

FINAL DELIBERATION HEARING BRIEFING CHARTS AND SCRIPT

CRAIG HALL

ANG SCRIPT FOR FINAL DELIBERATION HEARING

Category Chart F-1

The DOD is recommending the closure of these 5 Air National Guard Stations and relocation of their units to other Air Force installations.

Map F-2

General issues chart F-3

I would like to make a few points about this category in general, and how it was handled differently from other Air Force categories , then discuss each recommendation individually.

First, Air National Guard bases were not evaluated against one other for closure, as units maintain a relationship with their respective states. Relocating Guard units across state lines is not practical. Further, recruiting needs of each unit need to be considered. Consequently, the Air Force examined this category solely for cost effective relocations to other nearby active or reserve installations.

Second, since these 5 Air National Guard Stations do not employ 300 or more civilians, they did not complete data calls, or questionnaires for the base closure process. The Air Force also did not perform an analysis of military value on these installations. Consequently, relatively little information existed on these installations for the Air Force's Base Closure Executive Group to consider during its deliberations. Much of the data needed to determine the cost effectiveness of the relocations was collected after base closure recommendations were announced. As a result, these recommendations were not as cost effective, once more accurate costs and savings were fully developed.

Now let me turn to each recommendation individually.

Base Analysis Chart - Moffett F-4

Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station, CA is recommended for closure. Under this proposal, the Combat Rescue Group at Moffett would relocate to McClellan AFB. The relocation requires about \$18 million in up-front costs to be paid back in 6 years.

Issues reviewed Chart F-5

The next chart displays the issues we plan to present regarding Moffett Field.

Issues Chart - Moffet F-6

This Guard Station is currently located on a federally-owned airfield, operated by NASA-Ames Research Center. NASA assumed operation of the airfield as a result of a 1991 BRAC decision to close the Naval Air Station at Moffett Field. The ANG provides personnel and pays some of the costs to operate the airfield.

Since NASA will continue to operate the Moffett Federal Airfield if the ANG unit relocates, much of the cost savings claimed by the Air Force would be passed onto NASA. For this reason, in this chart, we show the cost effectiveness of this recommendation from BOTH a DOD and government-wide perspective. If costs and savings are viewed from a government-wide perspective this recommendation is NOT cost effective. The NPV is a net cost of \$17.6 million and a ROI would never be realized. Therefore, commission staff concurs with the community, if the Guard Station closes, costs will increase to federal government.

The Mountain View/Sunnyvale, CA community has raised concerns about the quality of the Air Force's analysis. Specifically, claimed savings are suspect as they have increased since the relocation was initially proposed to the Base Closure Executive Group, largely due to decreased military construction requirements. The commission staff found, while the cost effectiveness of this recommendation has improved since initially proposed, it is due to the improved cost information generated by the site survey at McClellan. Therefore, we concur with DOD.

Community officials also argue Moffett Federal Airfield offers more military value than McClellan AFB, and note the Air Force performed no military value analysis of this recommendation. While commission staff concur with the community in that the Air Force performed no military value analysis, we concur with DOD in that Moffett and McClellan offer comparable military value to the Guard unit.

Finally, the community also referred to a written agreement between the ANG and NASA as a long-term commitment by the ANG to remain at Moffett Field. Commission staff found while the agreement does indicate a long-term commitment was made, the agreement CAN be terminated by the ANG, as long as a years notice is provided.

Scenario Summary F-7

This final chart provides the pros and cons associated with this recommendation. Again, if viewed from a government-wide perspective the recommendation is not cost-effective.

This completes our briefing of issues regarding Moffett Field. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have regarding this recommendation.

Back-Up Chart-Moffett F-20

This closure could have been accomplished outside of base closure process, as it employees fewer than 300 civilians. For this reason, the community asserts the recommendation should not have been submitted to the commission. However, DOD and commission staff concur, DOD has the authority to submit recommendations below the BRAC threshold if it chose to do so. Therefore, DOD's submission of Moffett Federal Airfield AGS to this commission was valid.

IF MCCLELLAN CLOSES: F-7

Under the DOD recommendation regarding the closure of Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, the unit would relocate to McClellan AFB, CA. Since this commission moved earlier to close McClellan AFB, the DoD recommendation can not be implemented. Given the cost associated with relocating the unit to another Air Force Base, the Air Force recommends, and commission staff concur, the Guard Station and unit should remain at Moffett Federal Airfield.

Base Analysis Chart - North Highlands *F-8*

Next, I would like to turn to the recommendation regarding the closure of **North Highlands Air Guard Station, CA** and relocation of the Combat Communications unit to McClellan AFB. This requires only \$1.3 million in up front-costs and offers a 5 year ROI.

Scenario Summary Chart-North Highlands F-9

This next chart shows the pros and cons associated with this recommendation. There are no community or staff concerns regarding this recommendation. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have on this recommendation.

IF MCCLELLAN CLOSES: F-9

Under the DOD recommendation regarding the closure of North Highlands AGS, the unit would relocate to McClellan AFB, CA. Since this commission moved earlier to close McClellan AFB, the DoD recommendation can not be implemented. Given the cost associated with relocating the unit to another Air Force Base, the Air Force recommends, and commission staff concur, the Guard Station and unit should remain at North Highlands.

Base Analysis Chart - Ontario F-10

The next recommendation is closure of **Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station, CA** and relocation of the Combat Communications and Weather units to March Air Reserve Base, CA. The recommendation requires \$900,000 in up-front costs and an ROI of 9 years.

Scenario Summary Chart-Ontario F-11

The next chart shows the pros and cons associated with this recommendation. There are no concerns regarding this recommendation. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have on this recommendation.

Base Analysis Chart - Roslyn F-12

The next Air Guard Station we are considering for closure is **Roslyn Air Guard Station, NY.** and relocation of the Combat Communications Group and Electronic Installation units to Stewart International Airport AGS, NY. The relocation of these units requires \$14.2 million in up-front costs and a 2 year ROI. The NPV and ROI assumes DOD will be able to sell the Roslyn property at or near market value. This Guard Station is on 50 acres of property, 27 miles east of New York City on Long Island, NY.

The next chart shows the issues associated with this recommendation. The site survey completed after the March recommendation revealed that adequate facilities were not available at Stewart IAP. As a result, relocation costs increased from \$2.4 to \$14.2 million. However, according to the Air Force, prospects exist for realizing revenue from sale of the Guard Station property. This revenue, estimated at \$22.4 million, would be used offset the costs associated with the relocation of the unit. The Air Force would have to receive at least \$14 million by 1999 for the property if this proposal is to be cost-effective. The use of these proceeds was not part of the original DOD recommendation. ONLY when proceeds from the sale of the property are used is this recommendation cost effective. If these proceeds are NOT realized, the NPV is a net cost of \$11.3 million and the ROI becomes 100+ years.

There are two points we'd like to make regarding this issue. First, DOD policy discourages the use of such proceeds from property sales in calculating the costs and savings of closure recommendations, since proceeds may never be realized. Second, the Air Force did not include revenue from the sale of land as part of any other BRAC 95 recommendation. However, it feels this situation is unique because of the location of this property. Generally, the community opposes the closure of the Guard Station and has raised doubts as to whether sale of the property for commercial development is realistic given zoning restrictions.

Scenario Summary Chart-Roslyn F-14

The next chart summarizes the pros and cons regarding this recommendation. The costs, savings, ROI and NPV on this chart reflect the use proceeds from the sale of the Guard Station property. Again, only when these proceeds are used, is this recommendation cost-effective. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have on this recommendation.

Base Analysis Chart --Springfield F-15

The final recommendation regarding the Air National Guard is the closure of **Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH** and the relocation of the F-16 Fighter Group and a Combat Communications Group to Wright-Patterson AFB, OH. The one-time cost associated with this recommendation is about \$25 million with an 11 year ROI.

Issues reviewed Chart-Springfield F-16

The next chart shows the issues regarding this recommendation.

The savings associated with this recommendation are derived from elimination of personnel and base operating support costs. The estimate of personnel and base operating support savings has decreased since the relocation was originally proposed in March. As a result, the relocation of this unit is not as cost effective as originally estimated. It now offers an 11 year return on investment, almost twice the original estimate of 6 years.

The Springfield community argues that the personnel elimination remain overstated and military construction requirements remain understated. Commission staff found concur with DOD and find the personnel elimination reasonable, as four different Air Force organizations in the have agreed with the personnel elimination associated with the relocation of the unit. Commission staff also concur with DOD in that military constructions requirements have followed standardized costing procedures.

The second issue on this chart notes community concerns regarding the facilities at Wright-Patterson. Commission staff found F-16 flight-line facilities are adequate to meet the needs of the unit but there are some issues regarding other facilities that remain unresolved. However, facility issues are relatively minor, and although some of the facilities are not ideal, they would be adequate to meet the needs of the unit.

Moving to the third issue on this chart, the city of Springfield has recently proposed to provide fire crash rescue services during non-flying hours. This proposal, if accepted, would save about \$500,000 annually in personnel costs. If this proposal is assumed to be in place, the ROI regarding this closure would increase to 13 years. The Air Force and ANG are receptive to this offer if the commission does not close this Guard Station, however, it is a proposal only and it was not factored this into their estimate of ROI. The commission staff concur with the community in that this proposal would reduce operating costs and increase the ROI to 13 years. However, we concur with the Air Force as it is not a formal commitment and should be ONLY be considered as a potential to reduce operating costs if the unit remains at Springfield.

The last issue on this chart is that the ANG basing arrangement at the Springfield-Beckley MAP represents the ideal basing arrangement for the ANG, as they would like to keep units at civilian airports wherever possible. This helps to keep operating costs low and visibility with the local community high for recruiting.

Backup Springfield F-21

The relocation of the Springfield unit was proposed to this commission in 1993 where it was found not to be cost effective. Since 1993, an F-16 unit at Wright-Patterson deactivated, leaving facilities available for the Springfield unit to use. These availability of these facilities have made the relocation of the Springfield unit more attractive.

The next chart summarizes the pros and cons regarding this recommendation. Again, of note is the long return on investment required for this recommendation

This is the last installation in this category. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have on this recommendation.

Air National Guard Bases



F-2

AIR FORCE: AIR NATIONAL GUARD

TIER	INSTALLATION
N/A	Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA (C)
N/A	North Highlands AGS, GA (C)
N/A	Ontario AGS, CA (C)
N/A	Roslyn AGS, NY (C)
N/A	Springfield-Beckley AGS, OH (C)

(C) = DoD recommendation for closure

F-1

ANG SCRIPT FOR FINAL DELIBERATION HEARING

Category Chart F-1

The DOD is recommending the closure of these 5 Air National Guard Stations and relocation of their units to other Air Force installations.

Map F-2

FRANK WILL COVER

CATEGORY: AIR NATIONAL GUARD

GENERAL ISSUES

- AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASES DO NOT READILY COMPETE AGAINST EACH OTHER
- AIR GUARD STATIONS BELOW BRAC THRESHOLD
- MUCH DATA COLLECTED AFTER BASE CLOSURE RECOMMENDATIONS WERE ANNOUNCED

F-3

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners
with your permission

General issues chart F-3 ^{brief}

I would like to make a few points about this category in general, and how it was handled differently from other Air Force categories, then discuss each recommendation individually.

~~to I think this would help explain why we have concerns about some of these recommendations~~

First, Air National Guard bases were not evaluated against one other for closure, as units maintain a relationship with their respective states. Relocating Guard units across state lines is not practical. Further, recruiting needs of each unit need to be considered. Consequently, the Air Force examined this category solely for cost effective relocations to other nearby active or reserve installations.

Second, since these 5 Air National Guard Stations do not employ 300 or more civilians, they did not complete data calls, or questionnaires for the base closure process. The Air Force also did not perform an analysis of military value on these installations. Consequently, relatively little information existed on these installations for the Air Force's Base Closure Executive Group to consider during its deliberations.³ Much of the data needed to determine the cost effectiveness of the relocations was collected after base closure recommendations were announced. As a result, these recommendations were not as cost effective, once more accurate costs and savings were fully developed.

Now let me turn to each recommendation individually.

chart F7 - Maffett

SCENARIO SUMMARY

Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA

DoD RECOMMENDATION	
Close Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA. Relocate unit to McClellan AFB, CA.	
One Time Costs (\$M): 18.3 Annual Savings (\$M): 3.9 Return on Investment: 2003 (6 Years) Net Present Value (\$M): 34.8	
PRO	CON
Cost effective for Air Force by eliminating overhead positions and base operating support costs Positive recruiting and retention effects	Costs increase to federal government Dependent on McClellan AFB decision

IF MCCLELLAN CLOSES: F-9

Under the DOD recommendation regarding the closure of North Highlands AGS, the unit would relocate to McClellan AFB, CA. Since this commission moved earlier to close McClellan AFB, the DoD recommendation can not be implemented. Given the cost associated with relocating the unit to another Air Force Base, the Air Force recommends, and commission staff concur, the Guard Station and unit should remain at North Highlands.

Mr. Chairman, we will now answer any questions regarding this recommendation.

Next F10 - Ontario

SCENARIO SUMMARY North Highlands AGS, CA

DoD RECOMMENDATION	
Close North Highlands AGS, CA. Relocate unit to McClellan AFB, CA.	
One Time Costs (\$M): 1.3 Annual Savings (\$M): 0.3 Return on Investment: 2002 (5 Years) Net Present Value (\$M): 2.9	
PRO	CON
Eliminates base operating support personnel and costs Excess capacity at McClellan AFB Relocation of unit requires little expenditure	Long return on investment Dependent on McClellan AFB decision

IF MCCLELLAN CLOSES: F-7

Under the DOD recommendation regarding the closure of Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, the unit would relocate to McClellan AFB, CA. Since this commission moved earlier to close McClellan AFB, the DoD recommendation can not be implemented. Given the cost associated with relocating the unit to another Air Force Base, the Air Force recommends, and commission staff concur, the Guard Station and unit should remain at Moffett Federal Airfield.

Mr Chairman we will now ~~only~~ answer any questions the commission's may have regarding this recommendation.

Next - chart F9 No Highlands

BASE ANALYSIS North Highlands AGS, CA

DOD RECOMMENDATION: Close North Highlands AGS, CA. Relocate unit to McClellan AFB, CA.

FOR CONSIDERATION: Accept or reject each recommended closure.

CRITERIA	NORTH HIGHLANDS AGS, CA (C)
FORCE STRUCTURE	Combat Communications
ONE-TIME COSTS (\$ M)	1.3
ANNUAL SAVINGS (\$ M)	0.3
RETURN ON INVESTMENT	2002 (5 Years)
NET PRESENT VALUE	2.9
BASE OPERATING BUDGET (\$ M)	0.2
PERSONNEL ELIMINATED (MIL / CIV)	1/0
PERSONNEL REALIGNED (MIL / CIV)	3/36
ECONOMIC IMPACT (BRAC 95 / CUM)	0.0%/0.0%

(C) = DoD recommendation for closure

(R) = DoD recommendation for realignment

(X) = Joint Cross Service Group alternative for closure or realignment

(*) = *Commission add for further consideration*

Scenario Summary F-7

This final chart provides the pros and cons associated with this recommendation. Again, if viewed from a government-wide perspective the recommendation is not cost-effective.

This completes our briefing of issues regarding Moffett Field. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have regarding this recommendation.

MOTION

Base Analysis Chart - North Highlands F-8

Next, I would like to turn to the recommendation regarding the closure of **North Highlands Air Guard Station, CA** and relocation of the Combat Communications unit to McClellan AFB. This requires only \$1.3 million in up front-costs and offers a 5 year ROI.

ISSUES REVIEWED
Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA

<p>Government-wide costs</p> <p>Air Force cost analysis</p> <p>Military value</p> <p>Agreement between NASA and ANG</p>	<p>Closure can be accomplished outside of BRAC process</p>
---	--

Base Analysis Chart - Moffett F-4

Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station, CA is recommended for closure. Under this proposal, the Combat Rescue Group at Moffett would relocate to McClellan AFB. The relocation requires about \$18 million in up-front costs to be paid back in 6 years.

ISSUES

Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA

ISSUE	DoD POSITION	COMMUNITY POSITION	R&A STAFF FINDINGS
Government-wide costs	DOD costs only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROI: 6 years • NPV: \$35M 	Costs should be viewed from a government-wide perspective	Costs will increase to federal government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROI: Never • NPV: Cost \$17.6 M
Air Force Cost Analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MILCON Requirements • Savings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$9.2 M • 3.9 M annually 	Air Force's cost analysis is flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MILCON requirements have changed significantly • Claimed savings are suspect 	Cost analysis is reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MILCON figures have evolved but still reasonable • Savings reasonable
Military Value of McClellan vs. Moffett Field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comparable military value • positive effect on recruiting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Force performed no analysis of military value • Moffett Airfield offers more military value • Commander of California ANG thinks unit should remain at Moffett Field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Force did not perform military value assessment of ANG • Quality of facilities & access to ranges are comparable
Agreement between ANG and NASA	Agreement can be terminated	AF/ANG made long-term commitment to remain at Moffett Field	Agreement can be terminated by either party

Issues reviewed Chart F-5

The next chart displays the issues we plan to present regarding Moffett Field.

The next chart details these issues.

Issues Chart - Moffet F-6

This Guard Station is currently located on a federally-owned airfield, operated by NASA-Ames Research Center. NASA assumed operation of the airfield as a result of a 1991 BRAC decision to close the Naval Air Station at Moffett Field. The ANG provides personnel and pays some of the costs to operate the airfield.

Since NASA will continue to operate the Moffett Federal Airfield if the ANG unit relocates, much of the cost savings claimed by the Air Force would be passed onto NASA. For this reason, in this chart, we show the cost effectiveness of this recommendation from BOTH a DOD and government-wide perspective. If costs and savings are viewed from a government-wide perspective this recommendation is NOT cost effective. The NPV is a net cost of \$17.6 million and a ROI would never be realized. Therefore, commission staff concurs with the community, if the Guard Station closes, costs will increase to federal government.

The Mountain View/Sunnyvale, CA community has raised concerns about the quality of the Air Force's analysis. Specifically, claimed savings are suspect as they have increased since the relocation was initially proposed to the Base Closure Executive Group, largely due to decreased military construction requirements. The commission staff found, while the cost effectiveness of this recommendation has improved since initially proposed, it is due to the improved cost information generated by the site survey at McClellan. Therefore, we concur with DOD.

original:
MILCON
\$40M +

Community officials also argue Moffett Federal Airfield offers more military value than McClellan AFB, and note the Air Force performed no military value analysis of this recommendation. While commission staff concur with the community in that the Air Force performed no military value analysis, we concur with DOD in that Moffett and McClellan offer comparable military value to the Guard unit.

Finally, the community ~~also~~ referred to a written agreement between the ANG and NASA as a long-term commitment by the ANG to remain at Moffett Field. Commission staff found while the agreement does indicate a long-term commitment was made, the agreement CAN be terminated by the ANG, as long as a years notice is provided.

next chart pls.

Backup Springfield F-21

The relocation of the Springfield unit was proposed to this commission in 1993 where it was found not to be cost effective. Since 1993, an F-16 unit at Wright-Patterson deactivated, leaving facilities available for the Springfield unit to use. These availability of these facilities have made the relocation of the Springfield unit more attractive.

IF McClellan T.U.

BASE ANALYSIS

Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA

DOD RECOMMENDATION: Close Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station, CA. Relocate unit to McClellan AFB, CA.

FOR CONSIDERATION: Accept or reject each recommended closure.

CRITERIA	MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD AGS, CA (C)
FORCE STRUCTURE	Combat Rescue Group: HC-130 aircraft/HH-60 helicopters
ONE-TIME COSTS (\$ M)	18.3
ANNUAL SAVINGS (\$ M)	3.9
RETURN ON INVESTMENT	2003 (6 Years)
NET PRESENT VALUE	34.8
BASE OPERATING BUDGET (\$ M)	3.9
PERSONNEL ELIMINATED (MIL / CIV)	6/13
PERSONNEL REALIGNED (MIL / CIV)	82/217
ECONOMIC IMPACT (BRAC 95 / CUM)	-0.1%/-0.5%

(C) = DoD recommendation for closure

(R) = DoD recommendation for realignment

(X) = Joint Cross Service Group alternative for closure or realignment

(*) = Commission add for further consideration

F-4

ISSUES
Springfield-Beckley MAP AGS, OH

ISSUE	DoD POSITION	COMMUNITY POSITION	R&A STAFF FINDINGS
Closure proposed during BRAC 1993	Wright-Patterson F-16 facilities are now available due to deactivation of a unit	Savings overstated in 1993 and continue to be overstated in 1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flight-line facilities are now available at Wright-Patterson• More BOS savings claimed

F-21

Back-Up Chart-Moffett F-20

This closure could have been accomplished outside of base closure process, as it employees fewer than 300 civilians. For this reason, the community asserts the recommendation should not have been submitted to the commission. However, DOD and commission staff concur, DOD has the authority to submit recommendations below the BRAC threshold if it chose to do so. Therefore, DOD's submission of Moffett Federal Airfield AGS to this commission was valid.

ISSUES
Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA

ISSUE	DoD POSITION	COMMUNITY POSITION	R&A STAFF FINDINGS
Closure can be accomplished outside of BRAC process	Should be reviewed by BRAC	Moffett Field AGS does not meet BRAC threshold and should not be evaluated through BRAC process	Is a BRAC issue if service submits to BRAC for review

F-20

BACKUP SLIDES

F-19

The next chart summarizes the pros and cons regarding this recommendation. Again, of note is the long return on investment required for this recommendation

Mr. Chairman This is the last installation in this category. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have on this recommendation.

MOTION

SCENARIO SUMMARY

Springfield-Beckley MAP AGS, OH

DoD RECOMMENDATION	
Close Springfield-Beckley AGS, OH. Relocate unit to Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.	
One Time Costs (\$M): 24.6 Annual Savings (\$M): 2.8 Return on Investment: 2008 (11 Years) Net Present Value (\$M): 14.0	
PRO	CON
Eliminates base operating support personnel and costs	Long ROI required
F-16 flight-line facilities available at Wright-Patterson AFB	Sacrifice quality facilities at Springfield for little return
Consolidation will be cost-effective in long-run	Economic impact on Springfield-Beckley MAP and community

Issues Chart -Springfield F-17

The savings associated with this recommendation are ^{largely} derived from elimination of personnel and base operating support costs. The estimate of personnel and base operating support savings has decreased since the relocation was originally proposed in March. As a result, the relocation of this unit is not as cost effective as originally estimated. It now offers an 11 year return on investment, almost twice the original estimate of 6 years.

The Springfield community argues that the personnel elimination remains ^{key} overstated and military construction requirements remain ^{key} understated. Commission staff ~~find~~ concur with DOD and find the personnel elimination reasonable, as four different Air Force organizations ~~in the~~ have agreed with the personnel elimination associated with the relocation of the unit. Commission staff also concur with DOD in that military constructions requirements have followed standardized costing procedures.

The second issue on this chart notes community concerns regarding the facilities at Wright-Patterson. Commission staff found F-16 flight-line facilities are adequate to meet the needs of the unit but there are some issues regarding other facilities that remain unresolved. However, facility issues are relatively minor, and although some of the facilities are not ideal, they would be adequate to meet the needs of the unit.

Moving to the third issue on this chart, the city of Springfield has recently proposed to provide fire crash rescue services during non-flying hours. This proposal, if accepted, would save about \$500,000 annually in personnel costs. If this proposal is assumed to be in place, the ROI regarding this closure would increase to 13 years. The Air Force and ANG are receptive to this offer if the commission does not close this Guard Station, however, it is a proposal only and it was not factored this into their estimate of ROI. The commission staff concur with the community in that this proposal would reduce operating costs and increase the ROI to 13 years. However, we concur with the Air Force as it is not a formal commitment and should be ONLY be considered as a potential to reduce operating costs if the unit remains at Springfield.

The last issue on this chart is that the ANG basing arrangement at the Springfield-Beckley MAP represents the ideal basing arrangement for the ANG, as they would like to keep units at civilian airports wherever possible. This helps to keep operating costs low and visibility with the local community high for recruiting. Community & commission staff concur.

If there are no questions on this chart, can we put up the next chart please

comp

skip

vehicle maint
des.ing hall
BOS-civilian
security
new-combat
facility

the units

ISSUES

Springfield-Beckley MAP AGS, OH

ISSUE	DoD POSITION	COMMUNITY POSITION	R&A STAFF FINDINGS
Revised costs and savings result in 11 year ROI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel/BOS savings were originally overstated, but now accurate • Military construction requirements and costs validated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel elimination overstated • Military construction costs understated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Air Force Manpower Programming Office, ANG, AFMC • Followed standardized costing procedures
Facility concerns at Wright-Patterson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wright-Patterson AFB offers comparable operating environment • Facility concerns are minor and can be worked 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Springfield-Beckley offers a superior operating environment • Concerns with condition of some facilities and ability of dining hall to meet drill requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F-16 flight-line facilities available • Concerns with other facilities largely quality of life
Community proposal to reduce operating costs at Springfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANG receptive to offer • proposal only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City provide fire crash rescue during non-flying hours • Save \$480,000 annually • 13 year ROI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal would lower operating costs • No formal commitment
Springfield-Beckley basing arrangement	<p>ANG : "Keep units at civilian airports wherever possible"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • visibility helps recruiting • keeps costs low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong community support • Unit's community involvement 	<p>Springfield-Beckley presents ideal basing arrangement for ANG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • costs • community ties • recruiting

Issues reviewed Chart-Springfield F-16

The next chart shows the issues regarding this recommendation.

ISSUES REVIEWED
Springfield-Beckley MAP AGS, OH

<p>Revised costs and savings result in 11 year ROI</p> <p>Facilities concerns at Wright-Patterson AFB</p> <p>Community proposal to reduce operating costs at Springfield</p> <p>Springfield-Beckley basing arrangement</p>	<p>Closure proposed during BRAC 1993</p>
--	--

F-16

Base Analysis Chart --Springfield F-15

The final recommendation regarding the Air National Guard is the closure of **Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH** and the relocation of the F-16 Fighter Group and a Combat Communications Group to Wright-Patterson AFB, OH. The one-time cost associated with this recommendation is about \$25 million with an 11 year ROI.

next chart

BASE ANALYSIS

Springfield-Beckley MAP AGS, OH

DOD RECOMMENDATION: Close Springfield-Beckley MAP Air Guard Station, OH. Relocate units to Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

FOR CONSIDERATION: Accept or reject each recommended closure.

CRITERIA	SPRINGFIELD-BECKLEY MAP AGS, OH (C)
FORCE STRUCTURE	Fighter Group: F-16 aircraft, Combat Communications
ONE-TIME COSTS (\$ M)	24.6
ANNUAL SAVINGS (\$ M)	2.8
RETURN ON INVESTMENT	2008 (11 Years)
NET PRESENT VALUE	14.0
BASE OPERATING BUDGET (\$ M)	2.6
PERSONNEL ELIMINATED (MIL / CIV)	5/22
PERSONNEL REALIGNED (MIL / CIV)	56/233
ECONOMIC IMPACT (BRAC 95 / CUM)	0.0%/0.0%

(C) = DoD recommendation for closure

(R) = DoD recommendation for realignment

(X) = Joint Cross Service Group alternative for closure or realignment

(*) = *Commission add for further consideration*

F-15

Scenario Summary Chart-Roslyn F-14

The next chart summarizes the pros and cons regarding this recommendation. The costs, savings, ROI and NPV on this chart reflect the use proceeds from the sale of the Guard Station property. Again, only when these proceeds are used, is this recommendation cost-effective. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have on this recommendation.

Mr. Chairman

MOTION

SCENARIO SUMMARY

Roslyn AGS, NY

DoD RECOMMENDATION	
Close Roslyn AGS, NY. Relocate unit to Stewart IAP AGS, NY	
One Time Costs (\$M): 14.2 Annual Savings (\$M): 0.2 Return on Investment: 1999 (2 Years) Net Present Value (\$M): 8.9	
PRO	CON
Cost effective when proceeds from sale of property are considered	Recommendation not cost effective if proceeds not realized, results in 100+ years ROI DOD policy discourages use of proceeds from land sales Proceeds from sale of property may never be realized due to existing policies and practices

Issues Chart-Roslyn F-13

The next chart shows the issues associated with this recommendation. The site survey completed after the March recommendation revealed that adequate facilities were not available at Stewart IAP. As a result, relocation costs increased from \$2.4 to \$14.2 million. However, according to the Air Force, prospects exist for realizing revenue from sale of the Guard Station property. This revenue, estimated at \$22.4 million, would be used offset the costs associated with the relocation of the unit. The Air Force would have to receive at least \$14 million by 1999 for the property if this proposal is to be cost-effective. The use of these proceeds was not part of the original DOD recommendation. ONLY when proceeds from the sale of the property are used is this recommendation cost effective. If these proceeds are NOT realized, the NPV is a net cost of \$11.3 million and the ROI becomes 100+ years.

There are two points we'd like to make regarding this issue. First, DOD policy discourages the use of such proceeds from property sales in calculating the costs and savings of closure recommendations, since proceeds may never be realized. Second, the Air Force did not include revenue from the sale of land as part of any other ~~BRAC~~ ^{base closure} ~~95~~ recommendation. However, it feels this situation is unique because of the location of this property. Generally, the community opposes the closure of the Guard Station and has raised doubts as to whether sale of the property for commercial development is realistic given zoning restrictions.

drinking water
restrictions require
low population/use
densities
Tab 0

ISSUES
Roslyn AGS, NY

ISSUE	DoD POSITION	COMMUNITY POSITION	R&A STAFF FINDINGS
Cost effective only when proceeds from sale of property are used to offset relocation costs	When \$22.4 million from sale of land used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROI: 2 Years • NPV: \$8.9 million 	N/A	If proceeds NOT used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROI: 100+ years • NPV: Cost \$11.3 M
Use of proceeds from sale of property	DoD policy states generally should not be used, but Air Force considers this situation unique	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Force may never realize proceeds from sale of property • Air Force did not use proceeds from sale of property in any other recommendation

Base Analysis Chart - Roslyn F-12

The next Air Guard Station we are considering for closure is **Roslyn Air Guard Station, NY**, and relocation of the Combat Communications Group and Electronic Installation units to Stewart International Airport AGS, NY. The relocation of these units requires \$14.2 million in up-front costs and a 2 year ROI. The NPV and ROI assumes DOD will be able to sell the Roslyn property at or near market value. This Guard Station is on 50 acres of property, 27 miles east of New York City on Long Island, NY.

Next chart

BASE ANALYSIS Roslyn AGS, NY

DOD RECOMMENDATION: Close Roslyn Air Guard Station, NY. Relocate units to Stewart IAP AGS, NY

FOR CONSIDERATION: Accept or reject each recommended closure.

CRITERIA	ROSLYN AGS, NY (C)
FORCE STRUCTURE	Combat Communications, Electronic Installations
ONE-TIME COSTS (\$ M)	14.2
ANNUAL SAVINGS (\$ M)	0.2
RETURN ON INVESTMENT	1999 (2 Years)
NET PRESENT VALUE	8.9
BASE OPERATING BUDGET (\$ M)	0.6
PERSONNEL ELIMINATED (MIL / CIV)	2/2
PERSONNEL REALIGNED (MIL / CIV)	5/33
ECONOMIC IMPACT (BRAC 95 / CUM)	0.0%/0.0%

(C) = DoD recommendation for closure

(R) = DoD recommendation for realignment

(X) = Joint Cross Service Group alternative for closure or realignment

(*) = *Commission add for further consideration*

F-12

Scenario Summary Chart-Ontario F-11

The next chart shows the pros and cons associated with this recommendation. There are no ^{community or staff} concerns regarding this recommendation. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have on this recommendation.

MOTION

SCENARIO SUMMARY

Ontario AGS, CA

DoD RECOMMENDATION	
Close Ontario AGS, CA. Relocate unit to March ARB, CA.	
One Time Costs (\$M): 0.9 Annual Savings (\$M): 0.1 Return on Investment: 2006 (9 Years) Net Present Value (\$M): 0.8	
PRO	CON
Eliminates base operating support personnel and costs Excess capacity at March ARB Relocation of unit requires little expenditure No impact on recruiting	Long return on investment

F-11

Base Analysis Chart - Ontario F-10

The next recommendation is closure of **Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station, CA** and relocation of the Combat Communications and Weather units to March Air Reserve Base, CA. The recommendation requires \$900,000 in up-front costs and an ROI of 9 years.

BASE ANALYSIS Ontario AGS, CA

DOD RECOMMENDATION: Close Ontario Air Guard Station, CA;. Relocate units to March ARB, CA.

FOR CONSIDERATION: Accept or reject each recommended closure.

CRITERIA	ONTARIO AGS, CA (C)
FORCE STRUCTURE	Combat Communications, Weather
ONE-TIME COSTS (\$ M)	0.9
ANNUAL SAVINGS (\$ M)	0.1
RETURN ON INVESTMENT	2006 (9 years)
NET PRESENT VALUE	0.8
BASE OPERATING BUDGET (\$ M)	0.1
PERSONNEL ELIMINATED (MIL / CIV)	1/0
PERSONNEL REALIGNED (MIL / CIV)	3/22
ECONOMIC IMPACT (BRAC 95 / CUM)	0.0%/0.0%

(C) = DoD recommendation for closure

(R) = DoD recommendation for realignment

(X) = Joint Cross Service Group alternative for closure or realignment

(*) = *Commission add for further consideration*

F-10

Scenario Summary Chart-North Highlands F-9

This next chart shows the pros and cons associated with this recommendation. There are no community or staff concerns regarding this recommendation. We will now answer any questions the commissioners may have on this recommendation.

MOTION

GO TO ONTARIO