?
j. What percent of the time do conditions force the crosswind runway to be used?
k. Is the airfield equipped to support IFR flight operations?
l. Is the airfield owned by your service or leased?
m. Discuss any runway design features that are specific to particular types of training aircraft (e.g., are the airfield facilities designed primarily for helo, prop or jet training aircraft).

'acilities (cont.)

B. Airfields (cont.)

2. For the category codes listed below, most installations will need to conduct an in-house survey to accurately capture the condition of these facilities. This survey is required because, in most cases, Real Property Records lump all pavements and utility distribution systems under one facility number. The condition of these facilities is determined by the predominant condition of the entire system. This does not accurately indicate the true condition of the entire system and, therefore, necessitates a survey so you can report the percent of the system that is Adquate/Permanent, Substandard/Semi-Permanent and Inadequate/Temporary. When the bases do these surveys, it is vitally important they be auditable. Bases should have hard documentation to show exactly how they arrived at condition codes for each segment of the category codes listed below.

Facility Type (CCN)	Facility Description	Unit of Measure	Current Quantity	Adequate/ Permanent	Substandard/ Semi-Permanent	Inadequate/ Temporary
111	Airfield Pavement-Runways (Do not include shoulders or overruns)	SY				
112	Airfield Pavements-Taxiways (Do not include shoulders)	SY				
113	Airfield Pavements-Aprons (Do not include shoulders)	SY				
116-662	Dangerous Cargo Pad	SY				
812	Elec Power-Trans & Distr Lines (Overhead & U/G, Pri & Sec Lines) (Do not include 812-921, 812-926 and 812-928)	LF				

Facilities (cont.)

3. Airfields (cont.)

Facility Type (CCN)	Facility Description	Unit of Measure	Current Quantity	Adequate/ Permanent	Substandard/ Semi-Permanent	Inadequate/ Temporary
822	Heat-Trans & Distr Lines (Do not include 822-248 and 822-268)	LF				
832	Sewage and Industrial Waste-Collection (Mains) (Do not include 832-267)	LF				
842	Water-Distr Sys-Potable (Do not include 842-246 and 842-249)	LF				
843	Water-Fire Protection (Mains) (Do not include 843-315, 843-316 and 843-319)	LF				
851	Roads (Do not include 851-142 and 851-143)	SY				
852	Veh/Equip Parking (Do not include 852-282, 852-287 and 852-289)	SY				

Facilities (cont.)

3. Airfields (cont.)

3. List the major facility assets (using your service specific list by 5 digit category code number (CCN)) under installation control (e.g., runway, parking apron, hangars, terminal, administrative spaces) and assess their material condition by indicating the quantities that are adequate/permanent, substandard/semi-permanent and inadequate/temporary. Specify how the facility is used if it is not obvious from its CCN.

Facility Type (CCN)	Facility Use	Unit of Measure	Adequate/ Permanent	Substandard/ Semi-Permanent	Inadequate/ Temporary

4. An inadequate/temporary facility cannot be made adequate/permanent for its present use through "economically justifiable means." For all the categories above where inadequate/temporary facilities are identified provide the following information:

a. Facility Type/Code:
b. What makes it inadequate/temporary?
c. What use is being made of the facility?
d. What is the cost to upgrade the facility to substandard/semi-permanent?
e. What other use could be made of the facility and at what cost?
f. Current improvement plans and programmed funding:
g. Has this facility condition resulted in "C3" or "C4" designation on your BASEREP?

'acilities (cont.)

C. Ground Training Facilities

1. List ground training facilities at the installation that support pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training (e.g., classrooms, pistol ranges, water survival facilities). Provide the 5 digit category code number (CCN) where possible. Indicate if these facilities are unique or if they include any specialized equipment and assess their material condition by indicating the quantities that are adequate/permanent, substandard/semi-permanent and inadequate/temporary. Specify how the facility is used if it is not obvious from its CCN.

Facility Type (CCN)	Facility Use	Unit of Measure	Adequate/ Permanent	Substandard/ Semi-Permanent	Inadequate/ Temporary

2. An inadequate/temporary facility cannot be made adequate/permanent for its present use through "economically justifiable means." For all the categories above where inadequate/temporary facilities are identified provide the following information:

a. Facility Type/Code:
b. What makes it inadequate/temporary?
c. What use is being made of the facility?
d. What is the cost to upgrade the facility to substandard/semi-permanent?
e. What other use could be made of the facility and at what cost?
f. Current improvement plans and programmed funding:
g. Has this facility condition resulted in "C3" or "C4" designation on your BASEREP?

'acilities (cont.)

D. Aircraft Maintenance Facilities

1. Complete the following table for each type of aircraft which can be maintained at your installation. Place an "x" in the applicable columns for each type of aircraft.

Aircraft Types	Level of Maintenance			Source	
	Depot	Intermediate	Organizational	DOD	Contract

'acilities (cont.)

E. Special Military Facilities

1. List all facilities and equipment that play a special role in military operations (e.g., radar, communications, command and control, oceanographic facilities) of the aircraft at the installation.

Type of Facility	Operational Mission of Facility

2. Contingency and Deployment Requirements:
(Assume full mobilization, sustained 24-hour capability)

a. Can airfield handle wide-body aircraft (e.g. C-5, KC-10, E-3A, 747) transient operations, (e.g., arking, fueling, loading)? (Yes/No)

3. Does installation have a dedicated munitions loading pad?
   a. If yes, are there any access limitations?
   b. What type aircraft have used your pad over the last five years?

Facilities (cont.)

E. Special Military Facilities

4. Is the installation located within 150NM of:
   a. Ground Force Installation (active)? Yes/No (If yes, give name(s))
   b. Rail Access which allows the loading/unloading of heavy equipment? Yes/No
   c. Deep water port facility? Yes/No (If yes, give name(s))

5. Does the installation medical treatment facility routinely receive referral patients? (Yes/No)

6. Do installation medical facilities have any unique missions (aeromedical staging facility, environmental health laboratory, area dental laboratory, physiological training unit, wartime tasking, etc.)? Identify.

7. List any weapons storage and handling facilities located at the installation.

Type of Facility	Location	Mission and Capability of Facility

Facilities (cont.)

F. Facility Support Arrangements for Other Services

1. List all arrangements (e.g., inter-service support agreements) that involve supporting other military service activities at the installation.

Activity Name / Military Service	Description of Activity Role and Degree of Support

2. List all formal support agreements and other arrangements that involve supporting other governmental agencies (federal, state, local or international) or civilian activities at the installation.

Activity / Sponsor / Government Affiliation	Description of Activity Role and Support Level

Facilities (cont.)

J. Proximity to Operational Mission Areas

1. Does the location of the installation have any strategic role at the present time or in future plans (include both location and attributes available at that location, e.g., waterfront space). Discuss alternate military/civilian facilities that could fulfill the same strategic role.

H. Proximity to Training Areas

1. Does the location of the installation permit any specialized training with other operational units (e.g., Joint forces)? If so, provide details.

2. Describe the plan for conducting carrier qualifications. Will ship deploy to training squadron site or will squadrons deploy?

3. How far (nmi.) is the installation from a designated naval operations area where an aircraft carrier would conceivably operate ?

4. If the aircraft carrier deploys to an area within operating range of training air squadrons, would CQ training usually be conducted directly from the installation or on a detachment basis?

'acilities (cont.)

I. Proximity to Other Support Facilities

1. List other airfields (currently not used for undergraduate pilot and/or NFO/Navigator training) in the local flying area that are available for training and emergency uses.

Airfield Name	Major Use / Capability	Location / Distance

2. What other military facilities located in the vicinity are/could be used to support the installation's and tenants' mission?

Military Facility Name	Actual / Proposed Use	Distance

3. What civilian owned facilities located in the vicinity are/could be used to support the installation's and tenants' mission?

Facility Name	Actual / Proposed Use	Distance

Facilities (cont.)

j. Unique features

1. Identify any unique (one of a kind) features (function, equipment, ranges, etc.) possessed by this training installation. Please list each feature separately and provide a narrative explanation of the importance of the unique feature. (Do not include Depots, Product Centers or Laboratories)

2. Are there any on-installation facilities unique (one-of-a-kind) to your service that must be replaced if the installation is closed (Yes/No). If so, list the following information:
   a. Name or type of facility
   b. Total SF
   c. Cat code
   d. Present use

Future Requirements

A. Air Quality

1. What is the name of the Air Quality Management District in which the base is located?
   a. Is the installation or any of its OLFs or Staging Bases located in different Air Quality Management Districts? Yes/No
   b. If the answer is yes, provide acres of installation at each location, and answer questions 2-4 for each Air Quality Management District location.

2. Has EPA designated the air quality control area in which your installation is located as a maintenance or non-attainment area for any of the six criteria air pollutants (ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter (PM 10), sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, lead)? YES/NO
   a. If the base is in a maintenance area, identify the regulated pollutant(s).
   b. If the base is in a non-attainment area, identify the pollutant(s) and the degree of severity (marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme).

3. Are there any critical air quality regions (i.e., non-attainment areas, national parks, etc.) within 100 kilometers of the base? YES/NO

4. Has the local Air Quality Board (or similar organization) restricted or delayed any on- or off-installation activities due to air quality considerations? Examples to consider include restrictions to construction permits, restrictions to operating hours for industrial facilities, implementation of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) procedures during rush hour, etc. YES/NO
   a. If activities have been restricted, describe the nature, extent and duration of the restriction.
   b. Has the installation been required to implement emissions reduction through special actions, such as carpooling or emissions credit transfer? YES/NO
   c. If special actions have been implemented, specify the nature of the actions.

~~5. Are there any critical air quality regions (i.e. non-attainment areas, national parks, etc.) within 100 kilometers of the installation? YES/NO~~

Future Requirements (cont.)

B. Encroachment

1. Are there any known plans for a commercial airline to hub at an airport within 100 nmi. of your installation? If so, describe.

2. Have there been any ATC delays (15 minutes or greater) between initial takeoff request and actual takeoff during the past three years as a result of civilian traffic? If so, please complete the following table.

Fiscal Year	Average Delay (minutes)	Number of Delays	% of Total Flight Operations Affected
1991			
1992			
1993			

3. How many times during each of the past three years have any of your low level training routes been modified to accommodate construction and/or noise complaints?

Fiscal Year	Number of changes
1991	
1992	
1993	

Future Requirements (cont.)

B. Encroachment (cont)

4. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordnances?

a. Attach a copy of any applicable sections of the installation AICUZ plan and note any recent modifications.

b. Provide a description of local zoning ordinances and their impact on future encroachment, restricted flight hours and details of any litigation history.

5. Do current estimates of population growth and development or environmental constraints pose problems for existing or planned mission?

6. Provide a copy of the current and proposed land development plans for the area surrounding the installation (i.e., the local government's comprehensive land-use plan).

7. Air Space Encroachment.

a. Do you receive noise complaints from off-installation residents? YES/NO.

b. How many per month (average)? Include noise complaints from local and transient aircraft within the airfield traffic pattern and departure and arrival corridors.

c. Has the installation implemented noise abatement procedures? YES/NO.

d. Describe your procedures. Include noise abatement procedures for maintenance, flight operations, arrivals, departures, and command-directed.

Future Requirements (cont.)

b. Encroachment (cont)

8. Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) and Terminal Area Procedures. Answer as well as possible if civilian control or FAR PART 150 Study applies. Answer the following questions regarding current community and other land encroachment near or at the installation by filling in the attached tables following the instructions below.

a. Instructions:

(1) Provide the percent off base current incompatible land use within the Clear Zone (CZ), Accident Potential Zone I (APZ I), Accident Potential Zone II (APZ II), and each noise contour interval (i.e. 60-65 Ldn if available, 65-75 Ldn, 75-80 Ldn if available, and greater than 80 Ldn if available) in the attached tabular format, along with the indicated support information. Incompatibility is governed by DODI 4165.57 and is detailed in the 1980 report of the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise.

(2) Obtain current land use data by overlaying noise contours and CZ/APZ from the most recent publicly released AICUZ, Environmental Assessment which has Finding of No Significant Impact, Environmental Impact Statement which has a Record of Decision, or other officially released noise contour analysis onto current land use maps obtained from local governments. Include the source and date of data. If no current land use maps are available, bases may use recent aerial photography of the off-base areas to determine compatibility percentages. Aerial photos may be available from local governments, USDA offices or planning agencies. Another alternative is to obtain a USGS or map of the environs, and determine land uses through a windshield survey. Analysis of tax/parcel or similar maps may also be conducted.

(3) Then determine the percent incompatible land use. This work is now typically done with computer digitizing programs and equipment. However, the work can be done manually, with the help of the drafting section, through the use of a template or other means. Visit local government planning offices for assistance with off-base land use.

(4) For consistency, use generalized land use areas in determining incompatible land uses (i.e. for residential land uses, include residences, lawns, sidewalks, driveways, local streets, etc., NOT JUST THE RESIDENCES). Generalized land use is the traditional nationwide planning convention and is the standard used in the typical land use maps provided by local governments. For each farm house or rural residence in Accident Potential Zone (APZ) I, add 1/2 acre of incompatible land use.

(5) What is the percent current off-base incompatible land use:
- (a) Within the Clear Zone (CZ) at each end of each active runway?
- (b) Within Accident Potential Zone (APZ) I at each end of each active runway?
- (c) Within APZ II at each end of each active runway?
- (d) Between the 60 Ldn and 65 Ldn noise contours (if available)?
- (e) Between the 65 Ldn and 75 Ldn noise contours?
- (f) Between the 75 Ldn and 80 Ldn noise contours (if available)?
- (g) Within the 80 Ldn noise contour and above (if available)?

Future Requirements (cont.)

B. Encroachment (cont)

9. Current land use status for accident zones: reference questions 8.a.(5)(a) through 8.a.(5)(c). Describe current off-base encroachment/incompatible land use by completing the information in the following table for clear zones and accident potential zones.

Zones	Rnwy No.	Est Pop	Acres	% Incomp L-U
CZ				
APZ I				
APZ II				

NOTE: Develop a table like the above for each runway end (for example, one table for runway 19 and one table for runway 01) and identify if primary or secondary runway.

10. Current land use status for noise zones: reference questions 8.a.(5)(d) through 8.a.(5)(g). Describe current off-base encroachment/incompatible land use by filling in the information in the following table for noise zones/contour intervals.

LDN ~~DNL~~	Est Pop	Acres	% Incomp L-U
60-65*			
65-75			
75-80*			
80+*			

*** If available**

'uture Requirements (cont.)

B. Encroachment (cont)

11. Future local/regional community encroachment. Answer the following questions regarding future community and other land encroachment near or at the installation.

a. Provide a rough estimate of how previous BRAC or operational realignments will impact your AICUZ footprint (i.e., what types and quantities of aircraft and operations tempo increases are expected from incoming units, and what is their predicted effect on your footprints)?

b. How are local land use plans expected to impact the AICUZ footprints?

c. If the latest publicly released AICUZ is outdated (does not reflect current flying operations), provide milestones for completion of an updated AICUZ.

d. Describe how local governments (municipalities, counties) have incorporated AICUZ recommendations into land use controls (zoning, etc.) by indicating which local governments, if any, have incorporated any of the following into their land use controls. Be sure to specify which types of controls: zoning, building codes, subdivision regulations, etc. Indicate if any new local land use control efforts are to be implemented, when implemented, what jurisdiction, and what type of controls, as well as how ıcroachment will be limited.

(1) AICUZ recommended height restrictions.
(2) AICUZ recommended development limits for Accident Potential Zone (APZ) I.
(3) AICUZ recommended development limits for APZ II
(4) AICUZ recommended development limits between the 60 Ldn and 65 Ldn noise contours (if available).
(5) AICUZ recommended development limits between the 65 Ldn and 75 Ldn noise contours.
(6) AICUZ recommended development limits between the 75 Ldn and 80 Ldn noise contours (if available).
(7) AICUZ recommended development limits above the 80 Ldn noise contour (if available).
(8) Are real estate disclosure statements required by local communities?

Future Requirements (cont.)

'. Encroachment (cont)

11. Future local/regional community encroachment (cont.)

e. Indicate if significant development (i.e. a residential subdivision, shopping mall or center, industrial park, etc.) exists or is anticipated or has been announced or started. If so, indicate what type of land use (residential, commercial, industrial, etc.), the type and size of the development (for residential subdivision: number of housing units, number of acres, population; for shopping mall/center: number of stores, total number of acres), when completed or when completion expected. Indicate any long range (20 years) trends for new growth.

f. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? YES/NO.

(1) If not, indicate the runway approach and number of acres to be acquired, as well as timetable and expected acquisition costs.

g. Are on-base facilities and proposed facility development sited in accordance with AICUZ commendations? Refer to the Base Comprehensive or Master Plan. For each incompatible facility existing or proposed), indicate facility type (dormitory, etc.), approximate number of occupants, why the acility is incompatible, the reason this incompatibility is necessary, and the anticipated completion date if projected or under construction.

Future Requirements (cont.)

C. Ability for Expansion

1. Does the operational infrastructure (e.g., parking apron, fuel and munitions storage, warehouse space, hangar space) provide capabilities for future expansion or change in mission?

2. What is the availability of off-installation acreage for possible future installation development?

3. Provide the following information for installation infrastructure related facilities and functions. If these or other installation infrastructure attributes may be a determining factor for installation loading and expansion, provide additional comments and capacity measures as appropriate.

Type of Facility or Capability	On Installation Capacity	Off Installation Long Term Contract	Normal Steady State Load	Peak Demand
Electricity (KWH)				
Water (GPD)				
Sewage (GPD)				
Natural Gas (CFH)				
Short Term Parking				
High Temp. Water/ Steam Generation/ Distribution				

4. Are there any characteristics regarding your utility systems that should be considered?

uture Requirements (cont.)

C. Ability for Expansion (cont.)

5. Identify in the table below the real estate which has the potential to facilitate future development and for which you are the plant account holder. Complete a separate table for each individual site, i.e., main installation, outlying airfields, special off-site areas, off installation housing, etc. Unit of measure is acres.

Site Location: _____

Land Use	Total Acres	Developed[4]	Available for Development	
			Restricted[5]	Unrestricted
Operational				
Training				
Research & Development				
Supply and Storage				
Admin				
Housing				
Recreational				

6. Identify the features of this installation that make it a strong candidate for basing/training other types of aircraft/aircrews and other operational units in the future

[4] Developed land is that which currently has buildings, roads and utilities that prevent it from being further developed without lemolition of existing infrastructure.

This includes areas that are restricted for future development due to environmental constraints such as wet lands, landfills, archaeological sites, etc., and other restrictions such as ESQD arcs, HERO, HERP, HERF, AICUZ, ranges or cultural resources. Identify the reason for the restriction when providing the acreage in the above table.

Manpower Implications

A. Quality of Life

1. Military Housing

a. Family Housing:

(1) Do you have mandatory assignment to on-installation housing? (circle) yes no

(2) For military family housing in your locale provide the following information:

Type of Quarters	Number of Bedrooms	Total number of units	Number Adequate/ Permanent	Number Substandard/ Semi-Permanent	Number Inadequate/ Temporary
Officer	4+				
Officer	3				
Officer	1 or 2				
Enlisted	4+				
Enlisted	3				
Enlisted	1 or 2				
Mobile Homes					
Mobile Home lots					

(3) An inadequate/temporary facility cannot be made adequate/permanent for its present use through "economically justifiable means." For all the categories above where inadequate/temporary facilities are identified provide the following information:

a. Facility Type/Code:
b. What makes it inadequate/temporary?
c. What use is being made of the facility?
d. What is the cost to upgrade the facility to substandard/semi-permanent?
e. What other use could be made of the facility and at what cost?
f. Current improvement plans and programmed funding:
g. Has this facility condition resulted in "C3" or "C4" designation on your BASEREP?

Manpower Implications (cont.)

A. Quality of Life (cont.)

(4) Complete the following table for the military housing waiting list.

Pay Grade	Number of Bedrooms	Number on List[6]	Average Wait
O-6/7/8/9	1		
	2		
	3		
	4+		
O-4/5	1		
	2		
	3		
	4+		
O-1/2/3/CWO	1		
	2		
	3		
	4+		
E7-E9	1		
	2		
	3		
	4+		
E1-E6	1		
	2		
	3		
	4+		

[6]As of 31 March 1994.

Manpower Implications (cont.)

A. Quality of Life (cont.)

(5) What percent of your family housing units have all the amenities required by "The Facility Planning & Design Guide" (Military Handbook 1190 & Military Handbook 1035-Family Housing)?

(6) Provide the utilization rate for family housing for FY 1993.

Type of Quarters	Utilization Rate
Adequate/Permanent	
Substandard/Semi-Permanent	
Inadequate/Temporary	

(7) As of 31 March 1994, have you experienced much of a change since FY 1993? If so, why? If occupancy is under 98% (or vacancy over 2%), is there a reason?

(b) BEQ:

(1) Provide the utilization rate for BEQs for FY 1993.

Type of Quarters	Utilization Rate
Adequate/Permanent	
Substandard/Semi-Permanent	
Inadequate/Temporary	

(2) As of 31 March 1994, have you experienced much of a change since FY 1993? If so, why? If occupancy is under 95% (or vacancy over 5%), is there a reason?

Manpower Implications (cont.)

A. Quality of Life (cont.)

(c) BOQ:

(1) Provide the utilization rate for BOQs for FY 1993.

Type of Quarters	Utilization Rate
Adequate/Permanent	
Substandard/Semi-Permanent	
Inadequate/Temporary	

(2) As of 31 March 1994, have you experienced much of a change since FY 1993? If so, why? If occupancy is under 95% (or vacancy over 5%), is there a reason?

(d) Have any family housing/BOQ/BEQ units been vacated for purposes of renovation or are new units under construction? State type unit, total number of units, size, capacity and availability date.

Units Under Renovation or Construction				
Type Unit (Family Housing/BOQ/ BEQ)	Total Number	Size (Appropriate Measure)	Capacity (Appropriate Measure)	Availability Date

(e) Provide the following information on any family housing/BOQ/BEQ units planned for construction (MILCON) for FY94 - 97. State type unit, total number of units, size, capacity, and availability date.

Manpower Implications (cont.)

A. Quality of Life (cont.)

2. For on-installation MWR facilities[7] available, complete the following table for each separate location. For off-installation government owned or leased recreation facilities indicate distance from installation. If there are any facilities not listed, include them at the bottom of the table.

LOCATION _____ **DISTANCE** _____

Facility	Unit of Measure	Total	Profitable (Y,N,N/A)
Auto Hobby	Indoor Bays		
	Outdoor Bays		
Arts/Crafts	SF		
Wood Hobby	SF		
Bowling	Lanes		
Enlisted Club	SF		
Officer's Club	SF		
Library	SF		
Library	Books		
Theater	Seats		
ITT	SF		
Museum/Memorial	SF		
Pool (indoor)	Lanes		
Pool (outdoor)	Lanes		
Beach	LF		
Lake	Each		
Tennis CT	Each		

[7]Spaces designed for a particular use. A single building might contain several facilities, each of which should be listed separately.

Manpower Implications (cont.)

A. Quality of Life (cont.)

Facility	Unit of Measure	Total	Profitable (Y,N,N/A)
Volleyball CT (outdoor)	Each		
Basketball CT (outdoor)	Each		
Racquetball CT (indoor/outdoor)	Each		
Squash CT	Each		
Golf Course	Holes		
Driving Range	Tee Boxes		
Gymnasium	SF		
Fitness Center	SF		
Marina	Berths		
Stables	Stalls		
Rod and Gun Club/Range	Each		
Softball Fld	Each		
Football Fld	Each		
Soccer Fld	Each		
Youth Center	SF		

3. Is your library part of a regional interlibrary loan program?

Manpower Implications (cont.)

A. Quality of Life (cont.)

4. Installation Family Support Facilities and Programs

a. Complete the following table on the availability of child care in a child care center on your installation.

Age Category	Capacity (Children)	SF			# of PN on Wait List	Avg Wait (Days)
		Adequate/ Permanent	Substandard/ Semi-Permanent	Inadequate/ Temporary		
0-6 Mos						
6-18 Mos						
18Mos-5yrs						

b. An inadequate/temporary facility cannot be made adequate/permanent for its present use through "economically justifiable means." For all the categories above where inadequate/temporary facilities are identified provide the following information:

- Facility Type/Code:
- What makes it inadequate/temporary?
- What use is being made of the facility?
- What is the cost to upgrade the facility to substandard/semi-permanent?
- What other use could be made of the facility and at what cost?
- Current improvement plans and programmed funding:
- Has this facility condition resulted in "C3" or "C4" designation on your BASEREP?

c. If you have a waiting list, describe what programs or facilities other than those sponsored by your command are available to accommodate those on the list.

d. Are there other military child care facilities within 30 minutes of the installation? State owner and capacity (i.e., 60 children, 0-5 yrs).

Manpower Implications (cont.)

A. Quality of Life (cont.)

f. Complete the following table for services available on your installation. If you have any services not listed, include them at the bottom.

Service	Unit of Measure	Qty
Exchange	SF	
Gas Station	SF	
Auto Repair	SF	
Auto Parts Store	SF	
Commissary	SF	
Mini-Mart	SF	
Package Store	SF	
Fast Food Restaurants	Each	
Bank/Credit Union	Each	
Family Service Center	SF	
Laundromat	SF	
Dry Cleaners	Each	
Alcohol Rehabilitation Center	PN	
Chapel	PN	
FSC Classroom/Auditorium	PN	

5. Proximity of closest major metropolitan areas (provide at least three):

City	Distance (Miles)

Ianpower Implications (cont.)

A. Quality of Life (cont.)

6. Standard Rate VHA Data for Cost of Living:

Paygrade	With Dependents	Without Dependents
E1		
E2		
E3		
E4		
E5		
E6		
E7		
E8		
E9		
W1		
W2		
W3		
W4		
O1E		
O2E		
O3E		
O1		
O2		
O3		
O4		
O5		
O6		
O7		

Attachment 4

DEFINITIONS

SORTIE:

A "sortie" is an operational flight by one aircraft. A sortie begins when the aircraft begins to move forward on takeoff or takes off vertically from rest at any point of support. It ends after airborne flight when the aircraft returns to the surface and:

a. The engines are stopped, or
b. The aircraft is on the surface for 5 minutes (N/A for helicopters), whichever occurs first between a and b, or
c. A change is made in the crew.

AIRPORT OPERATIONS COUNT:

"Airport Operations Count" is the number of arrivals and departures from an airport with a control tower. Specifically, one airport operation count is taken for each landing and takeoff, while two airport operations counts are taken for low approach below traffic pattern altitude, stop and go, or touch and go operation.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-4000

29 SEP 1994

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ARMY BASING STUDY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BASE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM
HQ USAF RTR

SUBJECT: Request for Certified Data

Pursuant to the procedures outlined in the Internal Control Plan for Managing the Identification of DoD Cross-Service Opportunities as part of the DoD 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Process, dated 13 April 1994, request that the addressees utilize their BRAC-95 internal control mechanisms to collect the information contained in the attachment. These questions have been identified by the Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) Joint Cross-Service Working Group as needing resolution in order to allow the group to continue its analysis. For the most part, advance answers have already been informally provided by the cognizant authority.

Please ensure that the data and information provided to the UPT Joint Cross-Service Group is certified as accurate and complete in accordance with your respective BRAC-95 Internal Control Plans.

Please provide your response no later than 15 October 1994. My staff point of contact is Mr. Dan Gardner, Pentagon Rm 3B930, phone 695-6857.

Louis C. Finch
Chairman
Undergraduate Pilot Training Joint Cross-Service Group

Attachment:
As Stated

QUESTIONS TO BE REVALIDATED

1. NAS WHITING. Military Value Data Call. Weather, Question A.1. - Percent of canceled/rescheduled helo information?

2. FORT RUCKER. Military Value Data Call. Weather Question 2. - Official planning factor?

3. FORT RUCKER/NAS WHITING. Military Value Data Call. Airspace and Flight Training Areas, Question 7. Verify FORT RUCKER answer "no" to "specific terrain features." NAS WHITING failed to list VFR training routes within 30NM.

4. CNATRA. Capacity Data Call. Airfields, Question 4. How many simultaneous pattern operations at the OLFs?

5. FORT RUCKER. Military Value Data Call. Airfields, Question 5. Verify that all airfield facilities are "adequate/permanent."

6. NAS PENSACOLA. Same Question above. Provide total square yards for fixed wing and rotary wing taxiways, runways, and parking aprons. How much is adequate?

7. NAS WHITING. Military Value Data Call. Ground Training Facilities, Question 1. Provide answer to the question.

8. NAS WHITING. Military Value Data Call. Airfields, Question 3. How many hangars are for South Field?

9. FORT RUCKER. Military Value Data Call. Encroachment, Question 9. Does FORT RUCKER have any clear zone, APZ I, or APZ II off base?

10. FOR ALL TRAINING AIR STATIONS. Capacity Data Call. Housing and Messing. Provide number of BOQ/BEQ rooms that are adequate/permanent.

11. FORT RUCKER. Military Value Data Call. Quality of Life, Installation Family Support Facilities and Programs, Question 4a. Verify waiting list for child care.

12. COLUMBUS AFB. Military Value Data Call. Managed Training Areas. Report data for its one outlying field.

13. RANDOLPH AFB. Military Value Data Call. Airspace and Flight Training Areas. Remeasure distance to range. Randolph is reporting 76NM to air to ground range.

14. SHEPPARD AFB. Military Value Data Call. Airfields. Report data for 3rd parallel runway which is funded, contracted, and construction in progress. Also does SHEPPARD AFB have a physiology trainer?

15. LAUGHLIN AFB. Military Value Data Call,. Verify condition of runways.

16. NAS MERIDIAN. Military Value Data Call. Verify that all ground training and airfield facilities are "adequate." Answer all the Military Value Data Call Encroachment Questions.

17. RANDOLPH AFB. Military Value Data Call. Is existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? YES or NO?

18. NAS CORPUS CHRISTI. Military Value Data Call. Encroachment - Question 4. Answer the portion that deals with percent incompatible land use for clear zones, APZ I and APZ II.

19. NAS MERIDIAN. Military Value Data Call. Ground Training Facilities - Question 1. Answer the Question.

20. FORT RUCKER. Capacity Data Call. Airfields. Weather. Question 7. Provide cross-wind data

21. AETC. Does Air Force train in ATCAA Air space?

22. CNATRA. Capacity Data Call. Airfields. Question 16. Require maximum sorties per year with planned aircraft mix.

23. NAS KINGSVILLE. Capacity Data Call. Facilities. Airfields. Question 10. "homefield and all OLF's." (traffic count)

24. RANDOLPH AFB. Capacity Data Call. Features and Capabilities. BOQ Housing and Messing. Question 1. "How many students in the BOQ today?"

25. AETC. Capacity Data Call. Mission requirements. UFT Throughput/Graduates. Question A1. 1994-2001 Primary, Airlift/Tanker and Fighter/Bomber?

26. NAS WHITING. Capacity Data Call. Mission Requirements. Flight Training Ground School. Question 1. List classroom hours.

27. AETC. Capacity Data Call. Mission Requirements. Flight Training Ground School. Question 1. List hours required for classroom and simulators for each different undergraduate flight training syllabus.

28. FT RUCKER AATC. Capacity Data Call. Facilities. Ground Training - Question 1. Maximum Capacity for simulators?

29. RANDOLPH AFB. Capacity Data Call. Facilities Ground Training. Question 1. Maximum capacity for simulators?

30. NAS WHITING FIELD. Military Value Data Call. Facilities, Airfields. Question 1b Provide distance from main airfield for Choctaw OLF?

31. NAS WHITING FIELD. Capacity Data Call. Facilities, Airfields. Question 9. Answer following additional question: Based on JPATS contender with maximum runway requirement - verify split runway operations can still be performed.

32. AETC/CNATRA. Capacity Data Call. Mission Requirements, Training Airframes. Question 2. Please fill out attached chart for training airframes listed.

TRAINING AIRFRAME TABLE

AIRCRAFT	UTILIZATION RATE (SORTIES/MONTH)	PAA FOR THE COMMAND	TOTAL AIRCRAFT IN THE COMMAND INVENTORY
T-34 (FY 94)			
T-34 (FY 01)			
T-37 (FY 94)			
T-37 (FY 01)			
JPATS (TOTAL BUY) (USAF)			
JPATS (TOTAL BUY) (USN)			
T-1 (FY 94)			
T-1 (FY 01)			
T-38 (FY 94)			
T-38 (FY 01)			
AT-38 (FY 94)			
AT-38 (FY 01)			
T-3 (FY 94)			
T-3 (FY 01)			
T-2 (FY 94)			
T-2 (FY 01)			
TA-4 (FY 94)			
TA-4 (FY 01)			
T-44 (FY 94)			
T-44 (FY 01)			
T-45 (FY 94)			
T-45 (FY 01) (TOTAL BUY)			
T-43 (FY 94)			
T-43 (FY 01)			

SECTION THREE (B)

DATA CALL RESPONSES
(BOOKS 2 -)

SECTION THREE (C)

FUNCTIONAL VALUES

3

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-4000

14 OCT 1994

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ARMY BASING STUDY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BASE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM
HQ USAF RTR

SUBJECT: JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP ON UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING (UPT) SITE FUNCTIONAL VALUES

The corrected functional values developed by the Joint Cross-Service Group on UPT for each site are attached. As indicated in my memorandum of 11 October, 1994, additional corrected and certified data was received, reviewed, and determined to be of significance in the development of functional values. Further updates are not anticipated.

My staff point of contact is Mr. Dan Gardner, Pentagon Rm 1C757, at 695-6857.

D E Gardner

Louis C. Finch for
Chairman
Undergraduate Pilot Training Joint Cross-Service Group

Attachment:
As Stated

UPT FLTSCRN

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	6.8-6.9	RUCKER
2	6.7-6.8	LAU
3	6.6-6.7	KING
4	6.5-6.6	WHITING
4	6.5-6.6	COL
6	6.5-6.6	VANCE
7	6.4-6.5	MERIDIAN
8	6.3-6.4	CORPUS
9	6.1-6.2	SHEPPARD
9	6.1-6.2	REESE
11	6.0-6.1	P-COLA
12	5.6-5.7	RANDOLPH
13	5.2-5.4	HONDO
14	3.7-3.9	USAFA

UPT PRIMARY

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	7.0	KING
1	7.0	LAU
3	6.8	COL
3	6.8	MERIDIAN
3	6.8	VANCE
6	6.7	RANDOLPH
6	6.7	CORPUS
8	6.6	WHITING
9	6.4	P-COLA
10	6.3	SHEPPARD
11	6.0	REESE

DUPT LFTTNKER

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	7.8	P-COLA
2	7.7	KING
3	6.7	VANCE
4	6.6	MERIDIAN
5	6.5	RANDOLPH
5	6.5	SHEPPARD
5	6.5	CORPUS
8	6.3	COL
9	5.9	REESE
10	5.8	LAU

UPT MARIR2

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	7.6	KING
2	7.5	CORPUS
2	7.5	P-COLA
4	7.4	WHITING
5	6.8	VANCE
6	6.7	COL
7	6.6	MERIDIAN
8	6.5	SHEPPARD
8	6.5	LAU
10	6.4	RANDOLPH
11	5.9	REESE

UPT BOMBFTTR

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	7.8	P-COLA
2	7.3	KING
3	6.8	MERIDIAN
3	6.8	RANDOLPH
5	6.4	COL
6	6.3	SHEPPARD
7	5.6	REESE
8	5.5	LAU
8	5.5	VANCE

UPT STRKADV

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	7.6	P-COLA
2	7.3	KINGSVILLE
3	6.3	MERIDIAN
4	6.2	CORPUS
4	6.2	SHEPPARD
6	6.0	RANDOLPH
6	6.0	COLUMBUS
8	5.7	REESE
9	5.4	LAUGHLIN
10	5.3	VANCE

UPT PANELNAV

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	7.7	SHEPPARD
2	7.6	P-COLA
2	7.6	COL
4	7.5	VANCE
5	7.2	KING
5	7.2	REESE
7	7.0	MERIDIAN
8	6.9	RANDOLPH
9	6.8	LAU
10	5.9	CORPUS

UPT PRINFO

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	7.1	LAU
1	7.1	RANDOLPH
3	7.0	KING
4	6.9	COL
5	6.8	MERIDIAN
5	6.8	VANCE
7	6.7	CORPUS
8	6.4	P-COLA
8	6.4	WHITING
10	6.2	REESE
10	6.2	SHEPPARD

UPT WSOSTRK

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	7.6	P-COLA
2	7.4	KING
3	7.0	WHITING
4	6.9	CORPUS
5	6.7	RUCKER
6	6.6	COL
7	6.5	MERIDIAN
8	6.1	RANDOLPH

DUPT UPTHELO

RANK	SCORE	ALTERNATIVE
1	8.9	RUCKER
2	7.2	WHITING
3	6.5	P-COLA

	COL	LAU	RAN	REE	VAN
PRI	6.8	7.0	6.7	6.0	6.8
ALFT/TKR	6.3	5.8	6.5	5.9	6.7
BOMB/FTR	6.4	5.5	6.8	5.6	5.5
	6.50	6.10	6.67	5.83	6.3
AF average of JCSG FV scores	6.74	6.50	6.53	6.22	6.67

UPT FLTSCRN

	WEIGHT		RUCKER	WHITING	CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RANDOLPH	SHEPPARD
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	10		0.0	9.0+	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
MOA/AA SPEC AIRSPC	40		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		50	8.0	10.0	9.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3
3000/5 >=80%?	10		N-	N-	N-	N-	N-	N-	N-	Y+
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	40		78.80%	71.40%-	74.00%-	68.00%-	68.00%-	72.60%-	73.40%-	85.10%++
1500/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	20		86.50%	84.00%	84.10%	83.00%-	83.40%-	85.70%	83.60%-	91.90%+
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	40		98.00%+	99.00%++	94.00%--	98.00%+	96.00%	95.00%-	98.40%+	97.50%+
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		7.25%+	19.40%	22.20%	9.00%+	18.10%	10.00%+	15.00%	22.80%
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	10		Y+	N-	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-
SORTIE PLAN FCTR<=5%	10		16.70%	22.00%	18.00%	22.00%	17.80%	11.00%+	19.00%	22.80%
WEATHER ---		150	5.6	4.0	3.5	4.1	4.0	4.6	4.7	6.0
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	90		5431.0--	28511.0--	57169.0++	28445.0--	42588.0	62724.0++	85447.0++	29144.0--
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	120		1.5++	27.7++	39.6	35.3+	39.0	35.7+	65.2--	32.3++
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	20		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES--
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		0.0+	20.0--	2.0+	0.0+	2.0+	5.0	3.0+	26.0--
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		270	6.9	5.4	6.2	5.4	5.6	6.6	5.5	4.2
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	30		0.0-	9.0++	3.0+	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	20		101--	41	8+	20+	19+	26	20+	33
PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		A--	K++	H+	E	E	K++	B--	F++
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	30		100.00%+	56.00%--	100.00%+	100.00%+	100.00%+	100.00%+	66.00%-	100.00%+
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	25		100.00%+	95.00%+	36.00%--	53.00%-	100.00%+	95.00%+	27.00%--	100.00%+
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	27		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%--	100.00%
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	27		100.00%+	98.00%+	82.00%	87.00%	93.00%+	74.00%	40.00%--	77.00%
AIRFIELDS ---		229	5.6	8.6	7.6	7.2	7.8	7.9	4.9	8.3
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		323435.0++	34137.0-	48549.0	184423.0++	20385.0-	41826.0-	135526.0+	76822.0
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	100.00%	92.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%	100.00%
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		100037.0++	46413.0	22239.0-	40091.0	50224.0	47000.0	66423.0+	7737.0--
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		238036.0++	93438.0	2000.0-	113783.0+	28380.0	6162.0	36060.0	48349.0
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		79.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	64.00%	78.00%	99.00%
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	9.9	4.8	3.5	6.1	4.4	4.2	5.7	3.7
LVL MAINT OPS	30		I	D+	D+	I	I	I	I	I
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		245483.0	194391.0	1854292.0++	289040.0	218457.0	301674.0	238496.0	219824.0
COND OF HANGARS	5		100.00%	86.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	100.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	5.4	5.8	8.6	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.4
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	10		N-	Y+	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	N-	N-
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		9.70%	3.00%	25.00%-	28.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	22.00%-	4.00%
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		0.00%	2.00%	19.00%	50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	17.80%	2.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N	Y+	Y+	N	Y+	Y+	N	N
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N-	N-	N-	Y	Y	N-	Y	N-
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	5.3	8.7	6.8	4.0	10.0	9.0	5.1	5.7
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	10		732.0	205.0	162.0	604.0	99.0	130.0	558.0	659.0
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		87.40%	100.00%	100.00%	96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	10		100.00%	80.00%	90.00%	100.00%	80.00%	80.00%	87.00%	80.00%
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		1516.0+	330.0	439.0	687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	1287.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		98.00%	80.00%	100.00%	78.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		0.0	25.0	197.0-	69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0	42.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		0.0	145.0	265.0-	113.0	10.0	180.0	186.0	74.0
SERVICES ---		50	7.7-9.7	5.8-7.8	4.9-6.9	6.3-8.3	6.5-8.5	5.6-7.6	6.1-8.1	6.9-8.9
SCORE		999	6.8-6.9	6.5-6.6	6.3-6.4	6.0-6.1	6.4-6.5	6.6-6.7	5.6-5.7	6.1-6.2
RANK			1	4	8	11	7	3	12	9

Page 1, Tue Oct 18 08:00:50 1994,

UPT FLTSCRN

	WEIGHT		VANCE	REESE	LAU	COL	HONDO	USAFA	RATING SCALE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	10		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0-6, 6 HI
MOA/AA SPEC AIRSPC	40		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		50	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.0	8.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
3000/5 >=80%?	10		Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	40		83.90%++	86.70%++	81.80%+	78.80%	73.40%-	89.50%++	80-95%, 80 LO
1500/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	20		89.40%	91.50%+	90.90%+	89.10%	87.50%	93.50%+	80-95%, 95=3
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	40		97.80%+	93.20%--	99.30%++	99.20%++	98.40%+	88.00%--	%MIN-M, MAX HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		23.30%	19.80%	18.00%	22.90%	15.00%	23.00%	5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	10		N-	N-	Y+	N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
SORTIE PLAN FCTR<=5%	10		23.00%	27.00%	19.00%	26.00%	19.00%	28.30%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		150	5.7	5.2	6.7	4.7	4.9	4.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	90		36084.0-	31116.0--	53868.0++	45092.0+	76958.0++	3880.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	120		36.1+	42.6--	31.5++	39.5	48.2--	57.8--	MIN-M, MIN HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CNERC HUB W/IN 100MI	20		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES--	Y(0)/N(10)
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		20.0--	12.0-	4.0	2.0+	3.0+	3.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		270	5.1	4.7	6.6	5.7	6.3	2.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	30		1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0-	1.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	20		26	17+	22+	43	101--	27	MIN-100, MIN-HI
PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		F++	C++	C++	C++	A--	A--	PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	30		100.00%+	85.00%	85.00%	100.00%+	72.00%-	3.00%--	%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	25		88.00%+	29.00%--	42.00%-	100.00%+	67.00%	61.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	27		97.00%	92.00%	59.00%--	100.00%	100.00%	76.00%-	%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	27		56.00%-	87.00%	60.00%-	76.00%	100.00%+	74.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		229	8.0	7.1	6.5	7.9	4.9	4.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		26652.0-	59469.0	68320.0	84459.0	9556.0-	11452.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		86.00%	100.00%	91.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		75207.0++	60863.0+	70689.0+	63354.0+	0.0--	0.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%--	0.00%--	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		68639.0	51572.0	19365.0	17029.0	0.0-	8582.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		100.00%	99.00%	54.00%	36.00%	0.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	5.3	5.2	5.1	5.0	1.1	1.7	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		I	D+	I	D+	O--	O--	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		156858.0	147685.0	151346.0	151102.0	22494.0	80251.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		64.00%	54.00%	48.00%	57.00%	100.00%	92.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	4.9	5.4	4.7	5.4	3.0	3.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N--	Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	10		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		18.00%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N	N	Y+	N	N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	8.6	8.9	10.0	8.9	7.0	7.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	10		247.0	152.0	222.0	264.0	?	?	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	?-	?-	%0-100, 100 HI
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	10		70.00%	93.00%	87.00%	87.00%	0.00%-	77.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		230.0	400.0	654.0	812.0	0.0	1229.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		1.0	37.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	65.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		30.0	216.0	150.0	14.0	0.0	23.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		50	6.3-8.3	6.0-8.0	6.5-8.5	7.1-9.1	2.0-6.0	4.9-8.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
	===								
SCORE	999		6.5-6.6	6.1-6.2	6.7-6.8	6.5-6.6	5.2-5.4	3.7-3.9	
RANK			6	9	2	4	13	14	

Page 2, Tue Oct 18 08:01:00 1994,

UPT PRIMARY

	WEIGHT		WHITING	CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RANDOLPH	SHEPPARD	VANCE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	25		1.5	3.0++	0.5-	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
NOA SPEC AIRSPC	15		Y	N--	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	5		N-	N-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	5		Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y+	N-	N-	Y+
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		50	5.3	3.5	4.4	4.9	5.9	4.9	4.9	5.9
1500/3 > 80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	30		84.00%-	84.10%-	83.00%--	83.40%--	85.70%-	83.60%--	91.90%++	89.40%+
1000/3 > 80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	20		87.10%-	88.00%-	86.00%-	86.20%-	90.00%	90.00%	94.00%+	91.80%+
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	30		99.00%++	94.00%--	98.00%+	99.60%++	95.00%--	98.40%+	97.50%	97.80%+
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	10		0.10%	1.00%-	0.00%+	0.00%+	0.10%	0.10%	0.30%	0.20%
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		19.40%	22.20%	9.00%+	18.10%	10.00%+	15.00%	22.80%	23.30%
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	10		N-	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-
SORTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	10		22.00%	18.00%	22.00%	17.80%	11.00%+	19.00%	22.80%	22.30%
WEATHER ---		140	5.3	4.1	5.3	6.3	6.1	6.3	6.5	6.0
AMT NOA/AA ARSPCE	120		28511.0--	57169.0++	28445.0--	42588.0-	62724.0++	85447.0++	29144.0--	36084.0--
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		27.7+	39.6	35.3	39.0	37.5	65.2--	32.3+	36.1
# MTR'S AVAIL	30		21.0++	9.0-	9.0-	5.0--	9.0-	18.0+	19.0+	32.0++
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES--	NO
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		20.0--	2.0+	0.0++	2.0+	5.0+	3.0+	26.0--	20.0--
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		220	5.2	6.9	5.2	5.8	7.2	8.4	4.4	5.9
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	40		1.5+	3.0++	0.5--	1.0-	1.0-	1.0-	1.0-	1.0-
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	20		0.5+	1.0++	0.5+	1.0++	1.0++	0.0--	0.0--	0.0--
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		18	8	20	19	26	20	33	26
RUNWAY 5000 FT?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		6000-	8000	8002	8000	8000	8353	13100	9200
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		K+	H-	E--	E--	K+	B--	F++	F++
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	20		56.00%--	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.00%-	100.00%	100.00%
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	15		95.00%+	36.00%-	53.00%-	100.00%+	95.00%+	27.00%-	100.00%+	88.00%+
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	17		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%--	100.00%	97.00%
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	17		98.00%+	82.00%	87.00%	93.00%+	74.00%	40.00%-	77.00%	56.00%-
AIRFIELDS ---		239	7.6	8.9	6.9	7.9	8.2	5.2	7.8	7.6
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		34137.0-	48549.0-	184423.0++	20385.0--	41826.0-	135526.0++	76822.0	26652.0--
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	92.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%	100.00%	86.00%
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		46413.0	22239.0--	40091.0-	50224.0	47000.0	66423.0+	7737.0--	75207.0++
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		93438.0+	2000.0-	113783.0++	28380.0-	6162.0-	36060.0	48349.0	68639.0+
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	64.00%	78.00%	99.00%	100.00%
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.1	4.1	8.6	5.2	5.0	7.5	4.7	6.7
LVL MAINT OPS	30		DA++	D	I	I	I	I	I	I
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		194391.0	1854292.0++	289040.0	218457.0	301674.0	238496.0	219824.0	156858.0
COND OF HANGARS	5		86.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	100.00%	64.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	7.2	8.6	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.4	4.9
1 OTHR PRIPILOT FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ OTR PRI PILOT FLD	5		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y+
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	N-
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	7.5
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	10		Y+	Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	N--	N--	Y+
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		3.00%	25.00%-	28.00%--	0.00%+	0.00%+	22.00%-	4.00%	1.00%+
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		2.00%	19.00%	50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%	2.00%	18.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	N-
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N-	N-	Y	Y	N-	Y	N-	Y
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	8.7	6.8	4.0	10.0	9.0	5.1	5.7	8.6
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		205.0-	162.0-	604.0++	99.0-	130.0-	558.0++	659.0++	247.0
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		338.0	408.0	604.0	732.0	209.0	521.0	8074.0+	442.0
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		80.00%	90.00%	100.00%+	80.00%	80.00%	87.00%	80.00%	70.00%-
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		330.0	439.0	687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	1287.0+	230.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		80.00%	100.00%	78.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		25.0	197.0-	69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0	42.0	1.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		145.0	265.0-	113.0	10.0+	180.0	186.0	74.0	30.0
SERVICES ---		80	6.0	5.4	8.1	6.0	5.6	7.7	9.2	6.3
SCORE		999	6.6	6.7	6.4	6.8	7.0	6.7	6.3	6.8
RANK			8	6	9	3	1	6	10	3

UPT PRIMARY

	WEIGHT		REESE	LAU	COL	RATING SCALE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	25		1.0	1.0	1.0	0-6, 6 HI
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	15		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	5		N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		50	4.9	5.9	4.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1500/3 > 80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	30		91.50%++	90.90%++	89.10%+	80-95%, 80 LO
1000/3 > 80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	20		93.60%+	94.30%+	92.00%+	80-95%, 80 LO
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	30		93.20%--	99.30%++	99.20%++	%MIN-M, MAX HI
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	10		1.40%--	0.10%	0.10%	%MIN-M, MIN HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		19.80%	18.00%	22.90%	5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	10		N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
SORTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	10		27.00%	19.00%	26.00%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		140	4.4	7.9	6.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	120		31116.0--	53868.0++	45092.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		42.6	31.5+	39.5	MIN-M, MIN HI
# MTR'S AVAIL	30		9.0-	10.0-	11.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	Y(0)/N(10)
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		12.0-	4.0+	2.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		220	4.8	6.8	6.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	40		1.0-	1.0-	1.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	20		0.0--	0.0--	0.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		17	22	43-	MIN-100, MIN-HI
RUNWAY 5000 FT?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		10500	8858	12000	5-8K RW, 8K HI
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		C+	C+	C+	PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	20		85.00%	85.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	15		29.00%-	42.00%-	100.00%+	%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	17		92.00%	59.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	17		87.00%	60.00%-	76.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		239	6.9	6.5	7.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		59469.0	68320.0	84459.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	91.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		60863.0+	70689.0++	63354.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		51572.0	19365.0-	17029.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		99.00%	54.00%	36.00%-	%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.6	6.4	6.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		D	I	D	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		147685.0	151346.0	151102.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		54.00%	48.00%	57.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	5.4	4.7	5.4	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1 OTHR PRIPILOT FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ OTR PRI PILOT FLD	5		N-	N-	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N-	N-	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	5.0	5.0	5.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	10		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		0.00%+	0.00%+	1.00%+	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	8.9	10.0	8.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		152.0-	222.0-	264.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		462.0	400.0	690.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		93.00%	87.00%	87.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		400.0	654.0	812.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		37.0	6.0	4.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		216.0	150.0	14.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	6.0	6.6	7.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL
	===					
SCORE	999		6.0	7.0	6.8	
RANK			11	1	3	

UPT LFTTNKER

	WEIGHT		CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RANDOLPH	SHEPPARD	VANCE	REESE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	25		0.0--	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	0.0--	1.0+	1.0+
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	15		N--	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WA SPEC AIRSPC	10		Y++	Y++	N	N	N	N	N	N
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	5		N-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	5		Y+	N	N	Y+	N	N	Y+	N
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	2.5	7.1	5.4	6.3	5.4	3.3	6.3	5.4
1500/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	20		84.10%-	83.00%-	83.40%-	85.70%-	83.60%-	91.90%+	89.40%+	91.50%+
1000/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	10		88.00%	86.00%-	86.20%-	90.00%	90.00%	94.00%+	91.80%	93.60%
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	20		94.00%--	98.00%+	96.60%	95.00%-	98.40%+	97.50%	97.80%+	93.20%--
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	5		1.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.30%	0.20%	1.40%-
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		9.00%+	9.00%+	18.10%	10.00%	15.00%	22.80%	23.30%	19.80%
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=5%?	5		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
SORTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	5		9.00%+	10.50%+	17.80%	11.00%	20.00%	22.80%	24.50%	28.00%
WEATHER ---		90	4.7	6.2	5.1	5.7	6.1	7.0	6.6	4.9
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	140		137659.0++	137656.0++	42588.0--	143213.0++	85447.0++	29144.0--	36084.0--	31116.0--
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		22.5++	55.0-	39.0	38.9	65.2--	32.3+	36.1	42.6
# MTR'S AVAIL	30		9.0-	9.0-	5.0-	9.0-	18.0+	19.0+	32.0++	9.0-
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES--	NO	NO
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		2.0+	0.0+	2.0+	5.0+	3.0+	26.0--	20.0--	12.0-
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		240	8.8	8.2	4.5	8.6	6.2	3.4	4.7	3.8
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	20		0.0--	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	20		0.0--	1.0++	1.0++	1.0++	0.0--	1.0++	0.0--	0.0--
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		101.0-	20.0+	19.3+	26.0+	20.0+	89.0-	26.0+	17.0+
LNGST RUNWAY >=6k?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		8000.0-	8002.0-	8000.0-	8000.0-	8353.0	13100.0+	9200.0	10500.0+
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		A--	E+	B-	K++	B-	F++	B-	B-
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	20		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.00%-	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	15		36.00%-	53.00%-	100.00%+	95.00%+	27.00%-	100.00%+	88.00%+	29.00%-
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	17		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%-	100.00%	97.00%	92.00%
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	17		82.00%	87.00%+	100.00%+	74.00%	40.00%-	77.00%	56.00%-	87.00%+
AIRFIELDS ---		219	4.6	8.4	8.4	9.0	5.9	9.4	7.1	6.9
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		48549.0-	184423.0++	20385.0--	41826.0-	135526.0++	76822.0	26652.0--	59469.0-
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		92.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%	100.00%	86.00%	100.00%
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		22239.0--	40091.0-	50224.0	47000.0	66423.0+	7737.0--	75207.0++	60863.0+
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		2000.0-	113783.0++	28380.0	6162.0-	36060.0	48349.0	68639.0+	51572.0
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	64.00%	78.00%	99.00%	100.00%	99.00%
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	4.1	8.6	5.2	5.0	7.5	4.7	6.7	6.6
LVL MAINT OPS	30		DA++	I	I	I	I	I	D	D
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		1854292.0++	289040.0	218457.0	301674.0	238496.0	219824.0	156858.0	147685.0
COND OF HANGARS	5		94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	100.00%	64.00%	54.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	9.9	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.4	5.5	5.4
1 OTHR PRIPILOT FLD	20		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ OTR PRI PILOT FLD	20		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N--
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N-	Y	Y
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		Y+	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		50	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	5.0
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	N--	N--	Y+	Y+
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		25.00%-	28.00%-	0.00%+	0.00%+	22.00%-	4.00%	1.00%+	0.00%+
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		19.00%	50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	17.80%	2.00%	18.00%	4.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	N	Y+	Y+	N	N	N	N
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N-	Y	Y	N-	Y	N-	Y	Y
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	7.4	4.2	10.0	9.2	5.1	5.6	8.8	9.1
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		162.0-	604.0++	99.0-	130.0-	558.0++	659.0++	247.0-	152.0-
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		408.0	604.0	732.0	209.0	521.0	8074.0+	442.0	462.0
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	6		90.00%	100.00%	80.00%	80.00%	87.00%	80.00%	70.00%	93.00%
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	4		439.0	687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	1287.0+	230.0	400.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	20		100.00%	78.00%-	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	6		197.0-	69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0	42.0	1.0	37.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	4		265.0-	113.0	10.0	180.0	186.0	74.0	30.0	216.0
SERVICES ---		80	5.8	7.8	6.5	6.2	7.9	9.6	7.0	6.4
SCORE		999	6.5	7.8	6.6	7.7	6.5	6.5	6.7	5.9
RANK			5	1	4	2	5	5	3	9

UPT LFTTNKER

	WEIGHT		LAU	COL	RATING SCALE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	25		0.0--	0.0--	0-2, 2 HI
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	15		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
WA SPEC AIRSPC	10		N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	5		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	5		Y+	N	Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	4.2	3.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1500/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	20		90.90%+	89.10%+	80-95%, 80 LO
1000/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	10		94.30%+	92.00%	80-95%, 80 LO
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	20		99.30%++	99.20%++	%MIN-M, MAX HI
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	5		0.10%	0.10%	%MIN-M, MIN HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		18.00%	22.90%	5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=5%?	5		N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
SORTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	5		22.00%	25.50%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		90	7.7	7.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	140		53868.0--	45092.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		31.5+	39.5	MIN-M, MIN HI
# MTR'S AVAIL	30		10.0-	11.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	Y(0)/N(10)
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		4.0+	2.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		240	5.2	4.8	GROUP SUBTOTAL
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	20		0.0--	0.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	20		0.0--	0.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		101.0-	101.0-	MIN-100, MIN HI
LNGST RUNWAY >=6k?	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		8858.0	12000.0+	6-10K, 10K HI
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		B-	B-	PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	20		85.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	15		42.00%-	100.00%+	%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	17		59.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	17		60.00%-	76.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		219	5.0	6.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		68320.0	84459.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		91.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		70689.0++	63354.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		19365.0-	17029.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		54.00%	36.00%-	%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.4	6.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		I	D	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		151346.0	151102.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		48.00%	57.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	4.7	5.4	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1 OTHR PRIPILOT FLD	20		N--	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ OTR PRI PILOT FLD	20		N--	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
1 FLD <30MILES	5		N-	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		50	0.0	8.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		Y+	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		0.00%+	1.00%+	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	N	Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	10.0	9.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		222.0-	264.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		400.0	690.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	6		87.00%	87.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	4		654.0	812.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	20		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	6		6.0	4.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	4		150.0	14.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	7.0	7.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
	===				
SCORE	999		5.8	6.3	
RANK			10	8	

UPT MARIE2C2

	WEIGHT		WHITING	CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RANDOLPH	SHEPPARD	VANCE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	25		1.5+	3.0++	0.5--	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	15		Y	N--	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WA SPEC AIRSPC	10		N	Y++	Y++	N	N	N	N	N
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	5		N-	N-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	5		Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y+	N-	N-	Y+
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	6.5	6.7	6.0	5.4	6.3	5.4	5.4	6.3
1500/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	20		84.00%-	84.10%-	83.00%-	83.40%-	85.70%	83.60%-	91.90%+	89.40%+
1000/3 >=80%?	10		Y	N--	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	10		87.10%-	88.00%	86.00%-	86.20%-	90.00%	90.00%	94.00%+	91.80%
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	20		99.10%+	94.00%--	98.00%	99.60%++	95.00%--	98.40%+	97.50%	97.80%
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	5		0.10%	1.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.30%	0.20%
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		19.40%	9.00%+	9.00%+	18.10%	10.00%+	15.00%	22.80%	23.30%
SRTIE PLAN FCTR <=5%	5		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
SORTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	5		22.00%	9.00%+	10.50%+	17.80%	11.00%+	20.00%	22.80%	24.50%
WEATHER ---		90	5.9	3.6	6.1	6.1	5.7	6.0	7.0	6.6
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	140		138006.0++	137659.0++	137656.0++	42588.0--	143213.0++	85447.0+	29144.0--	36084.0--
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		43.2	22.5++	55.0--	39.0	38.9	65.2--	32.3+	36.1+
# MTR'S AVAIL	30		7.0-	9.0-	9.0-	5.0--	9.0-	18.0+	19.0+	32.0++
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES--	NO
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		20.0--	2.0+	0.0++	2.0+	5.0+	3.0+	26.0--	20.0--
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		240	7.8	8.8	8.2	4.5	8.6	6.2	3.4	4.7
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	20		1.5	3.0++	0.5-	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0+	1.0
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	20		0.5	1.0++	0.5	1.0++	1.0++	0.0--	1.0++	0.0--
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		17.6	8.0+	20.0	19.3	26.0	20.0	61.0--	26.0
LNGST RUNWAY >=5k?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		6000-	8000	8002	8000	8000	8353	13100	9200
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		K+	H-	E--	E--	K+	B--	F++	F++
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	20		56.00%--	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.00%-	100.00%	100.00%
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	15		95.00%+	36.00%-	53.00%-	100.00%+	95.00%+	27.00%-	100.00%+	88.00%+
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	17		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%--	100.00%	97.00%
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	17		98.00%+	82.00%	87.00%	93.00%+	74.00%	40.00%-	77.00%	56.00%-
AIRFIELDS ---		219	7.8	8.8	7.3	8.3	8.6	5.3	9.1	7.9
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		34137.0-	48549.0-	184423.0++	20385.0--	41826.0-	135526.0++	76822.0	26652.0--
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	92.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%	100.00%	86.00%
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		46413.0	22239.0--	40091.0-	50224.0	47000.0	66423.0+	7737.0--	75207.0++
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		93438.0+	2000.0-	113783.0++	28380.0-	6162.0-	36060.0	48349.0	68639.0+
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	64.00%	78.00%	99.00%	100.00%
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.1	4.1	8.6	5.2	5.0	7.5	4.7	6.7
LVL MAINT OPS	30		D	DA++	I	I	I	I	I	D
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		194391.0	1854292.0++	289040.0	218457.0	301674.0	238496.0	219824.0	156858.0
COND OF HANGARS	5		86.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	100.00%	64.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	5.8	9.9	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.4	5.5
1 OTHR PRIPILOT FLD	20		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ OTR PRI PILOT FLD	20		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	N-
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		Y+	Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	N--	N--	Y+
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		3.00%	25.00%-	28.00%--	0.00%+	0.00%+	22.00%-	4.00%	1.00%+
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		2.00%	19.00%	50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	18.90%	2.00%	18.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	N-
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N-	N-	Y	Y	N-	Y	N-	Y
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	9.0	7.4	4.2	10.0	9.2	5.0	5.6	8.8
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		205.0-	162.0-	604.0++	99.0-	130.0-	558.0++	659.0++	247.0
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		338.0	408.0	604.0	732.0	209.0	521.0	8074.0+	442.0
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		80.00%	90.00%	100.00%+	80.00%	80.00%	87.00%	80.00%	70.00%-
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		330.0	439.0	687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	1287.0+	230.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		80.00%	100.00%	78.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		25.0	197.0-	69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0	42.0	1.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		145.2	265.0-	113.0	10.0+	180.0	186.0	74.0	30.0
SERVICES ---		80	6.0	5.4	8.1	6.0	5.6	7.7	9.2	6.3
SCORE		999	7.4	7.5	7.5	6.6	7.6	6.4	6.5	6.8
RANK			4	2	2	7	1	10	8	5

UPT MARIE2C2

	WEIGHT		REESE	LAU	COL	RATING SCALE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	25		1.0	1.0	1.0	0-2, 2 HI
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	15		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
WA SPEC AIRSPC	10		N	N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	5		N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	5.4	6.3	5.4	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1500/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	20		91.50%+	90.90%+	89.10%+	80-95%, 80 LO
1000/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	10		93.60%+	94.30%+	92.00%	80-95%, 80 LO
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	20		93.20%--	99.30%+	99.20%+	%MIN-M, MAX HI
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	5		1.40%-	0.10%	0.10%	%MIN-M, MIN HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		19.80%	18.00%	22.90%	5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR <=5%	5		N	N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
SORTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	5		28.00%	22.00%	25.50%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		90	4.9	7.6	7.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	140		31116.0--	53868.0--	45092.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		42.6	31.5+	39.5	MIN-M, MIN HI
# MTR'S AVAIL	30		9.0-	10.0-	11.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	Y(0)/N(10)
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		12.0-	4.0+	2.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		240	3.8	5.2	4.8	GROUP SUBTOTAL
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	20		1.0	1.0	1.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	20		0.0--	0.0--	0.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		17.0	21.5	43.0-	MIN-M, MIN HI
LNGST RUNWAY >=5k?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		10500	8858	12000	5-8K RW, 8K HI
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		C+	C+	C+	PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	20		85.00%	85.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	15		29.00%-	42.00%-	100.00%+	%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	17		92.00%	59.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	17		87.00%	60.00%-	76.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		219	7.2	6.8	7.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		59469.0	68320.0	84459.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	91.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		60863.0+	70689.0++	63354.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		51572.0	19365.0-	17029.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		99.00%	54.00%	36.00%-	%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.6	6.4	6.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		D	I	D	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		147685.0	151346.0	151102.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		54.00%	48.00%	57.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	5.4	4.7	5.4	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1 OTHR PRIPILOT FLD	20		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ OTR PRI PILOT FLD	20		N--	N--	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N-	N-	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		50	5.0	5.0	9.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		0.00%+	0.00%+	1.00%+	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	9.1	10.0	9.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		152.0-	222.0-	264.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		462.0	400.0	690.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		93.00%	87.00%	87.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		400.0	654.0	812.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		37.0	6.0	4.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		216.0	150.0	14.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	6.0	6.6	7.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL
	===					
SCORE	999		5.9	6.5	6.7	
RANK			11	8	6	

UPT BOMBFITE

	WEIGHT		P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RANDOLPH	SHEPPARD	VANCE	REESE	LAU
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	20		1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	0.0-	0.0-	1.0+	0.0-
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WA/RA SPEC AIRSPC	10		Y++	Y++	Y++	N-	N-	N-	N-	N-
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR-SURF SPEC AIRSPC	10		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	6.7	6.7	6.7	5.0	3.3	3.3	5.0	3.3
3000/5 >=80%?	10		N--	Y+	Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	20		68.00%-	68.00%-	72.60%-	73.40%-	85.10%+	83.90%+	86.70%+	81.80%
1500/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	10		83.00%-	83.40%-	85.70%	83.60%-	91.90%+	89.40%	91.50%+	90.90%
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	25		98.00%	99.60%++	95.00%--	98.40%+	97.50%	97.80%	93.20%--	99.30%++
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	10		0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.30%	0.20%	1.40%--	0.10%
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		9.00%	18.10%	10.00%	15.00%	22.80%	23.30%	19.80%	18.00%
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	5		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N	N	N	N
SRTIE PLAN FCT 5-20%	5		10.50%	17.80%	11.00%	20.00%	22.80%	26.00%	28.00%	22.00%
WEATHER ---		100	5.3	6.4	5.1	4.9	5.9	5.8	3.7	6.3
AMT MOA/WA ARSPCE	120		135531.0++	42585.0--	136737.0++	82318.0++	35191.0--	35644.0--	30958.0--	53249.0--
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		57.1+	38.9	39.6	65.1++	32.9-	36.4	43.9	31.9-
1 AIR-SURF RGE 75MI	20		Y++	Y++	Y++	Y++	Y++	N--	N--	N--
2+ AIR-SURF RGE 75MI	10		Y++	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
NEAREST RNGE <50MI?	20		Y++	Y++	N--	Y++	N--	N--	N--	N--
# MTR's AVAIL	30		9.0-	5.0--	9.0-	14.0+	15.0+	23.0++	9.0-	6.0--
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		0.0+	3.0+	3.0+	3.0+	26.0--	19.0--	12.0-	4.0+
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		270	9.2	5.3	7.8	7.3	4.1	4.0	3.4	4.1
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	20		1.0++	1.0++	1.0++	1.0++	1.0++	0.0--	1.0++	0.0--
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	10		1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	0.0-	1.0+	0.0-	0.0-	0.0-
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		20.0+	19.3+	26.0+	20.0+	89.0-	101.0-	17.0+	101.0-
LNGST RUNWAY >=8k?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		8002.0-	8000.0-	8000.0-	8353.0-	13100.0+	9200.0	10500.0+	8858.0
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		B-	B-	K++	B-	C++	B-	B-	B-
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.00%-	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%	85.00%
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	10		53.00%	100.00%+	95.00%	27.00%-	100.00%+	88.00%	29.00%-	42.00%-
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%-	100.00%	97.00%	92.00%	59.00%-
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	10		87.00%	93.00%	74.00%	40.00%-	77.00%	56.00%	87.00%	60.00%
AIRFIELDS ---		170	7.3	7.6	8.6	5.8	8.8	5.1	6.8	4.5
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		184423.0++	20385.0--	41826.0-	135526.0++	76822.0	26652.0--	59469.0-	68320.0
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%	100.00%	86.00%	100.00%	91.00%
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		40091.0-	50224.0	47000.0-	66423.0+	7737.0--	75207.0++	60863.0+	70689.0++
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		113783.0++	28380.0-	6162.0-	36060.0	48349.0	68639.0+	51572.0	66067.0
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		100.00%	100.00%	64.00%	78.00%	99.00%	100.00%	99.00%	25.00%-
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	8.6	5.2	5.0	7.5	4.7	6.7	6.6	6.8
LVL MAINT OPS	30		I	I	I	I	I	I	DA++	I
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		289040.0+	218457.0	301674.0+	238496.0	219824.0	156858.0	147685.0-	151346.0-
COND OF HANGARS	5		100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	100.00%	64.00%	54.00%	48.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	7.9	7.2	7.9	6.9	7.2	6.2	8.0	6.0
MUNITIONS LDING PAD?	20		Y++	Y++	Y++	Y++	Y++	N--	N--	N--
WEAPON STRG MMD FAC?	20		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SPEC MIL FAC ---		40	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
1 OTHR AREA AIR FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N-
2+ OTR AREA AIR FLDS	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N-	N-
1 FLD <30MILES	5		N	Y+	N	Y+	N	N	Y+	N
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	5.0	7.5	5.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		N--	Y+	Y+	N--	N--	Y+	Y+	Y+
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		28.00%--	0.00%	0.00%	22.00%-	4.00%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%	2.00%	18.00%	4.00%	0.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N	Y+	Y+	N	N	N	N	Y+
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y	N-	Y	N-	Y	Y	Y
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	4.2	10.0	9.2	5.1	5.6	8.8	9.1	10.0
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		604.0++	99.0--	130.0-	558.0++	659.0++	247.0	152.0-	222.0-
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		604.0	732.0	209.0	521.0	8074.0+	442.0	462.0	400.0
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	1100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		100.00%+	80.00%	80.00%	90.00%	80.00%	70.00%-	96.00%	87.00%
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	1287.0+	230.0	400.0	654.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		78.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0-	42.0	1.0	37.0	6.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		113.0	10.0	180.0	186.0	74.0	30.0	216.0	150.0
SERVICES ---		80	7.7	6.0	5.2	7.3	9.0	6.3	5.8	6.5
SCORE		1000	7.8	6.8	7.3	6.8	6.3	5.5	5.6	5.5
RANK			1	3	2	3	6	8	7	8

UPT BOMBFITE

	WEIGHT		COL	RATING SCALE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	20		0.0-	0-2, 2 HI
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	10		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
WA/RA SPEC AIRSPC	10		N-	Y(10)/N(0)
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	10		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR-SURF SPEC AIRSPC	10		N	Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	3.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
3000/5 >=80%?	10		N--	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	20		78.80%-	80-95%, 80 LO
1500/3 >=80%?	10		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	10		89.10%	80-95%, 80 LO
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	25		99.20%+	%MIN-M, MAX HI
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	10		0.10%	%MIN-M, MIN HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		22.90%	5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	5		N	Y(10)/N(0)
SRTIE PLAN FCT 5-20%	5		25.00%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		100	4.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/WA ARSPCE	120		45089.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		39.7	0-MAX, MAX HI
1 AIR-SURF RGE 75MI	20		Y++	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ AIR-SURF RGE 75MI	10		Y++	Y(10)/N(0)
NEAREST RNGE <50MI?	20		Y++	Y(10)/N(0)
# MTR's AVAIL	30		10.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	Y(0)/N(10)
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		2.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		270	6.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	20		0.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	10		0.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		101.0-	MIN-100, MIN HI
LNGST RUNWAY >=8k?	10		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		12000.0+	8-12k, 12K HI
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		B-	PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	10		100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	10		100.00%+	%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	10		100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	10		76.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		170	5.7	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		84459.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		63354.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		17029.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		36.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		DA++	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		151102.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		57.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	8.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
MUNITIONS LDING PAD?	20		Y++	Y(10)/N(0)
WEAPON STRG HND FAC?	20		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
SPEC MIL FAC ---		40	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1 OTHR AREA AIR FLD	5		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ OTR AREA AIR FLDS	5		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
1 FLD <30MILES	5		N	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N	Y(10)/N(0)
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	5.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		1.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N	Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	9.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		264.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		690.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		87.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		812.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		4.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		14.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	7.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
SCORE	1000		6.4	
RANK			5	

UPT STRKADV

	WEIGHT		CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KINGSVILLE	RANDOLPH	SHEPPARD	VANCE	REESE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	20		0.0-	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	0.0-	0.0-	1.0+
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	10		N--	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WA/RA SPEC AIRSPC	10		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	N-	N-
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	10		N--	Y	N--	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR-SURF SPEC AIRSPC	10		N	N	Y++	Y++	N	N	N	N
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	1.7	6.7	6.7	8.3	5.0	3.3	3.3	5.0
3000/5 >=80%?	10		N-	N-	N-	N-	N-	Y+	Y+	Y+
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	20		74.00%	68.00%	68.00%	72.60%	73.40%	85.10%+	83.90%+	86.70%+
1000/3 >=80%?	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	5		88.00%	86.00%	86.20%	90.00%	90.00%	94.00%	91.80%	93.60%
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	10		94.00%-	98.00%	99.60%+	95.00%-	98.40%	97.50%	97.80%	93.20%-
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	5		1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.30%	0.20%	1.40%-
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		15.50%	9.00%+	27.90%	10.00%	15.00%	22.80%	23.30%	19.80%
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
SORTIE PLAN FCTR<=5%	5		13.50%	10.50%	17.80%	11.00%	20.00%	22.80%	26.00%	28.00%
WEATHER ---		70	2.7	4.5	4.0	3.9	4.0	5.3	5.1	4.1
ANT MOA/WA ARSPCE	120		130907.0++	135531.0++	42585.0--	136737.0++	82318.0++	35191.0--	35644.0--	30958.0--
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		22.5++	57.1--	38.9	39.6	65.1--	32.9+	36.4	43.9
1 AIR-SURF RGE 75MI	30		Y++	Y++	Y++	Y++	Y++	Y++	N--	N--
2+ AIR-SURF RGE 75MI	10		N	Y++	N	N	N	N	N	N
NEAREST RNGE <50MI?	10		N-	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y+	N-	N-
# MTR's AVAIL	30		9.0	9.0	5.0--	9.0	14.0+	15.0+	23.0++	9.0
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		2.0+	0.0+	3.0+	3.0+	3.0+	26.0--	19.0--	12.0-
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		270	8.3	8.7	5.3	8.2	6.2	5.0	4.1	3.3
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	20		0.0--	1.0++	1.0++	1.0++	1.0++	1.0++	0.0--	1.0++
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	10		0.0-	1.0+	1.0+	1.0+	0.0-	1.0+	0.0-	0.0-
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		101.0-	20.0+	19.3+	26.0+	20.0+	89.0-	101.0-	17.0+
LNGST RUNWAY >=8k?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		8000.0-	8002.0-	8000.0-	8000.0-	8353.0	13100.0+	9200.0	10500.0+
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		A--	B	B	K++	B	C++	B	B
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.00%-	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	10		36.00%-	53.00%	100.00%+	95.00%+	27.00%-	100.00%+	88.00%	29.00%-
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%-	100.00%	97.00%	92.00%
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	10		82.00%	87.00%	93.00%	74.00%	40.00%-	77.00%	56.00%	87.00%
AIRFIELDS ---		170	3.7	7.3	7.6	8.6	5.8	8.8	5.1	6.8
ANT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		48549.0-	184423.0++	20385.0--	41826.0-	135526.0++	76822.0	26652.0--	59469.0
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		92.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%	100.00%	86.00%	100.00%
ANT ADQ TRAINERS	30		22239.0--	40091.0-	50224.0	47000.0	66423.0+	7737.0--	75207.0++	60863.0+
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
ANT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		2000.0-	113783.0++	28380.0	6162.0-	36060.0	48349.0	68639.0+	51572.0
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	64.00%	78.00%	99.00%	100.00%	99.00%
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	4.1	8.6	5.2	5.0	7.5	4.7	6.7	6.6
LVL MAINT OPS	30		D	I	I	I	I	I	I	DA++
ANT ADQ HANGARS	15		1854292.0++	289040.0	218457.0	301674.0	238496.0	219824.0	156858.0	147685.0
COND OF HANGARS	5		94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	100.00%	64.00%	54.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	8.6	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.4	4.9	6.8
MUNITIONS LDING PAD?	20		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N--	Y+	N--	Y+
WEAPON STRG HND FAC?	20		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SPEC MIL FAC ---		40	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0
CARIER QUAL IN 100NM	30		15.0++	30.0++	101.0-	78.0+	101.0-	101.0-	101.0-	101.0-
PROX TO TRNG AREAS ---		30	10.0	10.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 OTHR AREA AIR FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ OTR AREA AIR FLDS	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N-
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y+	N	Y+	N	Y+	N	N	Y+
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	7.5	5.0	7.5	5.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	N--	N--	Y+	Y+
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		25.00%-	28.00%-	0.00%+	0.00%+	22.00%-	4.00%	1.00%	0.00%+
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		19.00%	50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%	2.00%	18.00%	4.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	N	Y+	Y+	N	N	N	N
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N-	Y	Y	N-	Y	N-	Y	Y
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	7.4	4.2	10.0	9.2	5.1	5.6	8.8	9.1
ANT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		162.0-	604.0++	99.0-	130.0-	558.0++	659.0++	247.0	152.0-
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
ANT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		408.0	604.0	732.0	209.0	521.0	8074.0+	442.0	462.0
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		90.00%	100.00%+	80.00%	80.00%	87.00%	80.00%	70.00%-	93.00%
ANT MIL HSE ADQ	6		439.0	687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	1287.0+	230.0	400.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	78.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		197.0-	69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0	42.0	1.0	37.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		265.0-	113.0	10.0	180.0	186.0	74.0	30.0	216.0
SERVICES ---		80	5.4	8.1	6.0	5.6	7.7	9.2	6.3	6.0
SCORE		1000	6.2	7.6	6.3	7.3	6.0	6.2	5.3	5.7
RANK			4	1	3	2	6	4	10	8

UPT STRKADV

	WEIGHT		LAUGHLIN	COLUMBUS	RATING SCALE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	20		0.0-	0.0-	0-2, 2 HI
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
WA/RA SPEC AIRSPC	10		N-	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
MTR SPEC AIRSPACE	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR-SURF SPEC AIRSPC	10		N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	3.3	3.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
3000/5 >=80%?	10		Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	20		81.80%	78.80%	80-95%, 80 LO
1000/3 >=80%?	5		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	5		94.30%	92.00%	80-95%, 80 LO
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	10		99.30%+	99.20%+	%MIN-M, MAX HI
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	5		0.10%	0.10%	%MIN-M, MIN HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		18.00%	22.90%	5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	5		N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
SORTIE PLAN FCTR<=5%	5		22.00%	25.00%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		70	5.3	3.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/WA ARSPCE	120		53249.0--	45089.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	20		31.9+	39.7	MIN-M, MIN HI
1 AIR-SURF RGE 75MI	30		N--	Y++	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ AIR-SURF RGE 75MI	10		N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
NEAREST RNGE <50MI?	10		N-	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
# MTR's AVAIL	30		6.0-	10.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	Y(0)/N(10)
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		4.0+	2.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		270	4.3	5.7	GROUP SUBTOTAL
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	20		0.0--	0.0--	0-MAX, MAX HI
#OUT/AUX FLD IFR CAP	10		0.0-	0.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	10		101.0-	101.0-	MIN-100, MIN HI
LNGST RUNWAY >=8k?	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	10		8858.0	12000.0+	8-12k, 12K HI
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		8	8	PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	10		85.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	10		42.00%	100.00%+	%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	10		59.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	10		60.00%	76.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		170	4.5	5.7	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		68320.0	84459.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		91.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		70689.0++	63354.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		19365.0-	17029.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		54.00%	36.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.4	6.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		I	DA++	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		151346.0	151102.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		48.00%	57.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	4.7	6.8	GROUP SUBTOTAL
MUNITIONS LDING PAD?	20		Y+	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
WEAPON STRG MND FAC?	20		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
SPEC MIL FAC ---		40	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
CARIER QUAL IN 100NM	30		101.0-	101.0-	50-100NM, 50 HI
PROX TO TRNG AREAS ---		30	0.0	0.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1 OTHR AREA AIR FLD	5		N-	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ OTR AREA AIR FLDS	5		N-	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
1 FLD <30MILES	5		N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N	N	Y(10)/N(0)
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	0.0	5.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		Y+	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		0.00%+	1.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	N	Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	10.0	9.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		222.0-	264.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		400.0	690.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		87.00%	87.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		654.0	812.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		6.0	4.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		150.0	14.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	6.6	7.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL
SCORE	1000		5.4	6.0	
RANK			9	6	

UPT PANELNAV

	WEIGHT		CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RANDOLPH	SHEPPARD	VANCE	REESE
MTR SPEC AIRSPC	50		N--	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		50	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
3000/5 > 80?	10		N-	N-	N-	N-	N-	Y+	Y+	Y+
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	15		74.00%	68.00%	68.00%	72.60%	73.40%	85.10%+	83.90%	86.70%+
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	25		1.00%--	0.00%+	0.00%+	0.10%+	0.10%+	0.30%	0.20%	1.40%--
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		9.00%	9.00%	18.10%	10.00%	15.00%	22.80%	23.30%	19.80%
SRTIE PLAN FCTR>=20%	5		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	N-
SRTIE PLAN FCTR	5		9.00%+	10.50%	17.80%	11.00%	20.00%	22.80%	23.00%	28.00%
WEATHER ---		70	3.5	6.0	5.2	5.7	5.0	5.7	5.8	3.1
# MTR's AVAIL	80		9.0-	9.0-	5.0--	9.0-	14.0++	15.0++	23.0++	9.0-
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	60		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	40		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
PLNED STRUC AFCT OPS	20		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES--	NO
STRUC CHGS W/IN 50NM	20		NO+	NO+	NO+	NO+	YES--	NO+	YES--	NO+
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		220	7.8	7.8	7.2	7.8	7.7	8.7	8.2	7.8
RUNWAY 7000 FT?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	50		8000.0--	8200.0--	8000.0--	8000.0--	8353.0--	13100.0++	9200.0+	10500.0++
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		A--	E++	B	K++	B	E++	B	B
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	30		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.00%--	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%-
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	30		36.00%--	53.00%-	100.00%++	95.00%++	27.00%--	100.00%++	88.00%+	29.00%--
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	20		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%--	100.00%	97.00%	92.00%
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	20		82.00%	87.00%+	93.00%+	74.00%	40.00%-	77.00%	56.00%-	87.00%+
AIRFIELDS ---		230	5.4	7.1	7.2	7.8	5.2	8.9	7.5	7.4
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	55		48549.0--	184423.0++	20385.0--	41826.0--	135526.0++	76822.0	26652.0--	59469.0-
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	25		92.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%-	100.00%	86.00%	100.00%
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	55		22239.0--	40091.0-	50224.0	47000.0	66423.0++	7737.0--	75207.0++	60863.0+
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	25		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	25		20000.0-	113783.0++	28380.0-	15782.0-	36060.0	48349.0	68639.0+	51572.0
CONDITION OTHR FAC	15		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	82.00%	78.00%	99.00%	100.00%	99.00%
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		200	4.9	8.7	5.7	5.6	7.7	5.2	7.0	6.9
LVL MAINT OPS	30		D	I	I	I	I	I	I	D
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		1854292.0++	289040.0	218457.0	301674.0	238496.0	219824.0	156858.0	147685.0
COND OF HANGARS	5		94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	100.00%	64.00%	54.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	8.6	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.4	4.9	5.4
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	10		Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y+	Y+
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		25.00%-	28.00%-	0.00%+	0.00%+	22.00%-	4.00%	1.00%+	0.00%+
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		19.00%	50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%	2.00%	18.00%	4.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	N	Y+	Y+	N	N	N	N
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N-	Y	Y	N-	Y	N-	Y	Y
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	6.8	4.0	10.0	9.0	5.1	5.7	8.6	8.9
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		162.0-	604.0++	99.0-	130.0-	558.0+	659.0++	247.0	152.0-
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		408.0	604.0	732.0	209.0	521.0	8074.0+	442.0	462.0
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		92.00%	100.00%+	80.00%	80.00%	87.00%	80.00%	70.00%-	93.00%
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		439.0	687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	1287.0+	230.0	400.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	78.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		197.0-	69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0	42.0	1.0	37.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		265.0-	113.0	10.0	180.0	186.0	74.0	30.0	216.0
SERVICES ---		80	5.5	8.1	6.0	5.6	7.7	9.2	6.3	6.0
SCORE	1000		5.9	7.6	7.0	7.2	6.9	7.7	7.5	7.2
RANK			10	2	7	5	8	1	4	5

UPT PANELNAV

	WEIGHT		LAU	COL	RATING SCALE
MTR SPEC AIRSPC	50		Y+	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		50	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
3000/5 > 80?	10		Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	15		81.80%	78.80%	80-95%, 80 LO
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	25		0.10%+	0.10%+	%MIN-M, MIN HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	5		18.00%	22.90%	5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR>=20%	5		N-	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
SRTIE PLAN FCTR	5		19.00%	25.00%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		70	5.9	4.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
# MTR's AVAIL	80		6.0--	10.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	60		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	40		NO	NO	Y(0)/N(10)
PLNED STRUC AFCT OPS	20		NO	NO	Y(0)/N(10)
STRUC CHGS W/IN 50NM	20		YES--	NO+	Y(0)/N(10)
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		220	6.4	7.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
RUNWAY 7000 FT?	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	50		8858.0	12000.0++	7-10K, 10K HI
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		8	8	PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	30		85.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	30		42.00%-	100.00%++	%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	20		59.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	20		60.00%-	75.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		230	6.2	8.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	55		68320.0	84459.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	25		91.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	55		70689.0++	63354.0++	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	25		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	25		14365.0-	17029.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	15		54.00%-	36.00%-	%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		200	6.6	6.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		I	D	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		151346.0	151016.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		48.00%	57.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	4.7	5.4	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	10		Y+	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		0.00%+	1.00%+	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	N	Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	10.0	8.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		222.0-	264.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		400.0	690.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		87.00%	87.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		654.0	812.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		6.0	4.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		150.0	14.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	6.6	7.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL
	===				
SCORE	1000		6.8	7.6	
RANK			9	2	

UPT PRINFO

	WEIGHT		WHITING	CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RANDOLPH	SHEPPARD	VANCE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	25		1.5	3.0++	0.5-	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	15		Y	N--	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	10		Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y+	N-	N-	Y+
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		50	6.3	4.5	3.4	3.9	5.9	3.9	3.9	5.9
1500/3 > 80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	30		84.00%-	84.10%-	83.00%--	83.40%--	85.70%-	83.60%--	91.90%++	89.40%+
1000/3 > 80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	20		87.10%-	88.00%-	86.00%-	86.20%-	90.00%	90.00%	94.00%+	91.80%+
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	30		99.00%++	94.00%--	98.00%+	99.60%++	95.00%--	98.40%+	97.50%	97.80%+
% TIME CROSWND <25KT	10		0.10%	1.00%-	0.00%+	0.00%+	0.10%	0.10%	0.30%	0.20%
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		19.40%	22.20%	9.00%+	18.10%	10.00%+	15.00%	22.80%	23.30%
SRTIE PLAN FCTR 20%?	10		N-	N-	N-	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-
SORTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	10		22.00%	22.00%	22.00%	17.80%	11.00%+	19.00%	22.80%	23.00%
WEATHER ---		140	5.3	3.2	5.3	6.3	6.1	6.3	6.5	6.0
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	130		28511.0--	57169.0++	28445.0--	42588.0-	62724.0++	85447.0++	29144.0--	36084.0--
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	40		27.7--	39.6	35.3-	39.0	37.5	65.2++	32.3-	36.1
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES--	NO
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		20.0--	2.0+	0.0++	2.0+	5.0+	3.0+	26.0--	20.0--
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		220	4.3	7.3	5.2	6.2	7.5	9.9	3.8	5.1
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	40		1.5+	3.0++	0.5--	1.0-	1.0-	1.0-	1.0-	1.0-
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	20		17.6+	8.0++	20.0	19.3+	26.0	20.0	33.0-	26.0
RUNWAY 5000 FT?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	20		6000--	8000	8002	8000	8000	8353	13100	9200
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		K+	H-	E--	E--	K+	B--	F++	F++
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	20		56.00%--	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.00%-	100.00%	100.00%
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	15		95.00%+	36.00%-	53.00%-	100.00%+	95.00%+	27.00%-	100.00%+	88.00%+
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	17		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%--	100.00%	97.00%
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	17		98.00%+	82.00%	87.00%	93.00%+	74.00%	40.00%-	77.00%	56.00%-
AIRFIELDS ---		239	7.6	8.9	7.1	7.7	7.8	5.8	8.1	8.0
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		34137.0-	48549.0-	184423.0++	20385.0--	41826.0-	135526.0++	76822.0	26652.0--
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	92.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%	100.00%	86.00%
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		46413.0	22239.0--	40091.0-	50224.0	47000.0	66423.0+	7737.0--	75207.0++
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		93438.0+	2000.0-	113783.0++	28380.0-	6162.0-	36060.0	48349.0	68639.0+
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	64.00%	78.00%	99.00%	100.00%
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.1	4.1	8.6	5.2	5.0	7.5	4.7	6.7
LVL MAINT OPS	30		DA++	D	I-	I-	I-	I-	I-	DA++
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		194391.0	1854292.0++	289040.0	218457.0	301674.0	238496.0	219824.0	156858.0
COND OF HANGARS	5		86.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	100.00%	64.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	7.2	8.6	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.4	6.9
1 OTHR PRI NFO FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ OTR PRI NFO FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N-	N-	Y
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	N-
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	7.5
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	10		Y+	Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	N--	N--	Y+
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		3.00%	25.00%-	28.00%--	0.00%+	0.00%+	22.00%-	4.00%	1.00%+
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		2.00%	19.00%	50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%	2.00%	18.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y+	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	N-
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N-	N-	Y	Y	N-	Y	N-	Y
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	8.7	6.8	4.0	10.0	9.0	5.1	5.7	8.6
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		205.0-	162.0-	604.0++	99.0-	130.0-	558.0++	659.0++	247.0
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		338.0	408.0	604.0	732.0	209.0	521.0	8074.0+	442.0
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		80.00%	90.00%	100.00%+	80.00%	80.00%	87.00%	80.00%	70.00%-
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		330.0	439.0	687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	1287.0+	230.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		80.00%	100.00%	78.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		25.0	197.0-	69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0	42.0	1.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		145.0	265.0-	113.0	10.0+	180.0	186.0	74.0	30.0
SERVICES ---		80	6.0	5.4	8.1	6.0	5.6	7.7	9.2	6.3
SCORE		999	6.4	6.7	6.4	6.8	7.0	7.1	6.2	6.8
RANK			8	7	8	5	3	1	10	5

UPT PRINFO

	WEIGHT		REESE	LAU	COL	RATING SCALE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	25		1.0	1.0	1.0	0-6, 6 HI
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	15		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	10		N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		50	3.9	5.9	3.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1500/3 > 80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1500/3	30		91.50%++	90.90%++	89.10%+	80-95%, 80 LO
1000/3 > 80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	20		93.60%+	94.30%+	92.00%+	80-95%, 80 LO
% TIME CROSWND <15KT	30		93.20%--	99.30%++	99.20%++	%MIN-M, MAX HI
% TIME CROSWND <25KT	10		1.40%--	0.10%	0.10%	%MIN-M, MIN HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		19.80%	18.00%	22.90%	5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR 20%?	10		N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
SORTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	10		27.00%	19.00%	26.00%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		140	4.4	7.9	6.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	130		31116.0--	53868.0++	45092.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	40		42.6+	31.5-	39.5	0-MAX, MAX HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	Y(0)/N(10)
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		12.0-	4.0+	2.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		220	5.2	6.7	6.4	GROUP SUBTOTAL
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS	40		1.0-	1.0-	1.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	20		17.0+	21.5	43.0--	MIN-M, MIN HI
RUNWAY 5000 FT?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	20		10500	8858	12000	5-8K RW, 8K HI
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		C+	C+	C+	PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	20		85.00%	85.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	15		29.00%-	42.00%-	100.00%+	%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	17		92.00%	59.00%-	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	17		87.00%	60.00%-	76.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		239	7.5	7.1	7.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		59469.0	68320.0	84459.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	91.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		60863.0+	70689.0++	63354.0+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		51572.0	19365.0-	17029.0-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		99.00%	54.00%	36.00%-	%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	6.6	6.4	6.3	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		D	I-	D	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		147685.0	151346.0	151102.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		54.00%	48.00%	57.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	5.4	4.7	5.4	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1 OTHR PRI NFO FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ OTR PRI NFO FLD	5		N-	N-	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N-	N-	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	5.0	5.0	7.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	10		Y+	Y+	Y+	Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		0.00%+	0.00%+	1.00%+	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N-	Y+	N-	Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	8.9	10.0	8.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		152.0-	222.0-	264.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		462.0	400.0	690.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
%NMR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		93.00%	87.00%	87.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		400.0	654.0	812.0	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		37.0	6.0	4.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		216.0	150.0	14.0+	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	6.0	6.6	7.2	GROUP SUBTOTAL

SCORE	999		6.2	7.1	6.9	
RANK			10	1	4	

UPT WSOSTRK

	WEIGHT		RUCKER	WHITING	CORPUS	P-COLA	MERIDIAN	KING	RANDOLPH	COL
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	20		Y+	Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+
WA/R SPEC AIRSPC	20		Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	N--	N--
MTR SPEC AIRSPC	10		N-	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+	Y+
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	10		Y+	Y+	Y+	N-	N-	Y+	N-	N-
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	8.3	6.7	5.0	8.3	8.3	10.0	5.0	5.0
3000/5 > 80?	5		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	15		78.80%	71.40%	74.00%	68.00%	68.00%	72.60%	73.40%	78.80%
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	10		0.00%	0.10%	1.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		7.25%+	19.40%-	9.00%+	9.00%+	18.10%-	10.00%+	15.00%	22.90%-
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N-
SRTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	10		16.70%	10.50%+	9.00%+	10.50%+	17.80%	11.00%+	20.00%-	25.00%-
WEATHER ---		70	5.8	5.1	5.0	6.2	4.7	6.0	4.6	2.7
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	100		5231.0--	138006.0++	137659.0++	137656.0++	42588.0--	143213.0++	85447.0-	45092.0--
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	30		5.1++	43.2-	22.5+	55.0-	39.0	38.9	65.2--	39.5
# MTR's AVAIL	40		0.0--	7.0-	9.0	19.0++	5.0--	9.0	17.0++	11.0+
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		0.0++	0.0++	2.0-	0.0++	3.0--	3.0--	3.0--	2.0-
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		220	3.8	7.8	7.9	8.7	3.8	7.4	5.7	4.7
RUNWAY 5000 FT?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	40		5000--	6000--	8000+	8200+	8000+	8000+	8351+	12000+
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		A--	K++	H+	E	E	K++	B--	C++
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	30		100.00%+	56.00%--	100.00%+	100.00%+	100.00%+	100.00%+	66.00%-	100.00%+
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	30		100.00%+	95.00%+	36.00%--	53.00%-	100.00%+	95.00%+	27.00%--	100.00%+
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	20		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	51.00%-	100.00%
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	20		100.00%+	98.00%+	82.00%	87.00%	93.00%+	74.00%	40.00%-	76.00%
AIRFIELDS ---		220	5.9	7.7	8.3	8.3	9.0	9.3	6.2	9.3
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	50		323435.0++	34137.0--	48549.0--	184423.0++	20385.0--	41826.0--	135526.0+	84459.0-
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	20		100.00%	100.00%	92.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%-	100.00%
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	50		100037.0++	46413.0-	22239.0--	40091.0-	50224.0	47000.0-	66423.0+	63354.0+
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	20		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	20		238036.0++	93438.0+	2000.0-	113783.0+	28380.0-	6162.0-	36060.0-	17029.0-
CONDITION OTHR FAC	10		79.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	64.00%	78.00%	36.00%-
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		170	9.9	5.1	4.0	6.3	4.7	4.5	6.0	5.3
LVL MAINT OPS	30		I	D	D	I	I	I	I	D
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		245483.0	194391.0	1854292.0++	289040.0	218457.0	301674.0	238496.0	151102.0-
COND OF HANGARS	5		100.00%	86.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	87.00%	52.00%	57.00%
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	5.4	5.8	8.6	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.9	5.4
1 OTHR PRI NFO FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ OTR PRI NFO FLD	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		N-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N-	N-
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	7.5	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.5	7.5
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		N--	Y+	Y+	N--	Y+	Y+	N--	Y+
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		9.70%	3.00%+	25.00%-	28.00%-	0.00%+	0.00%+	22.00%-	1.00%+
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		0.00%	2.00%	19.00%	50.00%-	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%	0.00%
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N-	Y+	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+	N-	N-
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N-	N-	N-	Y+	Y+	N-	Y+	Y+
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	5.3	9.0	7.4	4.2	10.0	9.2	5.1	9.1
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		732.0++	205.0-	162.0-	604.0+	99.0-	130.0-	558.0+	264.0
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		87.40%	100.00%	100.00%	96.00%	86.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		40.0-	338.0	408.0	604.0	732.0+	209.0	521.0	690.0
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		57.80%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		100.00%+	80.00%	90.00%	100.00%+	80.00%	80.00%	87.00%	87.00%
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		1516.0+	330.0	439.0	687.0	520.0	245.0	948.0	812.0
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		98.00%	80.00%	100.00%	78.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.00%	100.00%
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		0.0	25.0	197.0-	69.0	6.0	53.0	79.0	4.0
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		0.0	145.0	265.0-	113.0	10.0	180.0	186.0	14.0
SERVICES ---		80	8.9	6.2	5.7	8.4	6.6	5.7	7.9	7.6
SCORE		1000	6.7	7.0	6.9	7.6	6.5	7.4	6.1	6.6
RANK			5	3	4	1	7	2	8	6

UPT WSOSTRK

	WEIGHT		RATING SCALE
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	20		Y(10)/N(0)
WA/R SPEC AIRSPC	20		Y(10)/N(0)
MTR SPEC AIRSPC	10		Y(10)/N(0)
AA SPEC AIRSPACE	10		Y(10)/N(0)
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		60	GROUP SUBTOTAL
3000/5 > 80?	5		Y(10)/N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 3000/5	15		80-95%, 80 LO
% TIME CROSWND >25KT	10		%MIN-M, MIN HI
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		Y(10)/N(0)
% SORTIES CXL/RESCHD	10		5-20%, 5% HI
SRTIE PLAN FCTR<=20%	10		Y(10)/N(0)
SRTIE PLAN FCTR>=5%	10		5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		70	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	100		0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	30		MIN-M, MIN HI
# MTR's AVAIL	40		0-MAX, MAX HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	20		%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	10		Y(0)/N(10)
# OF BISECT AIRWAYS	20		0-MAX, MIN HI
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		220	GROUP SUBTOTAL
RUNWAY 5000 FT?	10		Y(10)/N(0)
LGEST MAIN FLD RUNWY	40		5-8K RW, 8K HI
#PRIMARY RUNWAYS	70		PRIMARY RUNWAYS
CONDIT OF RUNWAYS	30		%0-100, 100 HI
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	30		%0-100, 100 HI
CONDIT OF UTILITIES	20		%0-100, 100 HI
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	20		%0-100, 100 HI
AIRFIELDS ---		220	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	50		0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	20		%0-100, 100 HI
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	50		0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	20		%0-100, 100 HI
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	20		0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	10		%0-100, 100 HI
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		170	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		%0-100, 100 HI
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1 OTHR PRI NFO FLD	5		Y(10)/N(0)
2+ OTR PRI NFO FLD	5		Y(10)/N(0)
1 FLD <30MILES	5		Y(10)/N(0)
2+ FLDS < 30MILES	5		Y(10)/N(0)
PROX OTHR SPT FAC ---		20	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y(10)/N(0)
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y(10)/N(0)
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y(10)/N(0)
AIR QUALITY ---		50	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ CPLTD ENCODED	15		Y(10)/N(0)
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	20		%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		Y(10)/N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		Y(10)/N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		60	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		%0-100, 100 HI
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		%0-100, 100 HI
%MWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		%0-100, 100 HI
AMT MIL HSE ADQ	6		0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		%0-100, 100 HI
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	GROUP SUBTOTAL
SCORE	1000		
RANK			

UPT UPTHELO

	WEIGHT		RUCKER	WHITING	P-COLA	RATING SCALE
# OF OUTLYING FLDS	60		16.00++	13.00++	2.00--	0-MAX, MAX HI
MOA SPEC AIRSPC	20		Y	Y	Y	YES-NO
MANAGED TRNG AREAS ---		80	10.0	8.6	3.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
1000/3 >=80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 1000/3	30		88.90%	87.10%-	88.80%	80-95%, 80 LO
500/1 >=80?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)N(0)
%TIME WTHER > 500/1	20		94.90%	95.70%	95.00%	80-95%, 80 LO
<5% SRTIES CXL/RSCHD	10		7.30%	11.60%	9.00%	5-20%, 5% HI
SORTIE PLAN FCTR<=5%	10		16.10%-	10.00%	10.50%	5-20%, 5% HI
WEATHER ---		90	7.6	7.4	7.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT MOA/AA ARSPCE	20		9275.00+	10807.00+	2384.00--	0-MAX, MAX HI
AVG DIST TO AIRSCE	10		5.1+	15.7	29.9-	0-MAX, MIN HI
%ATC DLAYS > 15 MIN	30		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
CMERC HUB W/IN 100MI	20		NO	NO	NO	N(10)Y(0)
CHGS W/NEG UPT EFFCT	20		NO	NO	NO	N(10)Y(0)
STRUC W/IN 50MI	20		NO	NO	NO	N(10)Y(0)
AVAIL TERRAIN	30		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)N(0)
OVERWATER	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)N(0)
AIRSPC/FLT TRNG AREA ---		160	9.8	9.7	8.4	GROUP SUBTOTAL
#OTLYG/AUX FLDS HELD	50		16.00++	8.00-	2.00--	0-MAX, MAX HI
#OUT/AUX W/N/NVG CAP	40		16.00++	2.00--	1.00--	0-MAX, MAX HI
MEDIAN DIST <= MAX?	10		Y	Y	Y	Y(10)N(0)
MED DIST TO AUX/OUT	20		11.50+	16.00--	11.50+	MIN to MAX NUM
#UHPT SIMUL OPS	40		231.00++	148.00-	148.00-	0-MAX, MAX HI
%RUNWAY ADQTE CONDIT	20		100.00%+	56.00%-	100.00%+	ZERO - 100
%TAXI/APRNS ADQ COND	20		100.00%+	95.00%+	53.00%-	ZERO - 100
%FAC IN ADQ COND	20		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	ZERO - 100
%OTHR FAC ADQ COND	20		100.00%	98.00%	87.00%	ZERO - 100
AIRFIELDS ---		240	10.0	5.7	5.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT ADQ TRNG FAC	30		323435.00++	34137.00--	184423.00	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ CLAS	10		100.00%	100.00%	99.00%	ZERO - 100
AMT ADQ TRAINERS	30		100037.00++	46413.00-	40091.00-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION % ADQ TRNR	10		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	ZERO - 100
AMT OTHR TRNG FAC	15		238036.00+	93438.00-	113783.00-	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION OTHR FAC	5		79.00%	100.00%	100.00%	ZERO - 100
GRNF TRNG FAC ---		100	9.9	4.8	6.1	GROUP SUBTOTAL
LVL MAINT OPS	30		I-	DA++	I-	LVL MAINT
AMT ADQ HANGARS	15		245483.00	194391.00-	257321.00	0-MAX, MAX HI
COND OF HANGARS	5		100.00%	86.00%	100.00%	ZERO - 100
AIRCRFT MAINT FAC ---		50	5.8	9.1	6.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
# othr spt airflds	10		2 OR MORE	2 OR MORE	2 OR MORE	# OTHER AIRFIEL
DIST TO OTHR AIRFLDS	10		2 OR MORE	2 OR MORE	1 FIELD-	# OTHER AIRFIEL
PROX OTR SPT FAC ---		20	10.0	10.0	7.5	GROUP SUBTOTAL
UNIQ UHPT SPT FEATUR	80		1.0	1.0	1.0	0-2, 2 HI
UNIQUE FEATURES ---		80	5.0	5.0	5.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
IN ATTAIN/MAINT AREA	30		Y	Y	Y	YES-NO
MOD NONATTAIN/BETTER	10		Y	Y	Y	YES-NO
DELAYS DUE AIR QUAL	10		Y	Y	Y	YES-NO
AIR QUALITY ---		50	10.0	10.0	10.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AICUZ STUDY CPLTD?	5		Y	Y	Y	YES-NO
AICUZ CPLTD EHCODED	5		N	Y+	N	YES-NO
%INCOMPAT CLR ZONE	15		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZI	10		10.00%	3.00%+	28.00%-	%0-MAX, MIN HI
%INCOMPAT APZII	5		0.00%	2.00%	50.00%-	%0-MAX, MIN HI
REAL ESTATE DISCLOS	5		N	Y+	N	Y(10)N(0)
CLR ZONE ACQ CMPLTD	5		N	N	Y+	Y(10)N(0)
ENCROACHMENT ---		50	6.3	8.7	5.0	GROUP SUBTOTAL
AMT BOQ RMS ADQ	20		732.00+	205.00--	604.00+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BOQ % ADQ	10		97.00%	100.00%	96.00%	ZERO - 100
AMT BEQ RMS ADQ	6		40.00-	338.00	604.00+	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION BEQ % ADQ	4		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	ZERO - 100
%PWR/SPT FAC AVAIL	20		100.00%	80.00%-	100.00%	ZERO - 100
AMT NIL HSE ADQ	6		1516.00+	330.00-	687.00	0-MAX, MAX HI
CONDITION HSE % ADQ	4		98.00%	80.00%	78.00%	ZERO - 100
# CHLDCAR WAIT LIST	5		0.0+	25.0	69.0-	0-MAX, MIN HI
AVG WAIT CHILDREN	5		0.0+	145.2-	113.0	0-MAX, MIN HI
SERVICES ---		80	9.3	5.8	7.9	GROUP SUBTOTAL
SCORE	1000		8.9	7.2	6.5	
RANK			1	2	3	

Functional Value Calculation

Step by Step Method for Data Collection.

Answering Questions for Assessing Functional Quality Measures of Merit.

Steps:

1: Recorders asks questions for each functional area, i.e., "The number of outlining/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support Helicopter training:

2: Each member of the Joint Cross-Service Group Team looks up the answers to each question from the certified data calls.

3: The recorder records data for each base on consolidated data input sheets.

After all data recorded on all data sheets, a copy of the completed data sheets will be sent to the Army TRI-DEPT BRAC TEAM for input to D-PAD decision analysis software to calculate the functional value of each site/function combination.

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR FUNCTIONAL AREAS

MEASURES OF MERIT	Flight Screening	Primary Pilot	Bomber/ Fighter	Strike/ Adv E-2/C-2	Airlift/ Tanker	Maritime/ Int E-2/C-2	CORRESPONDING QUESTIONS
Managed Training Areas	5	5	6	6	6	6	pg 7/#1, 2
Weather	15	14	10	7	9	9	pg 10/#1-3
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	27	22	27	27	24	24	pgs 11-17/#1-23
Airfields	23	24	17	17	22	22	pgs 18-21/#1-4
Ground Training Facilities	10	10	10	10	10	10	pg 22/#1, 2
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	5	5	5	5	5	pg 23/#1 pg 21/#3
Special Military Facilities	0	0	4	4	0	0	pgs 24-25/#1-7
Proximity to Training Areas	0	0	0	3	0	0	pg 27/#1, 2, 3, 4
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	0	2	2	2	5	5	pg 28/#1, 2, 3
Unique Features	0	0	0	0	0	0	pg 29/#1, 2
Air Quality	5	5	5	5	5	5	pg 30/#1-5
Encroachment	5	5	6	6	6	6	pgs 31-38/#1-11
Services	5	8	8	8	8	8	pgs 39-47/#1-6
Total Points	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT	Prim & Int NFO/NAV	WSO Strike	Panel NAV	Helo	CORRESPONDING QUESTIONS
Managed Training Areas	5	6	5	8	pg 7/#1, 2
Weather	14	7	7	9	pg 10/#1-3
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	22	22	22	16	pgs 11-17/#1-23
Airfields	24	22	23	24	pgs 18-21/#1-4
Ground Training Facilities	10	17	20	10	pg 22/#1, 2
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	5	5	5	pg 23/#1 pg 21/#3
Special Military Facilities	0	0	0	0	pgs 24-25/#1-7
Proximity to Training Areas	0	0	0	0	pg 27/#1, 2, 3, 4
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	2	2	0	2	pg 28/#1, 2, 3
Unique Features	0	0	0	8	pg 29/#1, 2
Air Quality	5	5	5	5	pg 30/#1-5
Encroachment	5	6	5	5	pgs 31-38/#1-11
Services	8	8	8	8	pgs 39-47/#1-6
Total Points	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR:
FLIGHT SCREENING

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	5	The questions addressed in this area are focused toward ownership of special use airspace, and outlying fields. In this analysis, *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	15	This weight was used because students in flight screening need better weather than students in the primary/advanced tracks.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	27	This area was weighted heavily due to the direct impact it has on flight screening. It is important that special use airspace is in close proximity to the flight screening base due to the limited range and speed of flight screening aircraft.
Airfields	23	This area is weighted heavily due to the emphasis flight screening places on pattern activities.
Ground Training Facilities	10	This weight is commensurate with the role classrooms, simulators, and other facilities play in flight screening.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	Flight Screening aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	0	N/A
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	0	N/A
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	5	Encroachment plays a role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission; however, flight screening aircraft do not have a large impact on encroachment issues.
Services	5	Quality of life plays a less significant role in determining installation compatibility with the flight screening mission due to the transient nature of the student population, and the significant number of civilian employees (flight instructors).

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Flight Screening* Training

[redacted]**Managed Training Areas (5 points)**

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support Flight Screening . (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 6 (0 pt for 0 fields, 1 pt for 6 fields)
   Rationale: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training.
2. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports primary training. (4 pts or 80%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for MOA, 2 pts for AA
   Rationale: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training.

Weather (15 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 3000/5. (5 pt or 33%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 5 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: This weather is the best indicator of the viability to do the flight screening mission. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time weather is better than 1500/3. (3 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 3 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USAF weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
3. Percent of time crosswinds are less than 15 knots. (4 pt or 27%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (0 pt for min% and 4 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max crosswinds for majority of student training. Higher % is better.
4. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (1 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and 0 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-3.
[redacted]fficial Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (2 pts or 13%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (2 pts for 5% and 1 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-3.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (27 points)

1. Amount of airspace (MOA and AA) in nm^3 (9 pt or 34%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of weighted airspace from 0 to max airspace (MOA and .8 AA) (0 pt for 0 nm^3 and 9 pts for max nm^3). Weighted airspace for each site = amount of MOA airspace + .8(amount of AA airspace)
   Rationale: More airspace is better, MOA is slightly better than AA.
2. Average distance to airspace (12 pts or 45%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 12 pts for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^3 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale:
3. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (2 pts or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (2 pts for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
4. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (2 pts or 7%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
5. Number of bisecting airways. (2 pts or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: Bisecting airways reduce training effectiveness in areas.

elds (23 points)

[redacted]e # of outlying/auxiliary fields usable for primary pilot training (3 pts or 13%)
   Definition of usable field will be based on runway length (preliminary cutoff -- 2500 ft)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 3 pts for max # fields)
   Rationale: More outlying fields improve capacity and quality of training.
2. Median distance to outlying/auxiliary fields (2 pts or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between some min and max (0 pt for min distance, 2 pts for max)
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.
3. Number of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: With 0 crosswind runways: 2 pts for first runway, 4 pts for 2 parallel runways, 6 pts for 3 parallel runways without crosswind runways.
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
4. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (3 pts or 13%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pts for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
5. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (2.5 pt or 11%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2.5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
6. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (2.75 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
7. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (2.75 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (10 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
3. Amount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (1.5 pt or 15%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
6. Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (.5 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
   Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.

2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
   ndition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

Air Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.
2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.
3. There have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (5 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1 pts or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
2. What is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (1.5 pts or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1.5 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
   hat is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.
6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (5 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 1 pt for 100).
   Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
4. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
5. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
6. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
   verage wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR:
PRIMARY

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	5	The questions addressed in this area are focused toward ownership of special use airspace, air-to ground ranges, and outlying fields. In this analysis, *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	14	This weight was used because students in primary flight training need better weather than students in the advanced tracks.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	22	This area was weighted heavily due to the direct impact it has on primary flight training. Much of the training takes place in special use airspace; therefore, this area plays a large role in determining the training effectiveness of an installation.
Airfields	24	This area is weighted the heaviest due to the emphasis primary training places on pattern activities. This area plays a big role in evaluating the effectiveness of a training installation.
Ground Training Facilities	10	This weight is commensurate with the role classrooms, simulators, and other facilities play in flight training.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	Training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	0	N/A
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	2	This area looks at the local area to determine what other facilities are available The overall training infrastructure is already established and in use at each base so the impact to this area should be minimal.
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	5	Encroachment plays a role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission; however, training aircraft do not have a large impact on encroachment issues.
Services	8	Quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission and this weight will be applied to the other training functions.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Primary* Pilot Training

Managed Training Areas (5 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support primary training. (2.5 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 6 (0 pt for 0 fields, 2.5 pts for 6 fields)
   Rationale: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training.
2. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports primary training. (2.5 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: 1.5 pt for MOA, 0.5 pt for MTR, 0.5 for AA
   Rationale: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training.

Weather (14 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 1500/3. (4 pt or 29%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 4 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USAF weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time weather is better than 1000/3. (3 pt or 21%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 3 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USN weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
3. Percent of time crosswinds are less than 15 knots. (3 pt or 21%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (0 pt for min% and 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max crosswinds for majority of student training. Higher % is better.
4. Percent of time crosswinds are greater than 25 knots. (1 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (1 pt for min% and 0 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max aircraft crosswind limits. Lower % is better.
5. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (1 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and 0 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.
6. Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (2 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (2 pt for 5% and 1 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (22 points)

1. Amount of airspace (MOA and AA) in nm^3 (12 pt or 64%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of weighted airspace from 0 to max airspace (MOA and .8 AA) (0 pt for 0 nm^3 and 12 pt for max nm^3). Weighted airspace for each site = amount of MOA airspace + .8(amount of AA airspace)
   Rationale: More airspace is better, MOA is slightly better than AA.
2. Average distance to airspace (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 2 pt for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^3 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale: Closer airspace is better.
3. Number of MTR's available (3 pt or 14%).
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0 pt for 0 MTR's and 3 pt for max MTR's)
   Rationale: MTRs are required for training...more is better.
4. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (2 pt for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
5. [redacted]nned commercial hub within 100 miles. (1 pt or 4%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
6. Number of bisecting airways. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: Bisecting airways reduce training effectiveness in areas.

Airfields (24 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields usable for primary pilot training (4 pt or 17%) Definition of usable field will be based on runway length (preliminary cutoff -- 5000 ft)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 4 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: More outlying fields improve capacity and quality of training.
2. The # of usable outlying/auxiliary fields with IFR or night? capability. (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: This capability will help reduce congestion at the home field.
3. Median distance to outlying/auxiliary fields. (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between some min and max (2 pt for min distance, 1 pt for max)
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.
4. Runway length of longest runway at main airfield. (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5000 and 8000 ft (1 pt for 5000 ft runway , 2 points for 8000 ft runway)
   Rationale: Longer runway is better for safety reasons
5. Number of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pt or 29%)
   Scoring:
   With 0 crosswind runways: 2 pts for first runway, 4 pts for 2 parallel runways, 6 pts for 3 parallel runways without crosswind runways.
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
6. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
7. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (1.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
8. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (1.75 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
9. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (1.75 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (10 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
3. Amount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)

[redacted]

Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
nount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (1.5 pt or 15%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

6. Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (.5 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
   Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.
2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

Proximity to Other Support Facilities (2 points)

1. Number of other airfields in the area that could support primary pilot training (1 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: .5 pt for 1 field, 1 pt for 2 or more fields)
   Rationale: More available airfields are better.
   stance to other airfields. (1 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: .5 pt for 1 field less than 30 miles, 1 pt for 2 or more fields less than 30 miles
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.

Air Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.
2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.
3. There have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better..

Encroachment (5 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1 pts or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
2. What is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (1.5 pts or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1.5 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
   at is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.
6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (8 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
   Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR
BOMBER/FIGHTER

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	6	This area was weighted about the same as Primary (5%) because *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	10	This area was weighted less than Primary (14%) due to the increased proficiency of the students, and a more weather-capable aircraft.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	27	This area was weighted higher than Primary (22%) because there is greater emphasis on area work in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Airfields	17	This area was weighted lower than Primary (24%) because there is less emphasis on pattern work in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Ground Training Facilities	10	This was weighted the same as Primary because the role classrooms, simulators, and other facilities play in advanced training is the same.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	This was weighted the same as Primary because training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	4	Special credit was given to this area because it addresses the ability to handle munitions.
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	2	This area was weighted the same as Primary because the training infrastructure is already established and in use at each base.
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	6	This area is slightly higher than Primary (5%) due to the generally larger AICUZ footprint of the advanced training aircraft (jet aircraft).
Services	8	This area was weighted the same as Primary because quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Bomber/Fighter* Pilot Training

Managed Training Areas (6 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support Bomber/Fighter training. (2 pt or 33%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 2 (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pts for 2 fields)
   Rational: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training
2. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports Bomber/Fighter training. (4 pt or 67%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for MOA, 1 pt for WA/Restricted Area, 1 pt for MTR, 1 pt for Air-to-Surface range
   Rational: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training

Weather (10 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 3000/5. (3 pts or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 3 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: Weather requirements to best conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time weather is better than 1500/3. (2 pts or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 2 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USAF weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
3. Percent of time crosswinds are less than 15 knots. (2.5 pts or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (0 pt for min% and 2.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max crosswinds for majority of student training. Higher % is 'r.
   rcent of time crosswinds are greater than 25 knots. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (1 pt for min% and 0 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max aircraft crosswind limits. Lower % is better.
5. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (.5 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (.5 pt for 5% and 0 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.
6. Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and .5 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (27 points)

1. Amount of airspace (MOA/WA and Restricted area) in nm^3 (12 pt or 44%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of weighted airspace from 0 to max airspace (0 pt for 0 nm^3 and 12 pt for max nm^3).
   Rationale: More airspace is better. Bomber/Fighter require more airspace than Primary pilot training.
2. Average distance to airspace (2 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 2 pt for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^3 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA/WA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale: Closer airspace is better.
3. Number of Air-to-Surface ranges within 75 nm (3 pt or 11%).
   Scoring: 2 pts for 1 range, 3 pts for 2 or more ranges.
   Rationale: More airspace is better.
4. Distance to nearest Air-to-Surface range (2 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: 2 pt if range is within 50 nm.
   Rationale: Closer distance is better.
   'umber of MTR's available (3 pt or 11%).
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0 pt for 0 MTR's and 3 pt for max MTR's)
   Rationale: MTRs are required for training...more is better.
6. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (2 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (2 pts for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
7. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (1 pt or 4%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
8. Number of bisecting airways. (2 pts or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: Bisecting airways reduce training effectiveness in areas.

Airfields (17 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields usable for Bomber/Fighter pilot training (2 pt or 12%)

Definition of usable field will be based on runway length (preliminary cutoff -- 8K ft)

   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: More outlying fields improve capacity and quality of training.
2. The # of usable outlying/auxiliary fields with IFR or night? capability. (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 1 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: This capability will help reduce congestion at the home field.
3. Median distance to outlying/auxiliary fields. (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between some min and max(1 pt for min distance, 0 pt for max)
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.
4. Runway length of longest runway at main airfield. (2 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 8K and 12K ft (1 pt for 8K ft runway , 2 points for 12K ft runway)
   Rationale: Longer runway is better for safety reasons
5. Number of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pt or 41%)
   Scoring:
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
6. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
7. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
8. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
9. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (10 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)

[redacted]

Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

3. Amount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (1.5 pt or 15%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
6. Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (.5 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
   Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.
2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is [illegible]r.

[illegible]cial Military Facilities (4 points)

1. Does installation have munitions loading pad? (2 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: 2 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Munitions loading pad to handle hot cargo.
2. Does installation have weapons storage and handling facilities? (2 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: 2 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Weapons storage is necessary to handle munitions for the IFF program.

Proximity to Other Support Facilities (2 points)

1. Number of other airfields in the area with instrument capability that could support Bomber/Fighter pilot training (1 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: .5 pts for 1 field, 1 pt for 2 or more fields)
   Rationale: More available airfields are better.
2. Distance to other airfields. (1 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: .5 pts for 1 field less than 30 miles, 1 pt for 2 or more fields less than 30 miles
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.

Air Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.
2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.
3. [illegible]ere have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (6 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1.5 pts or 25%)
   Scoring: 1.5 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
2. What is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (2 pts or 33%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 17%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
4. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.
6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (8 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
   Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR
STRIKE & ADV. E-2/C-2

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	6	This area was weighted about the same as Primary (5%) because *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	7	This area was weighted less than Primary (14%) due to the increased proficiency of the students, and a more weather-capable aircraft.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	27	This area was weighted higher than Primary (22%) because there is greater emphasis on area work in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Airfields	17	This area was weighted lower than Primary (24%) because there is less emphasis on pattern work in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Ground Training Facilities	10	This was weighted the same as Primary because the role classrooms, simulators, and other facilities play in advanced training is the same.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	This was weighted the same as Primary because training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	4	Special credit was given to this area for this function because it addresses the ability to handle munitions.
Proximity to Training Areas	3	This credit was allotted to this area because of the capability to conduct carrier operations close to the Training Air Station.
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	2	This area was weighted the same as Primary because the training infrastructure is already established and in use at each base.
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	6	This area is slightly higher than Primary (5%) due to the generally larger AICUZ footprint of the advanced training aircraft (jet aircraft).
Services	8	This area was weighted the same as Primary because quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission.

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Strike/Adv E2/C2* Pilot Training

Managed Training Areas (6 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support Strike/Adv E2/C2 training. (2 pt or 33%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 2 (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pts for 2 fields)
   Rational: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training
2. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports Strike/Adv E2/C2 training. (4 pt or 67%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for MOA, 1 pt for WA/Restricted Area, 1 pt for MTR, 1 pt for Air-to-Surface range
   Rational: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training

Weather (7 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 3000/5. (3 pts or 43%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 3 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: Weather requirements to best conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time weather is better than 1000/3. (1 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (0.5 pt for 80% and 1 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USN weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
3. Percent of time crosswinds are less than 15 knots. (1 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (0 pt for min% and 1 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max crosswinds for majority of student training. Higher % is
   r.
   rcent of time crosswinds are greater than 25 knots. (0.5 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (0.5 pt for min% and 0 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max aircraft crosswind limits. Lower % is better.
5. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (0.5 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (0.5 pt for 5% and 0 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.
6. Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (1 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and 0.5 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (27 points)

1. Amount of airspace (MOA/WA and Restricted area) in nm^3 (12 pt or 44%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of airspace from 0 to max airspace (0 pt for 0 nm^3 and 12 pt for max nm^3).
   Rationale: More airspace is better. Strike/Adv E2/C2 require more airspace than Primary pilot training.
2. Average distance to airspace (2 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 2 pt for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^3 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA/WA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale: Closer airspace is better.
3. Number of Air-to-Surface ranges within 75 nm (4 pt or 15%).
   Scoring: 3 pts for 1 range, 4 pts for 2 or more ranges.
   Rationale: More airspace is better.
4. Distance to nearest Air-to-Surface range (1 pt or 4%)
   Scoring: 1 pt if range is within 50 nm.
   Rationale: Closer air-to-surface ranges are better.
   umber of MTR's available (3 pt or 11%).
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0 pt for 0 MTR's and 3 pt for max MTR's)
   Rationale: MTRs are required for training...more is better.
6. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (2 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (2 pts for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
7. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (1 pt or 4%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
8. Number of bisecting airways. (2 pts or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: Bisecting airways reduce training effectiveness in areas.

Airfields (17 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields usable for Strike/Adv E2/C2 pilot training (2 pt or 12%)
   Definition of usable field will be based on runway length (preliminary cutoff – 8000 ft)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: More outlying fields improve capacity and quality of training.
2. The # of usable outlying/auxiliary fields with IFR or night? capability. (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 1 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: This capability will help reduce congestion at the home field.
3. Median distance to outlying/auxiliary fields. (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between some min and max(1 pt for min distance, 0 pt for max)
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.
4. Runway length of longest runway at main airfield. (2 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 8K and 12K ft (1 pt for 8K ft runway , 2 points for 12K ft runway)
   Rationale: Longer runway is better for safety reasons
5. Number of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pt or 41%)
   Scoring:
   With 0 crosswind runways: 2 pts for first runway, 4 pts for 2 parallel runways, 6 pts for 3 parallel runways without crosswind runways.
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
6. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
7. Condition of taxiways/aprons – % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
8. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
9. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (10 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

[redacted]

Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

3. Amount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (1.5 pt or 15%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
6. Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (.5 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.
2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

Special Military Facilities (4 points)

1. Does installation have munitions loading pad? (2 pt or 50%)
Scoring: 2 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Munitions loading pad to handle hot cargo.
2. Does installation have weapons storage and handling facilities? (2 pt or 50%)
Scoring: 2 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Weapons storage is necessary to handle munitions for the IFF program.

Proximity to Training Areas (3 points)

1. Is there a carrier qual operating area within 100 nm of the site? (3 pts or 100%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 50 nm and 100 nm (3 pts for 50 nm or less, 0 pts for 100 nm or more)
Rationale: Strike training requires accessibility to a carrier.

Proximity to Other Support Facilities (2 points)

1. Number of other airfields in the area with instrument capability that could support Strike/Adv E2/C2 pilot training (1 pt or 50%)
Scoring: 0.5 pts for 1 field, 1 pt for 2 or more fields
Rationale: More available airfields are better.
2. Distance to other airfields. (1 pt or 50%)
Scoring: .5 pts for 1 field less than 30 miles, 1 pt for 2 or more fields less than 30 miles
Rationale: Closer airfields are better.

Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.
2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.
3. There have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (6 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1.5 pts or 25%)
Scoring: 1.5 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
2. What is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (2 pts or 33%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 17%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
4. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.
6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (8 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (2 pt or 25%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR
AIRLIFT/TANKER

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	6	This area was weighted about the same as Primary (5%) because *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	9	This area was weighted less than Primary (14%) due to the increased proficiency of the students, and a more weather-capable aircraft.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	24	This area was weighted higher than Primary (22%) because there is greater emphasis on area work and approaches at other airfields in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Airfields	22	This area was weighted lower than Primary (24%) because there is less emphasis on pattern work in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Ground Training Facilities	10	This was weighted the same as Primary because the role classrooms, simulators, and other facilities play in advanced training is the same.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	This was weighted the same as Primary because training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	0	N/A
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	5	This area was weighted higher than Primary (2%) because this type of training relies more on the surrounding infrastructure.
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	6	This area is slightly higher than Primary (5%) due to the generally larger AICUZ footprint of the advanced training aircraft.
Services	8	This area was weighted the same as Primary because quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Airlift/Tanker* Pilot Training

Managed Training Areas (6 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support Airlift/Tanker training. (2.5 pt or 42%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 2 (0 pt for 0 fields, 2.5 pts for 2 fields)
   Rational: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training
2. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports Airlift/Tanker training. (3.5 pt or 58%)
   Scoring: 1.5 pt for MOA, 1 pt for WA, 0.5 pt for MTR, 0.5 for AA
   Rational: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training

Weather (9 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 1500/3. (3 pt or 33%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 3 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USAF weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time weather is better than 1000/3. (2 pt or 22%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 2 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USN weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
3. Percent of time crosswinds are less than 15 knots. (2 pt or 22%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (0 pt for min% and 2 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max crosswinds for majority of student training. Higher % is
   [illegible]
   [illegible]rcent of time crosswinds are greater than 25 knots. (.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (.5 pt for min% and 0 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max aircraft crosswind limits. Lower % is better.
5. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (.5 pt for 5% and 0 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.
6. Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (1 pt or 11%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and .5 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (24 points)

1. Amount of airspace (MOA/WA and AA) in nm^3 (14 pt or 58%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of weighted airspace from 0 to max airspace (MOA and .8 AA) (0 pt for 0 nm^3 and 14 pt for max nm^3). Weighted airspace for each site = amount of MOA airspace + .8(amount of AA airspace)
   Rationale: More airspace is better, MOA is slightly better than AA. Airlift/Tanker require more airspace than Primary pilot training.
2. Average distance to airspace (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 2 pt for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^3 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA/WA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale:
3. Number of MTR's available (3 pt or 12.5%).
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0 pt for 0 MTR's and 3 pt for max MTR's)
   Rationale: MTRs are required for training...more is better.
4. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (2 pt or [illegible])
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (2 pt for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
5. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (1 pt or 4%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
6. Number of bisecting airways. (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: Bisecting airways reduce training effectiveness in areas.

Airfields (22 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields usable for Airlift/Tanker pilot training (2 pt or 9%)
   Definition of usable field will be based on runway length (preliminary cutoff -- 7000 ft)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: More outlying fields improve capacity and quality of training.
2. The # of usable outlying/auxiliary fields with IFR or night? capability. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: This capability will help reduce congestion at the home field.
3. Median distance to outlying/auxiliary fields. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between some min and max (2 pt for min distance, 1 pt for max)
   Rationale: Closer outlying fields are better.
4. Runway length of longest runway at main airfield. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 6000 and 10000 ft (1 pt for 5000 ft runway , 2 points for 10000 ft runway)
   Rationale: longer runway is better for safety reasons
5. Number of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pt or 29%)
   Scoring
   With 0 crosswind runways: 2 pts for first runway, 4 pts for 2 parallel runways, 6 pts for 3 parallel runways without crosswind runways.
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
6. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
7. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (1.5 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
8. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (1.75 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
9. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (1.75 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (10 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

'mount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (1.5 pt or 15%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

6. Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (.5 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.

2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.

3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

'imity to Other Support Facilities (5 points)

Number of other airfields in the area with instrument capability that could support airlift/tanker pilot training (4 pt or 80%)
Scoring: 2 pts for 1 field, 4 pts for 2 or more fields)
Rationale: More available airfields are better.

2. Distance to other airfields. (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: .5 pts for 1 field less than 30 miles, 1 pt for 2 or more fields less than 30 miles
Rationale: Closer airfields are better.

Air Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.

2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.

3. There have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (6 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1.5 pts or 25%)
Scoring: 1.5 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.

[redacted]at is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (2 pts or 33%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.

3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 17%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.

4. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.

5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.

6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (8 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.

2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.

3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.

4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.

5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (2 pt or 25%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.

6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.

7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.

8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.

9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR
MARITIME / INT E-2 & C-2

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	6	This area was weighted about the same as Primary (5%) because *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	9	This area was weighted less than Primary (14%) due to the increased proficiency of the students, and a more weather-capable aircraft.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	24	This area was weighted higher than Primary (22%) because there is greater emphasis on area work and approaches at other airfields in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Airfields	22	This area was weighted lower than Primary (24%) because there is less emphasis on pattern work in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Ground Training Facilities	10	This was weighted the same as Primary because the role classrooms, simulators, and other facilities play in advanced training is the same.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	This was weighted the same as Primary because training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	0	N/A
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	5	This area was weighted higher than Primary (2%) because this type of training relies more on the surrounding infrastructure.
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	6	This area is slightly higher than Primary (5%) due to the generally larger AICUZ footprint of the advanced training aircraft.
Services	8	This area was weighted the same as Primary because quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Maritime/Int E2/C2* Pilot Training

Managed Training Areas (6 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support Maritime/Int E2/C2 training. (2.5 pt or 42%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 2 (0 pt for 0 fields, 2.5 pts for 2 fields)
   Rationale: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training
2. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports Maritime/Int E2/C2 training. (3.5 pt or 58%)
   Scoring: 1.5 pt for MOA, 1 pt for WA, 0.5 pt for MTR, 0.5 for AA
   Rationale: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training

Weather (9 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 1500/3. (3 pt or 33%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 3 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USAF weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time weather is better than 1000/3. (2 pt or 22%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 2 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USN weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
3. Percent of time crosswinds are less than 15 knots. (2 pt or 22%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (0 pt for min% and 2 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max crosswinds for majority of student training. Higher % is
   .
   .rcent of time crosswinds are greater than 25 knots. (.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (.5 pt for min% and 0 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max aircraft crosswind limits. Lower % is better.
5. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (.5 pt for 5% and 0 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.
6. Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (1 pt or 11%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and .5 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (24 points)

1. Amount of airspace (MOA/WA and AA) in nm^3 (14 pt or 58%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of weighted airspace from 0 to max airspace (MOA and .8 AA) (0 pt for 0 nm^3 and 14 pt for max nm^3). Weighted airspace for each site = amount of MOA airspace + .8(amount of AA airspace)
   Rationale: More airspace is better, MOA is slightly better than AA. Maritime/Int E2/C2 require more airspace than Primary pilot training.
2. Average distance to airspace (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 2 pt for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^3 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA/WA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale: Closer airspace is better.
3. Number of MTR's available (3 pt or 12.5%).
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0 pt for 0 MTR's and 3 pt for max MTR's)
   Rationale: MTRs are required for training...more is better.
   `rcent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (2 pt or
)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (2 pt for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
5. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (1 pt or 4%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
6. Number of bisecting airways. (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: Bisecting airways reduce training effectiveness in areas.

Airfields (22 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields usable for Maritime/Int E2/C2 pilot training (2 pt or 9%)
   Definition of usable field will be based on runway length (preliminary cutoff -- 5000 ft)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: More outlying fields improve capacity and quality of training.
2. The # of usable outlying/auxiliary fields with IFR or night? capability. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 2 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: This capability will help reduce congestion at the home field.
3. Median distance to outlying/auxiliary fields. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between some min and max (2 pt for min distance, 1 pt for max)
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.
4. Runway length of longest runway at main airfield. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5000 and 8000 ft (1 pt for 5000 ft runway , 2 points for 8000 ft runway)
   Rationale: longer runway is better for safety reasons
5. Number of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pt or 29%)
   Scoring:
   With 0 crosswind runways: 2 pts for first runway, 4 pts for 2 parallel runways, 6 pts for 3 parallel runways without crosswind runways.
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
6. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
7. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (1.5 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
8. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (1.75 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
9. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (1.75 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (10 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

mount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (1.5 pt or 15%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
6. Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (.5 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.
2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

Proximity to Other Support Facilities (5 points)

umber of other airfields in the area with instrument capability that could upport Maritime/Int E2/C2 pilot training (4 pt or 80%)
Scoring: 2 pts for 1 field, 4 pts for 2 or more fields)
Rationale: More available airfields are better.
2. Distance to other airfields. (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: .5 pts for 1 field less than 30 miles, 1 pt for 2 or more fields less than 30 miles
Rationale: Closer airfields are better.

Air Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.
2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.
3. There have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (6 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1.5 pts or 25%)
Scoring: 1.5 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
hat is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (2 pts or 33%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 17%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
4. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.
6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (8 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (2 pt or 25%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR
NFO/NAV PRIMARY & INTERMEDIATE

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	5	The questions addressed in this area are focused toward ownership of special use airspace, air-to ground ranges, and outlying fields. In this analysis, *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	14	This weight was used because students in primary flight training need better weather than students in the advanced tracks.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	22	This area was weighted heavily due to the direct impact it has on primary flight training. Much of the training takes place in special use airspace; therefore, this area plays a large role in determining the training effectiveness of an installation.
Airfields	24	This area is weighted the heaviest due to the emphasis primary training places on pattern activities. This area plays a big role in evaluating the effectiveness of a training installation.
Ground Training Facilities	10	This weight is commensurate with the role classrooms, simulators, and other facilities play in flight training.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	Training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	0	N/A
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	2	This area looks at the local area to determine what other facilities are available. The overall training infrastructure is already established and in use at each base so the impact in this area should be minimal.
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	5	Encroachment plays a role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission; however, training aircraft do not have a large impact on encroachment issues.
Services	8	Quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission and this weight will be applied to the other training functions.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Primary NFO/NAV* Training

Managed Training Areas (5 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support primary NFO/NAV training. (2.5 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 2 (0 pt for 0 fields, 2.5 pts for 2 fields)
   Rationale: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training
2. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports primary training. (2.5 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: 1.5 pt for MOA, 1 for AA
   Rationale: Owning airfields and airspace have equal impact on training

Weather (14 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 1500/3. (4 pt or 29%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 4 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USAF weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time weather is better than 1000/3. (3 pt or 21%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 3 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USN weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
3. Percent of time crosswinds are less than 15 knots. (3 pt or 21%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (0 pt for min% and 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max crosswinds for majority of student training. Higher % is better.
4. Percent of time crosswinds are greater than 25 knots. (1 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (1 pt for min% and 0 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max aircraft crosswind limits. Lower % is better.
5. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (1 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and 0 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.
6. Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (2 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (2 pt for 5% and 1 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-4.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (22 points)

1. Amount of airspace (MOA and AA) in nm^3 (13 pt or 59%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of weighted airspace from 0 to max airspace (MOA and .8 AA) (0 pt for 0 nm^3 and 13 pt for max nm^3). Weighted airspace for each site = amount of MOA airspace + .8(amount of AA airspace)
   Rationale: More airspace is better, MOA is slightly better than AA.
2. Average distance to airspace (4 pt or 18%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 4 pt for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^3 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale: Closer airspace is better.
3. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (2 pt for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
4. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (1 pt or 4%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
5. Number of bisecting airways. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: Bisecting airways reduce training effectiveness in areas.

Airfields (24 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields usable for primary Nav/NFO training (4 pt or 17%)
   Definition of usable field will be based on runway length (preliminary cutoff -- 5000 ft)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 4 pt for max # fields)
   Rationale: More outlying fields improve capacity and quality of training.
2. Median distance to outlying/auxiliary fields. (3 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between some min and max (3 pts for min distance, 1 pt for max)
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.
3. Runway length of longest runway at main airfield. (3 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5000 and 8000 ft (1 pt for 5000 ft runway , 3 points for 8000 ft runway)
   Rationale: longer runway is better for safety reasons
4. Number of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pt or 29%)
   Scoring:
   With 0 crosswind runways: 2 pts for first runway, 4 pts for 2 parallel runways, 6 pts for 3 parallel runways without crosswind runways.
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
5. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (2 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
6. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (1.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
7. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (1.75 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
8. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (1.75 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.75 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (10 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
3. Amount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (1.5 pt or 15%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)

[redacted]

[redacted]

Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

[redacted]ondition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (.5 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
   Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.
2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

Proximity to Other Support Facilities (2 points)

1. Number of other airfields in the area that could support primary NFO/NAV training (1 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: .5 pt for 1 field, 1 pt for 2 or more fields)
   Rationale: More available airfields are better.
2. Distance to other airfields. (1 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: .5 pt for 1 field less than 30 miles, 1 pt for 2 or more fields less than 30 miles
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.

Air Quality (5 points)

the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-? (3 pt or 60%)
Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.

2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.
3. There have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (5 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1 pts or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
2. What is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (1.5 pts or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1.5 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
4. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.

Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 10%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (8 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
   Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR
WSO / STRIKE

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	6	This area was weighted about the same as Primary (5%) because *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	7	This area was weighted less than Primary (14%) due to the increased proficiency of the students, and a more weather-capable aircraft.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	22	This area was weighted the same as Primary because of the direct impact it has on advanced flight training.
Airfields	22	This area was weighted lower than Primary (24%) because there is less emphasis on pattern work in advanced training than there is in Primary training.
Ground Training Facilities	17	This was weighted more than Primary because of the greater role classrooms, simulators, and other facilities play in advanced training.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	This was weighted the same as Primary because training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	0	N/A
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	2	This area was weighted the same as Primary because the training infrastructure is already established and in use at each base.
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	6	This area is slightly higher than Primary (5%) due to the generally larger AICUZ footprint of the advanced training aircraft.
Services	8	This area was weighted the same as Primary because quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *WSO/Strike* Training

Managed Training Areas (6 points)

1. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports WSO./Strike training. (6 pt or 100%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for MOA, 2pts for WA/Restricted Area, 1 pt for MTR, 1 pt for AA
   Rationale: NFO/WSO training require special use airspace.

Weather (7 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 3000/5. (2 pt or 29%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (0.5 pts for 80% and 2 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: Weather requirements to best conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time crosswinds are greater than 25 knots. (1 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (1 pt for min% and 0 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max aircraft crosswind limits. Lower % is better.
3. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (2 pts or 29%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (2 pts for 5% and 1 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-2.
4. Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (2 pts or 28%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (2 pt for 5% and 1 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-2.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (22 points)

mount of airspace (MOA/WA and AA) in nm^3 (10 pt or 45%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of weighted airspace from 0 to max airspace (MOA/WA and .8 AA) (0 pt for 0 nm^3 and 10 pt for max nm^3). Weighted airspace for each site = amount of MOA/WA airspace + .8(amount of AA airspace)
   Rationale: More airspace is better, MOA/WA is slightly better than AA.
2. Average distance to airspace (3 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 3 pt for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^3 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA/WA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale: Closer airspace is better.
3. Number of MTR's available. (4 pt or 18%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0 pts for 0 and 4 pts for max)
   Rationale: MTRs are required for training...more is better.
4. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (2 pt for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
5. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (1 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
6. Number of bisecting airways. (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: Bisecting airways reduce training effectiveness in areas.

Airfields (22 points)

1. Runway length of longest runway at main airfield. (5 pts or 23%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5000 and 8000 ft (1 pt for 5000 ft runway, 5 pts for 8000 ft runway)
   Rationale: Longer runway is better for safety reasons
umber of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pts or 32%)
   Scoring:
   With 0 crosswind runways: 2 pts for first runway, 4 pts for 2 parallel runways, 6 pts for 3 parallel runways without crosswind runways.
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
3. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (3 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
4. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (3 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
5. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
6. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (17 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (5 pt or 29%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (2 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
3. Amount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (5 pt or 3029
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (2 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (2 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
6. Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
   Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.
2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

dimity to Other Support Facilities (2 points)

umber of other airfields in the area that could support NFO/NAV training (1 pt or 50%)
Scoring: .5 pt for 1 field, 1 pt for 2 or more fields)
Rationale: More available airfields are better.

2. Distance to other airfields. (1 pt or 50%)
Scoring: .5 pt for 1 field less than 30 miles, 1 pt for 2 or more fields less than 30 miles
Rationale: Closer airfields are better.

Air Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.
2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.
3. There have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (6 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1.5 pts or 25%)
Scoring: 1.5 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
hat is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (2 pts or 33%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 17%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
4. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.
6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 8%)
Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (8 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? pt or 25%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR
PANEL NAVIGATOR

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	5	This area was weighted the same as Primary (5%) because *accessibility* to these facilities was considered more important than ownership.
Weather	7	This area was weighted significantly lower than Primary (14%) because the crew and aircraft are fully qualified to fly in instrument conditions.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	22	This area was weighted the Primary (22%) because of the unique airspace needs of this mission.
Airfields	23	This area was weighted about the same as Primary (24%) because it also plays a big role in evaluating a training installation.
Ground Training Facilities	20	This area was weighted higher than Primary (10%) due to the higher emphasis on classroom and simulator activities.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	This was weighted the same as Primary because training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	0	N/A
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	0	N/A
Unique Features	0	N/A
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	5	Encroachment plays a role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission; however, training aircraft do not have a large impact on encroachment issues.
Services	8	This area was weighted the same as Primary because quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Panel Navigator* Training

Managed Training Areas (5 points)

1. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports Panel Nav training. (5 pts or 100%)
   Scoring: 5 pts for MTR
   Rationale: MTRs are the primary special use airspace utilized.

Weather (7 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 3000/5. (2.5 pt or 36%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 2.5 pts for 95%)
   Rationale: Weather requirements to best conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time crosswinds are greater than 25 knots. (2.5 pts or 36%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between min% and max% (2.5 pts for min% and 0 pt for max%)
   Rationale: Max aircraft crosswind limits. Lower % is better.
3. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (1 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and 0.5 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-2.
4. Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (1 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and 0.5 pt for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-2.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (22 points)

1. Number of MTR's available. (8 pts or 36%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0 pts for 0 and 8 pts for max)
   Rationale: MTRs are required for training...more is better.
2. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (6 pt or 27%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (6 pt for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
3. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (4 pts or 18%)
   Scoring: 4 pts for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
4. Are there any planned changes to the major air traffic structures in the region that will affect installation operations? (2 pts or 9%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Fewer changes in the current airspace structure is better.
5. Are current operations affected by major air traffic structures within 50 nm of the airfield? (2 pts or 9%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Less impact on major air structures is better.

Airfields (23 points)

1. Runway length of longest runway at main airfield. (6 pts or 26%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 7000 and 10000 ft (1 pt for 7000 ft runway, 6 pts for 10000 ft runway)
   Rationale: Longer runway is better for safety reasons
2. Number of primary runways that can support concurrent ops and crosswind runways at main field. (7 pts or 30%)
   Scoring:
   With 0 crosswind runways: 2 pts for first runway, 4 pts for 2 parallel runways, 6 pts for 3 parallel runways without crosswind runways.
   With 1 crosswind runway: 3 pts for first primary runway, 5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 non-parallel crosswind runways: 3.5 pts for first primary runway, 5.5 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   With 2 parallel crosswind runways: 4 pts for first primary runway, 6 pts for 2 parallel runways, 7 pts for 3 parallel runways.
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
3. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (3 pt or 14%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
4. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (3 pts or 13%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
5. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (2 pt or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
6. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (2 pts or 9%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (20 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (5.5 pt or 27%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 5.5 pts for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (2.5 pt or 13%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2.5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
3. Amount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (5.5 pt or 27%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 5.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (2.5 pt or 13%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2.5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (2.5 pt or 13%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
6. Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1.5 pt or 7%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
   Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.
2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

Air Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.
2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no

[redacted]

[redacted]

Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.

[redacted]ere have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)

Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no

Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (5 points)

1. Is the existing AICUZ study encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1.5 pts or 25%)
   Scoring: 1.5 pts for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
2. What is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (2 pts or 33%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (2 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 17%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
4. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.
6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

[redacted]**ces (8 points)**

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
   Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

MEASURES OF MERIT FOR
HELICOPTER

MEASURES OF MERIT	WEIGHT	RATIONALE
Managed Training Areas	8	This area was weighted about the same as Primary (5%) because ownership of these facilities was considered more important than accessibility.
Weather	9	This area was weighted significantly lower than Primary (14%) due to the lower weather requirements for helicopter training.
Airspace and Flight Training Areas	16	This area was weighted significantly lower than Primary (22%) because much of the helicopter training is conducted in uncontrolled airspace.
Airfields	24	This was weighted the same as Primary (24%) due to the similar infrastructure needs for helicopter training.
Ground Training Facilities	10	This area was weighted the same as Primary (10%) due to the similar emphasis on classroom and simulator activities.
Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	5	This was weighted the same as Primary because training aircraft are not difficult to maintain and do not require an extensive training infrastructure.
Special Military Facilities	0	N/A
Proximity to Training Areas	0	N/A
Proximity to Other Support Facilities	2	This area was weighted the same as Primary because the training infrastructure is already established and in use at each base.
Unique Features	8	This was weighted higher than Primary (0) due to requirement of unique features to support helo training (ITAS - Instrumented Training Airway System, HLT (Helicopter Landing Trainer - afloat platform))
Air Quality	5	This has been baselined due to like aircraft.
Encroachment	5	Encroachment plays a role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission; however, training aircraft do not have a large impact on encroachment issues.
Services	8	This area was weighted the same as Primary because quality of life plays a significant role in determining installation compatibility with the training mission.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Questions for Assessing the Functional Quality of *Helicopter* Pilot Training

Managed Training Areas (8 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields that are controlled/owned by the installation and support Helicopter training. (6 pt or 75%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 fields, 6 pts for max fields)
   Rationale: Owning airfields has more impact on helo training than owning airspace.
2. The number and type of special use airspace that is controlled/owned by the installation and supports Helicopter training. (2 pts or 25%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for MOA and or AA
   Rationale: Owning airfields has more impact on helo training than owning airspace.

Weather (9 points)

1. Percent of time weather is better than 1000/3. (4 pts or 44%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 4 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USN weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
2. Percent of time weather is better than 500/1. (3 pt or 33%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 80% and 100% (1 pt for 80% and 3 pt for 95%)
   Rationale: USA weather requirements to conduct training. Higher % is better.
3. Percent of sorties canceled/rescheduled. (1 pt or 11%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and 0 pts for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-2.
   Official Planning factor for lost sorties due to weather. (1 pt or 11%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 5% and 20% (1 pt for 5% and 0 pts for 20%)
   Rationale: This area captures weather attrition not covered by questions 1-2.

Airspace and Flight Training Areas (16 points)

1. Amount of special use airspace (MOA and AA) in nm^2 (2 pt or 13%).
   Scoring: Linear scale of weighted airspace from 0 to max airspace (MOA and .8 AA) (0 pt for 0 nm^2 and 2 pt for max nm^2). Weighted airspace for each site = amount of MOA airspace + .8(amount of AA airspace)
   Rationale: More airspace is better, MOA is slightly better than AA.
2. Average distance to airspace (1 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max weighted average airspace size times distance (0 pt for min and 1 pt for max). Weighted average airspace size times distance for each site = Sum (airspace size in nm^2 times distance to airspace in nm) for all MOA or AA divided by the Sum of all airspace size.
   Rationale: Closer airspace is better.
3. Percent of flight ops experiencing ATC delays of 15 minutes or greater. (3 pts or 19%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (3 pt for 0 % delays and 0 pts for max % delay)
   Rationale: Fewer ATC delays is better.
4. Planned commercial hub within 100 miles. (2 pts or 13%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Commercial hub will impact training. No hub is better.
5. Are there any planned changes to the major air traffic structures that supports flight training at your installation that will negatively impact on UPT? (2 pts or 13%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Fewer changes in the current airspace structure is better.
   Are installation operations currently affected by the major air traffic structures within 50 nm of the airspace and airfields? (2 pts or 13%)
   Scoring: 2 pts for no and 0 pt for yes.
   Rationale: Less impact on major air structures is better.
7. Availability of required specific terrain features or overwater access to support helo training (4 pts or 25%)
   Scoring: 3 pts for terrain, 1 pt for overwater access
   Rationale: Helo training requires specific terrain feature to train effectively.

Airfields (24 points)

1. The # of outlying/auxiliary fields usable for Helicopter pilot training (5 pt or 21%)
   Definition of usable field - should support emergency procedures for TH 57/67
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 5 pts for max # fields)
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
2. The # of usable outlying/auxiliary fields with night/night vision goggle capability. (4 pts or 17%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pt for 0 fields, 4 pts for max # fields)
   Rationale: More runways improve quality of training for safety reasons and flexibility
3. Median distance to outlying/auxiliary fields. (3 pts or 13%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between some min and max (3 pt for min distance, 1 pt for max)
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.
4. Number of lanes that can support UHPT. Must be able to support emergency procedures for TH-57/67. (4 pts or 17%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pts for no lanes, 4 pts for max lanes)
   Rationale: More lanes are better for safety reasons; less congestion
5. Condition of runways -- % of runway sq ft in adequate condition (2 pts or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pts for 0%, 2 pts for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the runway. Higher quality is better.
6. Condition of taxiways/aprons -- % of taxiways/aprons sq ft in adequate condition (2 pts or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pts for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the taxiways. Higher quality is better.
7. Condition of utilities -- ave % of facilities in adequate condition (2 pts or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pts for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the utilities. Higher quality is better.
8. Condition of other facilities (e.g., term, admin) -- ave % of facilities in adeq cond (2 pts or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pts for 100%)
   Rationale: This indicates the quality of the facilities. Higher quality is better.

Ground Training Facilities (10 points)

1. Amount of training facilities (classrooms) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
2. Condition of training facilities (classrooms) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
3. Amount of training facilities (trainers) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (3 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 3 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
4. Condition of training facilities (trainers) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (1 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.
5. Amount of training facilities (other) rated "adequate" in sq ft. (1.5 pt or 15%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Condition of training facilities (other) - % of "adequate" sq ft. (.5 pt or 5%)
Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
Rationale: This measures the amount and quality of the training facilities. More quality is better.

Aircraft Maintenance Facilities (5 points)

1. Level of maintenance operations at site (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for O-level, 2 pt for I-level, 2.5 pt for Depot level, 3 pt for Depot level for aircraft type (TMS)
   Rationale: Higher level of maintenance is better.
2. Amount of hangars rated "adequate" in sq ft (1.5 pt or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 1.5 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" hangar space is better.
3. Condition of hangars - % of hangars in "adequate" condition (.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .5 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: This is another measure of installation quality. Higher % is better.

Proximity to Other Support Facilities (2 points)

1. Number of other airfields in the area that could support Helicopter pilot training (1 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: .5 pt for 1 field, 1 pt for 2 or more fields)
   Rationale: More available airfields are better.
2. Distance to other airfields. (1 pt or 50%)
   Scoring: .5 pt for 1 field less than 30 miles, 1 pt for 2 or more fields less than 30 miles
   Rationale: Closer airfields are better.

Unique Features (8 points)

1. Identify unique features (functions, equipment, etc.) possessed by the installation that support UHPT (8 pts or 100%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and some max (0 pts for 0 features, and 8 pts for max features)
   Rationale: If there is a unique feature already at a base to support training in a given function it should be recognized.

Air Quality (5 points)

1. Is the air station in an attainment or maintenance area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (3 pt or 60%)
   Scoring: 3 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Attainment and maintenance areas are best.
2. Is the air station in a moderate non-attainment area or better area for CO, ozone, and PM-10? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Moderate and marginal non-attainment (as well as attainment and maintenance) are better than Serious, Severe, and Extreme non-attainment.
3. There have been no restrictions or delays due to air quality considerations (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: 1 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Fewer restrictions are better.

Encroachment (5 points)

1. Has the existing AICUZ study been completed and encoded in local zoning ordinances? (1 pts or 20%)
   Scoring: .5 pt for having completed the study and 1 pt for being encoded.
   Rationale: Having an existing AICUZ study in the zoning ordinance is best.
2. What is the percent incompatible land use for clear zones? (1.5 pts or 30%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1.5 pts for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
3. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ I? (1 pt or 20%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (1 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
4. What is the percent incompatible land use for APZ II? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pts for max).
   Rationale: The lower amount of incompatible land use is better.
5. Are real estate disclosures required by local communities? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: Real estate disclosures are best.
6. Has all clear zone acquisition been completed? (0.5 pt or 10%)
   Scoring: 0.5 pt for yes, 0 pt for no
   Rationale: It is best if all clear zones have been acquired.

Services (8 points)

1. Amount of BOQ rooms rated "adequate" (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, 2 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
2. Condition of BOQ rooms - % of "adequate" (1 pt or 12%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, 1 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
3. Amount of BEQ rooms rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
4. Condition of BEQ rooms - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" billeting space is better.
5. What percent of the listed MWR and support facilities/programs are available? (2 pt or 25%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to 100 (0 pt for 0 and 2 pt for 100).
   Rationale: More MWR facilities are better to enhance quality of life.
6. Amount of military housing rated "adequate" (.6 pt or 8%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and max (0 pt for 0 %, .6 pt for max%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
7. Condition of military housing - % of "adequate" (.4 pt or 5%)
   Scoring: Linear scale between 0 and 100 (0 pt for 0 %, .4 pt for 100%)
   Rationale: More "adequate" housing is better.
8. Number of children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Fewer children on waiting list is better.
9. Average wait for children on the waiting list. (0.5 pt or 6%)
   Scoring: Linear scale from 0 to max (0.5 pt for 0 and 0 pt for max).
   Rationale: Less waiting time for child care is better.

[redacted]

Approved 8/11/94

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS FOR ASSESSING FUNCTIONAL VALUE

1. Helo: Airspace and flight training areas (Q1 MoM) - Recommend including warning areas and restricted areas. Rationale: Certified data indicated usage by training air stations of those areas.

2. Helo: Airspace and flight training areas (Q10 - MV) - Recommend only using flight training areas within 30NM vice 100NM. Rationale: Time and distance limitations [30NM at 90kts = 20 min. enroute to area] to maximize training value.

3. Helo: Airfields (Q4 MoM) - Recommend change question to read "Number of simultaneous helicopter operations that can be safely supported at outlying fields that can support UHPT." Rationale: To capture the amount of helicopter ops at outlying fields that support helicopter ops in common terms.

(Note - Army emergency and night vision goggle procedures training and qualification require hard/lighted pads [lanes]. These procedures cannot be performed at Navy outlying fields as currently configured for UHPT. This dissimilarity will be addressed by the COBRA model runs).

4. All Training Air Stations: Capacity Data Call, housing and messing - Provide total number of BOQ/BEQ rooms and the percentage that are adequate/permanent. Rationale: Amplifying data required to complete the intended analysis.

5. Airfields: (Q2 MoM for all functions less helicopter) - Recommend change question to read "Number of outlying/auxiliary fields with IFR capability." Rationale: To delineate the higher order of magnitude.

6. Strike Training; Special Military Facilities: (Q3 MV) - Recommend change question to read "Can the installation load training munitions, to include forward firing training munitions, on training aircraft?" Rationale: Clarification required to make the data received meaningful.

7. Primary and Primary NFO/NAV Training; Airfields: (Q1 MoM) - Recommend change question to limit "# of outlying/auxiliary fields" to those within 50NM. Rationale: Time and distance limitations.

8. For all calculations of Special Use Airspace in cubic nautical miles for airspace it was agreed to an airspace altitude cap of 45,000 ft. Rationale: 1) No rational utilization of the higher airspace by UPT aircraft, 2) similar special use airspace capped at 45,000 ft., and 3) all other airspace altitude ceilings limited to lower levels by external factors.

SECTION THREE (D)

CAPACITY - RESOURCE ANALYSIS

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

FACTORS	HISTORICAL	REQUIREMENTS: PROG'MED TRAINING (SYLLABI) (A)	REQUIREMENTS: PROG'MED GRADS (B)	REQUIRED CAPACITY (AxB)	MAX AVAILABLE CAPACITY (C)	EXCESS CAPACITY (C-(AxB))
TRAINING SORTIES	SORTIES/ GRAD SYLLABUS •OVERHEAD PG 6 # 5 PG 14 #2	SORTIES/ GRAD •MAJCOM PG 9 # 2	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR PG 4 #1 & 2	SORTIES/ YEAR	SORTIES/ YEAR PG 18 # 16	SORTIES/ YEAR
AIRFIELD OPS	OPS/SORTIE •TRAFFIC CNT PG 17 # 10 •TOT # SORTIES PG 14 # 2	OPS/GRAD •MAJCOM PG 9 # 2 X =	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	OPS/YEAR	OPS/YEAR PG 17 # 9	OPS/YEAR
AIRSPACE BLOCK = #BF # ALT/AIRCRAFT	BLOCKS AVAILABLE BLOCK HOURS AVAILABLE SYLLABUS •OVERHEAD •MX PG 22 # 1	AIRSPACE BLOCK HRS GRAD •MAJCOM PG 8 # 1	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	AIRSPACE BLOCK HRS YEAR	HOURS # OF AREAS X AVAILABLE YEAR = AIRSPACE BLOCK HRS YEAR PG 22 # 1	AIRSPACE BLOCK HRS YEAR
GROUND TRAINING	FACILITIES AVAILABLE FACILITY HOURS AVAIL/YEAR •SYLL + ATTRIT •CLASSROOMS •SIMULATORS •LIFE SPT TNG	FACILITY HRS GRAD •MAJCOM PG 10 # 1	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	FACILITY HRS YEAR	FACILITY HRS YEAR PG 25 # 1 PG 27 # 8	FACILITY HRS YEAR

6/12/94

CAPACITY ANALYSIS (CONT)

FACILITY FACTORS	HISTORICAL	REQUIREMENTS: PROG'MED TRAINING (SYLLABI) (A)	REQUIREMENTS: PROG'MED GRADS (B)	REQUIRED CAPACITY (AxB)	MAX AVAILABLE CAPACITY (C)	EXCESS CAPACITY (C-(AxB))
RAMPS/ APRONS/ TAXIWAYS	TOT FP USED # OF AIRCRAFT SUPPORTED FP / AIRCRAFT REQ PG 28 # 1	AIRCRAFT (GRAD/YEAR) PG 28 # 1 PG 4 # 1	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR PG 4 #1 & 2	AIRCRAFT	TOT FP AVAIL / FP / AIRCRAFT = AIRCRAFT PG 28 # 3	AIRCRAFT
HANGARS	HANGARS USED MX DOCKS/HANGAR AIRCRAFT/MX DOCK	AIRCRAFT (GRAD/YEAR)	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	AIRCRAFT	AC MX DOCK X BLOCK HANGAR X HANGAR = AIRCRAFT PG 29 # 4	AIRCRAFT
MAINTENANCE	FACILITIES USED # OF AIRCRAFT SUPPORTED AIRCRAFT / FACILITY REQ	AIRCRAFT (GRAD/YEAR)	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	AIRCRAFT	AC HOURS X HOURS AVAILABLE = AIRCRAFT PG 29 # 5	AIRCRAFT
SUPPLY/ STORAGE	TOT FP USED # OF AIRCRAFT SUPPORTED FP / AIRCRAFT REQ	AIRCRAFT (GRAD/YEAR)	GRADS/YEAR •PGL •PTR	AIRCRAFT	TOT FP AVAIL / FP / AIRCRAFT = AIRCRAFT PG 30 # 9	AIRCRAFT
HOUSING	CAPACITY USED STUDENTS/DAY PG 31 # 1	STUDENTS/DAY PG 4 # 1		STUDENTS/DAY	STUDENTS/DAY PG 32 # 5	STUDENTS/DAY
MESSING	CAPACITY USED STUDENTS/DAY PG 32 # 3	STUDENTS/DAY PG 4 # 1		STUDENTS/DAY	STUDENTS/DAY PG 32 # 5	STUDENTS/DAY

6/12/94

10/20/94

CAPACITY ANALYSIS FORMULATIONS

PROVIDED BELOW ARE THE FORMULAS USED IN THE COMPUTATION OF CAPACITY ANALYSIS DATA. THESE FORMULAS STANDARDIZE TO THE BEST EXTENT POSSIBLE THE DATA OF ALL SERVICES.

1. TRAINING SORTIES = AIRFIELD OPERATIONS AT THE MAIN BASE DIVIDED BY TWO (TWO IS THE BASE LINE NUMBER DERIVED FROM ONE TAKE-OFF AND ONE LANDING PER SORTIE AT HOME BASE).

2. DAYLIGHT AIRFIELD OPERATIONS = (FAA AIRFIELD OPERATIONS MODEL)(WEATHER FACTOR)(242)(12) FAA MODEL IS BASED ON RUNWAY CONFIGURATION. WEATHER FACTOR IS BASED ON HISTORICAL DATA FROM EACH INSTALLATION. 242 IS THE NUMBER OF TRAINING DAYS. 12 IS THE NUMBER OF TRAINING HOURS IN ONE DAY. AIRFIELD OPERATIONS INCLUDES ALL OUTLYING FIELDS. NAVAL NUMBERS ARE BASED ON A WEATHER FACTOR INCORPORATED IN THE FAA MODEL. FOR WHITING FIELD THE RUNWAY OPERATIONS ARE BASED ON JPATS. THE HEAVIER WEIGHT OF NAVY AIRCRAFT CONSTRAINS OPERATIONS AT NAVAL AIR STATIONS RESULTING IN A LOWER AIRFIELD OPERATIONS CAPACITY.

3. AIRSPACE

FUNCTIONAL VALUE AIRSPACE = (AVAILABLE AIRSPACE WITHIN 100 NAUTICAL MILES OF THE MAIN FIELD TO INCLUDE ATCAA, BUT NOT WARNING AREAS FOR PRIMARY, PRINFO AND FLT SCREENING. ALL OTHER FUNCTIONS INCLUDE WARNING AREAS)(SQUARE NAUTICAL MILES)(ALTITUDE/6080). 6080 IS THE CONVERSION FACTOR OF FEET TO NAUTICAL MILES.

CAPACITY ANALYSIS AIRSPACE

BLOCK HOURS AVAILABLE = (BLOCKS OF CURRENTLY USED AIRSPACE) (12 HOURS PER DAY) (242 DAYS PER YEAR). BLOCKS OF AIRSPACE WERE DETERMINED BY SUMMING THE SQ NM OF CURRENTLY USED AIRSPACE AND DIVIDING IT INTO ADVANCED (200 SQ NM X 12000') AND PRIMARY (100 SQ NM X 5000') BLOCKS. (EXCEPTION: CORPUS CHRISTI WAS GIVEN CREDIT FOR W-228 BECAUSE THEY CONTROL/SCHEDULE THIS AIRSPACE) PRIMARY AND ADVANCED BLOCKS WERE DOUBLE STACKED WHERE POSSIBLE. THE CAPACITY NUMBERS REFLECT THE ADVANCED AIRSPACE BLOCKS CAPACITY. (EXCEPTIONS: NAS WHITING, HONDO, AND USAFA HAVE NO ADVANCED AIRSPACE BLOCKS; THEREFORE, PRIMARY AIRSPACE CAPACITY WAS USED)

4. GROUND TRAINING CLASS ROOM HOURS PER YEAR = DESIGN CAPACITY (IN TERMS OF STUDENTS) (8 HOURS PER DAY)(242 TRAINING DAYS) 8 HOURS IS A STANDARD TRAINING DAY. 242 IS THE STANDARDIZED TRAINING YEAR.

5. GROUND TRAINING SIMULATORS = (DESIGN STUDENT CAPACITY)(16 HRS PER DAY)(242 DAYS PER YEAR) 16 HOURS BASED ON AN AVERAGE AVAILABILITY OF SIMULATORS

6. RAMPS = (TOTAL NUMBER OF USABLE SQUARE YARDS OF PARKING SPACE)(.80) 80% IS BASED ON ACCESS REQUIREMENTS TO GET TO MAIN

TAXIWAY. (REFERENCE PENSACOLA CAPACITY ANALYSIS DATA CALL 19, FACILITIES, PARA D, QUESTION 3)

Rationale for Elimination of Capacity Measures 10/13/94

Training Sorties

Training sorties do not capture maximum airfield capacity. A sortie is a training event which contains as a subset additional manuevers which include touch and go's, full stop and missed approach landings. Maximum airfield operations require a full accounting of the total number of operations. Sorties do not capture that. A better measure of an airfields' maximum generated capacity is the total number of operations (take-offs, landings, touch and go's, etc.) that can be accomplished over a set period of time.

Hangars

Hangars are not required for the parking of aircraft or for most of the required maintenance in UPT. Accordingly, hangars are not a meaningful capacity constraint.

Maintenance/Supply/Storage

All maintenance on training aircraft is accomplished by contractors. Therefore, the capacity is more a function of the contract and the contractors capabilities than the base maintenance/supply/storage facilities.

Housing and Messing

Base housing is not a capacity constraint because it ignores the availability of off-base housing and current demographics for aviators under training. Messing facilities for military officers no longer exist.

1/10/94

11/10/94

12/17/94 Update

	Columbus	Corpus Christi	Ft Rucker	Kingsville	Laughlin	Meridian	Pensacola	Randolph	Reese	Sheppard	Vance	Whiting Field	Hondo	USAFA	
Site Military Value															
Functions for UPT	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	FV	DoD Requireme
Flight Screening	6.6	6.4	6.9	6.7	6.8	6.5	6.1	5.7	6.2	6.2	6.6	6.6	5.4	3.9	2,073
Primary Pilot	6.8	6.7	X2	7.0	7.0	6.8	6.4	6.7	6.0	6.3	6.8	6.6	0.0	0.0	2,493
Airlift/Tanker	6.3	6.5	X1	7.7	5.8	6.6	7.8	6.5	5.9	6.5	6.7	X1	0.0	0.0	752
Inter E2/C2, Adv Maritime	6.7	7.5	X2	7.6	6.5	6.6	7.5	6.4	5.9	6.5	6.8	7.4	0.0	0.0	273
Adv E2/C2, Strike	6.0	6.2	X1	7.3	5.4	6.3	7.6	6.0	5.7	6.2	5.3	X1	0.0	0.0	372
Adv Bomber/Fighter	6.4	X1	X1	7.3	5.5	6.8	7.8	6.8	5.6	6.3	5.5	X1	0.0	0.0	619
Helicopter	X2	X2	8.9	X2	X2	X2	6.5	X2	X2	X2	X2	7.2	0.0	0.0	1,481
Primary NFO, Inter NFO	6.9	6.7	X2	7.0	7.1	6.8	6.4	7.1	6.2	6.2	6.8	6.4	0.0	0.0	718
Adv NFO Strike	6.6	6.9	6.7	7.4	X3	6.5	7.6	6.1	X3	X3	X3	7.0	0.0	0.0	312
Adv NFO Panel	7.6	5.9	X1	7.2	6.8	7.0	7.6	6.9	7.2	7.7	7.5	X1	0.0	0.0	222

X1 - Runway length constraints X2 - Lack of outlying fields X3 - Too far from water

Resources	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap	Cap
Airfield Ops	784,371	752,136	7,441,016	389,136	787,572	389,136	270,072	619,768	686,547	646,988	685,390	865,392	554,664	651,630
Airspace	116,973	315,810	0	253,418	218,889	128,879	181,790	49,494	106,925	166,922	114,708	147,888	43,560	49,368
Ground Training Classroom	542,080	464,640	5,523,408	859,584	193,600	406,560	3,915,544	696,960	696,960	348,480	373,648	554,400	116,160	77,440
Ground Training Simulators	77,440	46,464	212,960	61,952	61,952	54,208	135,520	92,928	61,952	92,928	61,952	104,544	0	0
Aprons	209,840	540,367	392,726	240,614	217,378	241,166	299,395	501,946	282,496	394,125	223,645	386,667	251,200	46,122
* Normalized Airfield Ops	—	—	—	537,008	—	537,008	326,517	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Resources per student	Flight Screening	Primary Pilot	Airlift/Tanker	Inter E2/C2, Adv Maritime	Adv E2/C2, Strike	Adv Bomber/Fighter	Helicopter	Primary NFO, Inter NFO	Adv NFO Strike	Adv NFO Panel	
Training Sorties	24	94	88	44	166	132	137	33	70	13	Maximum requirements where duplicate training
Airfield Ops	526	1,156	405	496	1,393	926	1,288	248	280	39	"
Airspace	6	32	61	21	97	75	N/A	37	53	0	"
Ground Training Classroom	14	213	186	202	196	156	955	371	144	304	"
Ground Training Simulators	0	27	42	30	98	29	32	44	53	80	"
Aprons	18.81	181.92	357.60	190.01	303.45	357.35	190.62	60.31	239.59	201.00	"
* Normalized Airfield Ops	—	—	—	—	1922	—	—	—	386	54	

#Aircraft/student	0.0555	0.2274	0.2384	0.2088	0.3817	0.5105	0.2681	0.1058	0.1346	0.0402
SQ YDS/Aircraft	339	800	1,500	910	795	700	711	570	1,780	5,000
# Aircraft Required	113	567	179	57	142	316	397	76	42	9

No copies to be made without express permission of JCSG UPT Chairman

* Normalized Light/Heavy aircraft → Airfield Ops

STUDENT RESOURCE CALCULATION

Reference: (a) CNO ltr 1542, ser N889JG/4U61666 dated 20 July 1994

Flight Screening (T-3)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Hondo Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from the Hondo Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2 and Facilities paragraphs A.2 and A.10. Operations were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Traffic Count (Fac A.10) X Sorties/Student (M. R. B.2)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.2)}}$$

c. Airspace - Taken from the Hondo Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1. This number was divided by two to account for the fact that the requirement for primary airspace is half that for advanced airspace.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - Taken from the Hondo Capacity Analysis Mission Requirements, paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Hondo and USAFA Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1 Hondo \& USAFA) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Primary Pilot (T-34 and T-37)

a. Training Sorties - The JPATS syllabus requirement of 65 sorties was accepted as the standard number of syllabus sorties. USAF overhead on primary training is 60% while USN overhead is 30%. The JCS working group agreed to use an average overhead value of 45% which leads to a total sortie requirement of 94 (65 sorties + .45 x 65).

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from the Whiting Field Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2 and Facilities paragraphs A.2 and A.10 using the T-34 data (see spreadsheet). Operations were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Traffic Count (Fac A.10) X Sorties/Student (M. R. B.2)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.2)}}$$

$$= 12.3 \text{ ops/sortie}$$

Total ops = 94 sorties X 12.3 ops/sorties = 1156 operations

c. Airspace - The average block hours required were taken from the USAF Capacity Analysis data calls, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1. USAF block hour requirements were used because the current USAF syllabus more closely resembles the JPATS syllabus. This number was divided by two to account for the fact that the requirement for primary airspace is half that for advanced airspace.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The average Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the amendments to USAF Capacity Analysis data calls, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1. USAF requirements were used because the current USAF syllabus more closely resembles the JPATS syllabus.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. For USAF, SY/aircraft data for all aircraft, was taken from Randolf AFB

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Airlift/Tanker (T-1)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2. Reese AFB was used because they are the only ones fuly functional in Airlift/Tanker training.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2 and Facilities paragraphs A.2 and A.10 (see spreadsheet). Operations were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Traffic Count (Fac A.10)} \times \text{Sorties/Student (M. R. B.2)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.2)}}$$

c. Airspace - Taken from the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the amendments to the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Reese Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. SY/aircraft data was taken from Randolf AFB which provides this data for all USAF training aircraft.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Intermediate E2/C2 and Advance Maritime (T-44)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Corpus Christi Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from Corpus Christi Navy Capacity Analysis (Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph b.3. Advanced Maritime requirement was used because it was higher.

c. Airspace - Taken from the Corpus Christi Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the Corpus Christi Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Corpus Christi Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up). SY/aircraft data was taken from NAVFAC P-80 which provides this data for all USN training aircraft. Advanced Maritime PTR requirements were taken from reference (a) and intermediate E2/C2 were taken from the Corpus Christi Navy Capacity Analysis (Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph A.3.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirements.}}$$

Advance E2/C2 and Strike (T-45)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Kingsville Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2. NAS Kingsville was used because they are the only ones fully functional in T-45 training.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from Kingsville Navy Capacity Analysis (Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph b.3.

c. Airspace - Taken from the Kingsville Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the Kingsville Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Kingsville Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and Facilities paragraph D.3. Navy PTR requirements were taken from reference (a).

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Advance Fighter/Bomber (T-38)

a. Training Sorties - Used an average value taken from Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Used an average value taken from Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2 and Facilities paragraphs A.2 and A.10 (see spreadsheet). Operations were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Traffic Count (Fac A.10) X Sorties/Student (M. R. B.2)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.2)}}$$

c. Airspace - Used an average value taken from Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - For the Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required, used an average value taken from the amended Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance data calls, Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from Columbus, Laughlin, Sheppard, and Vance Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. SY/aircraft data was taken from Randolf AFB which provides this data for all USAF training aircraft.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Helicopter

a. Training Sorties - Used an average value taken from Fort Rucker and Whiting Field Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Used an average value taken from Whiting Field (USN Capacity Analysis, Data Call 2, Mission Requirements, paragraph b.3) and Fort Ruckers Capacity Analysis Facilities paragraphs A.13 and A.16. Fort Rucker ops were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Operations/student} = \frac{\text{Historic Operations (Fac A.13)}}{\text{Total Sorties (Fac A.16)}}$$

c. Airspace - Not Required for Helo training.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - For the Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required, used an average value taken from the Fort Rucker Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1. Fort Rucker had more extensive ground training requirements than did Whiting field.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from Whiting Field and Fort Rucker Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. For USN, SY/aircraft data was taken from NAVFAC P-80 which provides this data for all USN training aircraft. Navy PTR requirements were taken from reference (a).

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

Primary and Intermediate NFO (T-34)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Taken from Pensacola Navy Capacity Analysis (Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph b.3.

c. Airspace - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1. This number was divided by two to account for the fact that the requirement for primary airspace is half that for advanced airspace.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up). SY/aircraft data was taken from NAVFAC P-80 which provides this data for all USN training aircraft. Primary and Intermediate NFO PTR requirements were taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis (USN Data Call 2), Mission Requirements, paragraph A.3.

Ramps/student =

Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)
DoD Pilot Training Requirements.

Advance NFO Strike (T-39/T-2)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2. Used the Radar Intercept Officer (RIO) track because it is the longest.

b. Airfield Ops - Multiplied the number of required training sorties by 4 ops/sorties. Used military judgement to arrive at 4 ops/sortie - pilots are already trained and therefore don't need to practice take-offs and landings. One additional touch and go was included with each sortie.

c. Airspace - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph B.1. Summed the RIO in special use airspace.

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator hours required were taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1. Used the RIO track.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Pensacola Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up). SY/aircraft data was taken from NAVFAC P-80 which provides this data for all USN training aircraft. Navy PTR requirements were taken from reference (a).

Ramps/student =

Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1) X SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)
DoD Pilot Training Requirements.

Advance NFO Panel (T-43)

a. Training Sorties - Taken from the Randolf Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements, paragraph B.2.

b. Airfield Ops - Multiplied the number of sorties by 3 ops/sortie. Used military judgement to arrive at 3 ops/sortie - pilots are already trained and therefore don't need to practice take-offs and landings. One additional touch and go was included for every other sortie.

c. Airspace - All work is done in Airways and MTR's

d. Ground Training Classrooms/Simulators - The Ground Training Classroom/Simulator

hours required were taken from the amendments to the Randolf Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraph C.1.

e. Ramp Space - Taken from the Randolf Capacity Analysis, Mission Requirements paragraphs E.1 (See also supplemental data call paragraph E.2 follow-up) and A.1, and Facilities paragraph D.2. SY/aircraft data was taken from Randolf AFB which provides this data for all USAF training aircraft.

Ramps/student =

$$\frac{\text{Aircraft in DoD inventory (MR E.1)} \times \text{SY/Aircraft (Facilities D.2)}}{\text{DoD Pilot Training Requirement}}$$

SECTION FOUR

ANALYTICAL TOOL OUTPUT/RUNS

(REFER TO SECTION SIX MINUTES: 10/21 - 11/21 1994)

SECTION FIVE

ALTERNATIVES

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-4000

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

23 NOV 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR ARMY BASING STUDY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BASE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM
SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE CSAF FOR REALIGNMENT AND TRANSITION (USAF/RT)

SUBJECT: BRAC Alternatives Developed by the Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) Joint Cross-Service Group

This memorandum forwards the results of the UPT Joint Cross-Service Group's efforts. It provides three UPT BRAC alternatives for consideration and assessment by the military departments, along with an illustrative scenario for each alternative. Every alternative reduces excess capacity while maintaining high average military value. In developing these alternatives, the Joint Group focused on limiting moves of functions to new sites and on consolidation of functions. Further, the Joint Group's analysis incorporated the principles of the Deputy Secretary's memorandum on "Consolidation of Fixed-Wing Flight Training," dated October 24, 1994.

In responding to these alternatives, you are requested to provide your assessments and comments in accordance with the guidelines and schedule provided by the OSD BRAC Office. We are especially interested in identifying any analytical considerations that may have been overlooked or were beyond the purview of the Joint Group (e.g., capacity requirements for graduate level courses or collateral functions at UPT sites, disruption of operations resulting from functional moves, introduction of new training systems (JPATS), etc.).

Members of the Joint Group's Study Team are available to answer your questions and provide data used in this analysis. The staff point of contact is Mr. Dan Gardner, Pentagon Rm 1C757, COMM (703) 614-9481, DSN 225-2618

Louis C. Finch
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
Chairman

Todd A. Weiler
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army
Training and Education

Glenn A. Profitt II
Major General, USAF
Director, Plans and Operations
HQ Air Education and Training Command

CAPT Brian V. Buzzell
Department of the Navy
Principal Representative

Attachments: As Stated

a. OPTION NUMBER:	b. CANDIDATE INSTALLATION:	c. DATE:
1	UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	23 NOV 1994

d. INSTALLATION CATEGORY:

e. SCENARIO DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY:

THREE SITE CLOSURE. THIS ALTERNATIVE CLOSES NAS MERIDIAN, REESE AIR FORCE BASE, AND NAS WHITING FIELD. ALL SERVICE UHPT IS CONDUCTED AT FORT RUCKER. THE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNCTIONS AT REMAINING SITES ARE LEFT TO THE SERVICES. THE ALTERNATIVE ADHERED TO RESTRICTIONS OUTLINED IN THE COVER MEMORANDUM.

THE ALTERNATIVE WAS DEVELOPED USING THE OPTIMIZATION MODEL. IT MAXIMIZED AVERAGE MILITARY VALUE, FACTORED IN FUNCTIONAL VALUE, AND REDUCED EXCESS CAPACITY OF EXISTING AIRFIELD COMPLEXES. IN THE ILLUSTRATIVE SCENARIO, MINIMUM MOVEMENT OF FUNCTIONS TO NEW SITES AND CONSOLIDATION/COLLOCATION OF FUNCTIONS AT SINGLE SITES WERE ALSO EMPHASIZED.

f. INSTALLATIONS IN SCENARIO:

INSTALLATION NAME	STRATEGY (CLOSE/GAIN/LOSE/DEACTIVATE)	COMPLETION YEAR
MERIDIAN NAS	CLOSE. STRIKE TRAINING TO MOVE AT DISCRETION OF NAVY.	NLT FY 2001
REESE AFB	CLOSE. SUPT TRAINING TO MOVE AT DISCRETION OF AIR FORCE.	"
WHITING NAS	CLOSE. MOVE HELICOPTER TRAINING TO FORT RUCKER. MOVE PRIMARY TRAINING AT DISCRETION OF DON.	"
FORT RUCKER	GAIN DON HELICOPTER TRAINING.	"

g. MAJOR ACTIVITIES AND/OR ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED (OR POTENTIALLY AFFECTED):

UIC/SRC	DESCRIPTION:	PERSONNEL STRENGTH: OFF/WOF/ENL/CIV/NAF/OTHER	STRATEGY: DESTINATION/YEAR
	NOT ADDRESSED BY THIS GROUP.		

h. REMARKS

AN ILLUSTRATIVE SCENARIO IS ATTACHED THAT CONSOLIDATES/COLLOCATES FUNCTIONS AND ALSO REDUCES THE NUMBER OF FUNCTIONAL MOVES TO NEW SITES.

ALTERNATIVE 1 SCENARIO
THREE-SITE CLOSURE (GRADUATES PER YEAR)

While consistent with modeled results with respect to sites open and closed, this scenario was developed by the Joint Group to demonstrate a reasonable allocation of functions to the sites remaining open.

FIXED-WING UFT	PRIMARY	AIRLIFT-TANKER	MARITIME	BOMBER-FIGHTER	STRIKE	PRIMARY NFO	NFO STRIKE	PANEL NAV	AFLD OPS AVAILABLE	AFLD OPS REQUIRED
COLUMBUS	370			369					784371	769414
CORPUS	262		273						537240	438280
KINGSVILLE					372				751904	714984
LAUGHLIN	681								787572	787236
MERIDIAN										
PENSACOLA	301					718	312		647815	646452
RANDOLPH	520							222	619768	613108
REESE										
SHEPPARD	359			250					646988	646504
VANCE		752							685390	304560
WHITING										
TOTAL UPT	2493	752	273	619	372	718	312	222	5461048	4920538
ROTARY WING	UHPT									
FT RUCKER	1481								7441016	1907528
FLT SCREENING	FLT SCR									
HONDO	1037								554664	545462
USAFA	1036								651630	544936
TOTAL	2073								1206294	1090398

9.9% Excess

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. NAS Kingsville utilizes excess capacity from existing outlying airfield.
2. NAS Pensacola utilizes excess capacity from existing outlying airfield.

Note: It is possible to accomplish this alternative without using the excess capacity of outlying fields from sites identified for closure. However, in the scenario above, some of this excess capacity is used to allow more flexibility in the functional spread.

a. OPTION NUMBER:	b. CANDIDATE INSTALLATION:	c. DATE:
2	UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	23 NOV 1994

d. INSTALLATION CATEGORY:

e. SCENARIO DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY:

FOUR SITE CLOSURE. THIS ALTERNATIVE CLOSES NAS MERIDIAN, REESE AFB, VANCE AFB, AND NAS WHITING. ALL SERVICE UHPT IS CONDUCTED AT FORT RUCKER. THIS ALTERNATIVE CAPTURED CAPACITY FROM OUTLYING FIELDS CLOSED FROM ALTERNATIVE ONE AND RESULTED IN THE CLOSURE OF AN ADDITIONAL BASE. GIVEN THE FOUR CLOSURES, THE GROUP DEVELOPED A POSSIBLE SCENARIO MINIMIZING MOVES AND CONSOLIDATING FUNCTIONS (SEE ALTERNATIVE TWO SCENARIO ATTACHED).

THE ALTERNATIVE WAS DEVELOPED USING THE OPTIMIZATION MODEL CONSTRAINED BY ALTERNATIVE ONE AND ASSUMING REDISTRIBUTION OF EXCESS AIRFIELD OPERATIONS CAPACITY AS DESCRIBED ABOVE, SHARED AIRSPACE BETWEEN RANDOLPH AFB AND NAS CORPUS CHRISTI, AND ADDING MINOR MILCON FOR RAMP SPACE AT COLUMBUS AFB. IT MAXIMIZED AVERAGE MILITARY VALUE, FACTORED IN FUNCTIONAL VALUE, AND REDUCED EXCESS CAPACITY OF EXISTING AIRFIELD COMPLEXES. IN THE ILLUSTRATIVE SCENARIO, MINIMUM MOVEMENT OF FUNCTIONS TO NEW SITES AND CONSOLIDATION OF FUNCTIONS AT SINGLE SITES WERE ALSO EMPHASIZED.

f. INSTALLATIONS IN SCENARIO:

INSTALLATION NAME	STRATEGY (CLOSE/GAIN/LOSE/DEACTIVATE)	COMPLETION YEAR
MERIDIAN NAS	CLOSE. STRIKE TRAINING MOVE AT DISCRETION OF DON.	NLT FY 2001
REESE AFB	CLOSE. SUPT TRAINING TO MOVE AT DISCRETION OF USAF.	"
VANCE AFB	CLOSE. SUPT TRAINING TO MOVE AT DISCRETION OF USAF.	"
WHITING NAS	CLOSE. MOVE HELICOPTER TRAINING TO FORT RUCKER. PRIMARY TRAINING TO MOVE AT DISCRETION OF DON.	"
FORT RUCKER	GAIN. DON HELICOPTER TRAINING.	"

g. MAJOR ACTIVITIES AND/OR ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED (OR POTENTIALLY AFFECTED):

UIC/SRC	DESCRIPTION:	PERSONNEL STRENGTH: OFF/WOF/ENL/CIV/NAF/OTHER	STRATEGY: DESTINATION/YEAR
	NOT ADDRESSSED BY THIS GROUP		

UIC/SRC	DESCRIPTION:	PERSONNEL STRENGTH: OFF/WOF/ENL/CIV/NAF/OTHER	STRATEGY: DESTINATION/YEAR

h. REMARKS
AN ILLUSTRATIVE SCENARIO IS ATTACHED THAT CONSOLIDATES/COLLOCATES FUNCTIONS AND ALSO REDUCES THE NUMBER OF FUNCTIONAL MOVES TO NEW SITES.

ALTERNATIVE 2 SCENARIO
FOUR-SITE CLOSURE (GRADUATES PER YEAR)

While consistent with modeled results with respect to sites open and closed, this scenario was developed by the Joint Group to demonstrate a reasonable allocation of functions to the sites remaining open.

	PRIMARY	AIRLIFT-TANKER	MARITIME	BOMBER-FIGHTER	STRIKE	PRIMARY NFO	NFO STRIKE	PANEL NAV	AFLD OPS AVAILABLE	AFLD OPS REQUIRED
COLUMBUS	566			369					996770	995990
CORPUS	347		273						537240	536540
KINGSVILLE					372				751904	714984
LAUGHLIN	681								787572	787236
MERIDIAN										
PENSACOLA	301					718	312		647815	646452
RANDOLPH	239	752						222	619768	592832
REESE										
SHEPPARD	359			250					646988	646504
VANCE										
WHITING										
TOTAL	2493	752	273	619	372	718	312	222	4988057	4920538
ROTARY WING	UHPT									
FT RUCKER	1481								7441016	1907528
FLT SCREENING	FLT SCR									
HONDO	1037								554664	545462
USAFA	1036								651630	544936
TOTAL	2073								1206294	1090398

1.3% Excess

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. NAS Kingsville utilizes excess capacity from existing outlying airfield.
2. Columbus AFB utilizes excess capacity from existing outlying airfield.
3. NAS Pensacola utilizes excess capacity from existing outlying airfield.
4. Randolph AFB uses some NAS Corpus Christi airspace.
5. Requires MILCON for approximately 25,000 square yards of ramp space at Columbus AFB.

a. OPTION NUMBER:	b. CANDIDATE INSTALLATION:	c. DATE:
3	UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	23 NOV 1994

d. INSTALLATION CATEGORY:

e. SCENARIO DESCRIPTION / SUMMARY:

FIVE SITE CLOSURE. THIS ALTERNATIVE CLOSES NAS CORPUS CHRISTI, NAS MERIDIAN, REESE AFB, VANCE AFB, AND NAS WHITING FIELD. ALL SERVICE UHPT IS CONDUCTED AT FORT RUCKER. THIS ALTERNATIVE BUILT ON ALTERNATIVE TWO CAPTURING THE OUTLYING FIELD AND AIR SPACE CAPACITY FROM CORPUS CHRISTI CLOSURE. IN ADDITION MINOR MILCON WAS REQUIRED TO ADD CAPACITY (TWO USABLE OUTLYING FIELDS) AT PENSACOLA. THE GROUP DEVELOPED A SCENARIO MINIMIZING MOVES AND CONSOLIDATING FUNCTIONS (SEE ALTERNATIVE THREE SCENARIO ATTACHED).

THE ALTERNATIVE WAS DEVELOPED MANUALLY BY EXTENDING THE LOGIC FROM OPTION TWO. IT MAXIMIZED AVERAGE MILITARY VALUE, FACTORED IN FUNCTIONAL VALUE, AND REDUCED EXCESS CAPACITY OF EXISTING AIRFIELD COMPLEXES. IN THE ILLUSTRATIVE SCENARIO, MINIMUM MOVEMENT OF FUNCTIONS TO NEW SITES AND CONSOLIDATION OF FUNCTIONS AT SINGLE SITES WAS ALSO EMPHASIZED.

f. INSTALLATIONS IN SCENARIO:

INSTALLATION NAME	STRATEGY (CLOSE/GAIN/LOSE/DEACTIVATE)	COMPLETION YEAR
CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	CLOSE. PRIMARY, MARITIME TRAINING MOVE AT DISCRETION OF DON.	NLT FY 2001
MERIDIAN NAS	CLOSE. STRIKE TRAINING MOVE AT DISCRETION OF DON	"
REESE AFB	CLOSE. SUPT TRAINING TO MOVE AT DISCRETION OF USAF.	"
VANCE AFB	CLOSE. SUPT TRAINING TO MOVE AT DISCRETION OF USAF.	"
WHITING AFB	CLOSE. MOVE HELICOPTER TRAINING TO FORT RUCKER. MOVE PRIMARY AT DISCRETION AT DON.	"
FORT RUCKER	GAIN DON HELICOPTER TRAINING	"

g. MAJOR ACTIVITIES AND/OR ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED (OR POTENTIALLY AFFECTED):

UIC/SRC	DESCRIPTION:	PERSONNEL STRENGTH: OFF/WOF/ENL/CIV/NAF/OTHER	STRATEGY: DESTINATION/YEAR
	NOT ADDRESSED BY THIS GROUP		

UIC/SRC	DESCRIPTION:	PERSONNEL STRENGTH: OFF/WOF/ENL/CIV/NAF/OTHER	STRATEGY: DESTINATION/YEAR

h. REMARKS

AN ILLUSTRATIVE SCENARIO IS ATTACHED THAT CONSOLIDATES/COLLOCATES FUNCTIONS AND ALSO REDUCES THE NUMBER OF FUNCTIONAL MOVES TO NEW SITES.