DCN 4290

Operation KEEP CANNON

July 7, 2005

Mr. Ken Small
Air Force Team Leader
Defense Base Closure
& Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202-3920

Dear Mr. Small:

The community of Clovis, New Mexico is pleased to provide you with our certified data, analysis, and a description of the methodology used to analyze the Air Force's recommendation to close Cannon Air Force Base. It is our intent to be a partner with you and your staff as you analyze the Air Force data. All of our analysis is, and will continue to be, provided in a complete, transparent, and time-sensitive manner.

Our analysis team is comprised of superb cost and accounting analysts with specific Department of Defense infrastructure experience. They understand BRAC and the Department of Defense's data collection process and are prepared to discuss their findings at any time. Specifically, we encourage you to review not only our findings regarding data inconsistencies, but the failure to adequately take into account Cannon's range, air space, and its complete freedom from encroachment.

We understand the incredible time challenge you are under and immense volumes of data you are responsible for analyzing. Your staff has been generous with their time and we have confidence that they are reviewing the facts fairly and thoroughly. Similarly, we appreciate your dedicated service and your commitment to the defense of the nation.

Sincerely,

R Harris

Randy Harris
Chairman, Committee of Fifty

Attachment (1) MCI Calculation Methodology
Attachment (2) Economic Value Methodology

Attachment 1
Methodology For Community MCI Scoring Calculations For Cannon
June 24, 2005

The Clovis community support team reviewed data released by DOD and the BRAC Commission prior to the June 24, 2005 regional hearing and prepared an alternative scoring analysis for some of the Military Capabilities Index (MCI) reported scores. While we questioned the overall weighting process, especially for issues such as encroachment, we concentrated principally on whether the data available accurately reflected the true situation at Cannon. This effort has been hampered by the lack of access to detailed information on the data call reporting and scoring of individual elements within each MCI question. However, we followed the AF's formula to the extent possible to highlight errors and ambiguity. Following is our methodology for scoring the various MCI questions:

Question 1242: ATC Restrictions to Operations

Maximum Points	5.98
Air Force Score	3.99
Community Score	5.98

Data was taken from the computerized aircraft maintenance system (CAMS). This system measures maintenance not ATC restrictions. Thus the measurement process was inappropriate for tracking ATC delays. Cannon controls its own departures, arrivals and airspace and thus has no ATC restrictions at all. Cannon should have received maximum points.

Effective Points: 100% X 5.98 = 5.98

Question 1245: Proximity to Airspace Supporting Mission

Maximum Points	22.08
Air Force Score	6.04
Community Score	15.12

Detailed scoring for each of the 12 elements of this question is not yet available to the community. Supporting data that was available is scattered throughout various files in the BRAC database and is inconsistent, particularly for airspace volume and operating hours. Therefore, the community applied the following evaluation:

Element (% of Total)	Community % Attributed
Volume (15%)	**7.5%** (Unclear if all available airspace volume was reported. NMTRI not considered. We conservatively assumed 50% of total % available)

Operating Hours (15%)	**15%** (Hours reported range from 12 to 24. Anything less than 24 is by local authorities making decisions related to manpower and community convenience. Cannon should get full points)
Scoreable Range (10%)	**10%** (Melrose was ranked first in ACC in terms of range utilization. Cannon should get full points here.)
AGWD (11.25%)	**0.0%** (Melrose has full capabilities to train in Air to Ground Weapons Delivery and should get full points here. However, because of uncertainties in the definition of AGWD, we have assumed 0 points for this element)
Low Angle Strafe/Live Ordnance /IMC Weapons Release/ Electronic Combat/Laser Use Auth /Lights Out Capable/ Flare Auth/Chaff Auth- (43.75% Combined)	**36%** (Melrose has full capability for all except Live Ordnance and IMC Weapon release, and thus should get max points for all except these (36%)
Total Available (95%)	Total Community (68.5%)

Effective Points: 68.5% X 22.08 = 15.12

Question 1246: Proximity to Low Level Routes

Max Points	7.25
Air Force Score	2.64
Community Score	7.25

Cannon should receive maximum points because it has four low level route entries and eight low level route exits less than 50 miles from the base. Cannon was apparently penalized for having multiple legacy routes which have been used in the past and may be available in the future if needed, but are not used currently.

Effective Points: 100% X 7.25 = 7.25

Question 1270: Suitable Auxiliary Airfields Within 50 NM

Max Points	5.18
Air Force Score	0
Community Score	3.89

The formula used by the AF called for points to be awarded for auxiliary airfields within 50 NM. The reported data did not consider either the second, fully equipped, crosswind runway at Cannon or the Clovis Municipal Airport less than 20 miles from the base. Those 2 runways should have given Cannon 75% of maximum available points

Effective Points: 75% X 5.18 = 3.89

Question 1203: Access to Adequate Supersonic Airspace

Max Points	6.72
Air Force Score	1.34
Community Score	5.04

We believe the available data mistakenly showed operating hours of less than 24/7 and did not consider all of the accessible supersonic airspace available to Cannon. In addition, the additional airspace made available by the New Mexico Training Range Initiative (NMTRI) was not considered at all. Our methodology gave Cannon full credit for operation hours (50% of the score) and half value for airspace exceeding 150 NM X 80 NM (50% of the score).

Effective Points: 75% X 6.72 = 5.04

Question 1266: Range Complex (RC) Supports Mission

Even though the question context is different, the elements scored for this question are the same as for question 1245. Therefore, even though the maximum number of points available is different, our analysis applied the same methodology as for the answer, i.e.:

Max Points	11.95
Air Force Score	7.45
Community Score	8.19

Detailed scoring for each of the 12 elements of this question is not yet available to the community. Supporting data that was available is scattered throughout various files in the BRAC database and is inconsistent, particularly for airspace volume and operating hours. Therefore, the community applied the following evaluation:

Element (% of Total)	Community % Attributed
Volume (15%)	**7.5%** (Unclear if all available airspace volume was reported. NMTRI not considered. We conservatively assumed 50% of total % available)
Operating Hours (15%)	**15%** (Hours reported range from 12 to 24. Anything less than 24 is by local decision related to manpower convenience. Cannon should get full points)
Scoreable Range (10%)	**10%** (Melrose was ranked first in ACC in terms of range utilization. Cannon should get full points here.)
AGWD (11.25%)	**0.0%** (Melrose has full capabilities to train in Air to Ground Weapons Delivery and should get full points here. However, because of uncertainties in the definition of AGWD, we have assumed 0 points for this element)
Low Angle Strafe/Live Ordnance /IMC Weapons Release/ Electronic Combat/Laser Use Auth /Lights Out Capable/ Flare Auth/Chaff Auth- (43.75% Combined)	**36%** (Melrose has full capability for all except Live Ordnance and IMC Weapon release, and thus should get max points for all except these (36%)
Total Available (95%)	Total Community (68.5%)

Effective Points: 68.5% X 11.95 = 8.19

Question 1205: Buildable Acres of Air/Industrial Operations

Max Points:	1.96/1.96
Air Force Score:	0.07/0.05
Community Score	1.96/1.96

The data available to the community indicates that total unconstrained acreages for industrial and air development operations were reported as 9 and 10.5 acres respectively. This is erroneous, as Cannon has over 150 acres available (figure needed to get maximum points) according to our understanding of the data. (In fact, Cannon has 368 buildable acres for air/industrial operations.) Cannon should get maximum points here.

Effective Points: 100% X 1.96 = 1.96

Question 1250: Area Cost Factor

Max Points:	1.25
Air Force Score	.74
Community Score	1.25

The community understands that Area Cost Factor per se is a plug number taken from a DOD document and therefore not necessarily produced by the Air Force. However, when numerous cost elements such as Per Diem, Base Allowance for Housing (BAH), Sustainment, Base Operating Support (BOS) costs and others for Cannon are compared to other fighter bases, the numbers for Cannon are almost always lower, in many cases significantly lower. Thus, the community believes that Cannon should get maximum points in any cost comparison exercise.

Effective Points: 100% X 1.25 = 1.25

Regional Economic Impact Of Cannon Air Force Base

(Attachment 2)

INTRODUCTION

On May 13, 2005, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) released its list of closure and realignment recommendations to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission. The State of New Mexico learned that Cannon Air Force Base, eight miles west of Clovis on the high eastern plains of the state, was recommended for closure. Within days, the state's congressional delegation and its governor, Bill Richardson, vowed to combat the recommendation and offered assistance to community leaders to mount a review of the criteria that led to the recommendation. This report addresses the impact of Cannon AFB on local employment (jobs), labor income (payroll), and total industry output (materials, services, labor, and inter-industry dependencies). The report responds to an analysis conducted by the U.S. Air Force and published by DoD as part of the BRAC recommendations showing a potential loss of one in every five local jobs if Cannon were to close.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the report is to provide information on the economic impact of Cannon AFB on the communities of Clovis and Portales (Curry and Roosevelt counties) and compare the employment findings with those of the Air Force as published in DoD's May 13 *Base Closure and Realignment Report.*

BACKGROUND

The 2005 BRAC process represents the fifth round of military realignments and closures. It is the latest round in a process that began in the early 1960's when then-Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara determined it was necessary to downsize the nation's inventory of military installations created during World War II and the

Korean Conflict. Without consulting Congress, the Office of the Secretary of Defense established the criteria for the selection of bases, and closed 60 installations.

In the 1970's, Congress intervened in the process. In August 1977 President Jimmy Carter approved Public Law 95-82. It required DOD to notify Congress when a base was a candidate for reduction or closure; to prepare studies on the strategic, environmental, and local economic consequences of such an action; and to wait 60 days for a congressional response.

Congress has enacted two laws since 1988 that provide for closure of military installations within the continental United States. The laws allow the realignment of facilities, in part or in whole, and provide guidance on the process.

Since 1988, there have been four bipartisan Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commissions (BRAC) that recommended the closure of 125 major military facilities and 225 minor military installations and the realignment in operations and functions of 145 others. By another accounting, the four BRAC rounds achieved 97 base closings and 55 major realignments. This has resulted in net savings to taxpayers of more than $16 billion through 2001 and more than $6 billion in additional savings annually.[1]

The principal mechanism for implementing base closures and reductions in both statutes has been an independent, bipartisan commission, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Under the BRAC process, the Secretary of Defense makes recommendations to the commission. The commission reviews these recommendations and makes its own recommendations to the President. The President then reviews the recommendations and either sends those back to the commission for additional work or forwards them, without changes, to Congress. The recommendations then go into effect unless disapproved by a joint resolution of Congress.

[1] Reference found at www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/brac.htm

2005 BRAC

Although the 2005 BRAC process is similar in many respects to previous rounds (1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995), the legislation authorizing the 2005 BRAC made a number of changes. Significant to this report, the law obligates the Secretary of Defense to provide an economic analysis of the impact to the local community when a base is considered for realignment or closure. The new law narrows the guidance on economic analysis to determining the impact "on existing communities in the vicinity of the military installations."

The law authorizing the 2005 BRAC provides guidance on a number of other issues, many of which are reflected in the current BRAC criteria for evaluating military installations (See Attachment A). A comparison of the 2005 BRAC criteria to earlier rounds is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparing 2005 BRAC Criteria to Previous Criteria

2005 Criteria	Previous Criteria[2]	Change
The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.	The current and future mission requirements and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force.	Replaces "requirements" with "capabilities." Emphasizes the importance of jointness.
The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.	The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace at both existing and potential receiving locations.	Explicit recognition of the need for staging areas for homeland defense missions. Explicit recognition of training areas as an important criterion and greater detail on the need for diversity in training areas.
The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.	The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations.	Clarifies need for future options for both operations and training.
The cost of operations and manpower implications.	The cost and manpower implications.	Sharpens the distinction between the cost of operations and manpower implications.
The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.	The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.	No change.
The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.	The economic impact on communities.	Narrows the definition of economic impact.
The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions, and personnel.	The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions, and personnel.	No change.
The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities.	The environmental impact.	Explicit recognition of the costs of environmental cleanup activities.

Source: www.tomudall.house.gov/pdf/ACF983E.pdf

[2] The criteria was identical for the 1991, 1993, and 1995 BRAC rounds.

Also of note, the 2005 BRAC legislation authorizes an increase from eight to nine in the number of individuals serving on the BRAC Commission. The new law allows for bases to be added to the closure list, but requires at least two commissioners to visit the installation prior to making such a recommendation. The law also permits the Secretary of Defense to propose to place a military base into caretaker status if the installation is deemed important for future national security.

As of this writing, the 2005 BRAC process is well under way. Nine individuals have been appointed to serve on the Commission:

- Anthony J. Principi, chairman, former Secretary of Veterans Affairs (2001-05)
- James H. Bilbray, former Democratic House member from Nevada (1987-95)
- Philip Coyle of California, former Assistant Secretary of Defense
- Ret. Adm. Harold W. Gehman of Virginia, a former NATO Supreme Allied Commander
- James V. Hansen of Utah, a former Republican House member (1981-03)
- Ret. Army Gen. James T. Hill of Florida
- Ret. Air Force Gen. Lloyd "Fig" Newton, former Air Force Vice Chief of Staff
- Samuel Knox Skinner of Illinois, former Secretary of Transportation
- Ret. Air Force Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner of Texas

A list of upcoming key dates and deadlines:

- Sept. 8: BRAC Commission to make its own base closure recommendations
- Sept. 23: Presidential decision on whether to accept or reject the BRAC recommendations in their entirety, the White House's only options. If Bush accepts the plan, it becomes final within 45 legislative days, unless Congress passes a joint resolution to block the entire package.
- Oct. 20: If Bush rejects the BRAC recommendations, the commission has until this date to submit a revised list of proposed closures.
- Nov. 7: President to approve or disapprove the revised recommendations
- April 15, 2006: The commission terminates.

UNDERSTANDING THE AIR FORCE IMPACT ANALYSIS

To generate the employment consequences of a base realignment or closure, DoD provided to the Air Force and other review groups (3 military and 7 cross-service groups) with what is known as the "calculator," or the Economic Impact Tool (EIT). According to DoD, the EIT measures total potential job change--direct, indirect and induced—for a base realignment or closure "scenario." For the Clovis/Curry County region, the EIT identifies the loss of 2,824 direct jobs and calculates an indirect/induced loss of 1,956 additional jobs, if Cannon were to close.

The EIT generates indirect/induced employment impacts for Cannon AFB using a cumulative multiplier of 1.6926. The impacted community is defined by the Air Force as the Clovis Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is identified in the EIT model as Curry County. The potential community job change is calculated as -20.47% of the area employment, a percentage reached by dividing the number of potential job losses (-4,780) over total area employment (23,348).

Air Force-generated employment and output data are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Employment Impact Data for Cannon AFB

Year	2007
Direct Military	-2,385
Direct Civilian	-384
Direct Student	0
Direct Contractor	-55
Cumulative Direct	-2,824
Cumulative Indirect/Induced	-1,956
Cumulative Total	-4,780

Source: Close Cannon Scenario, EIT Run, USAF Deliberative Document 0114v3, found in archive directory at www.defenselink.mil/brac

Table 3. Economic Output Data for Cannon AFB

Economic Region of Influence (ROI)	Clovis, NM Micropolitan Statistical Area
Overall Economic Impact of Proposed BRAC-05 Action:	
ROI Population (2002)	44,921
ROI Employment (2002)	23,348
Authorized Manpower (2005)	3,919
Authorized Manpower (2005) / ROI Employment (2002)	16.79%
Total Estimated Job Change	-4,780
Total Estimated Job Change / ROI Employment (2002)	-20.47%

Source: Close Cannon Scenario, EIT Run, USAF Deliberative Document 0114v3, found in archive directory at www.defenselink.mil/brac

In regard to Cannon AFB, the BRAC evaluation process requires the Air Force to determine the economic impact (positive or negative) of dispersing Cannon's 60 F-16 fighter jets to other locations. Using the EIT tool, these bases demonstrate positive employment impacts as a result of Cannon's closure (See Attachment B).

METHODOLOGY FOR THIS ANALYSIS

Data Collection

Table 4 provides federal FY2004 employment and payroll data (input) for Cannon AFB.

Table 4. 2004 Employment and Payroll at Cannon AFB

	Job Number	Payroll[3]
Active Duty	3,846	$125,669,337
Appropriated	400	25,503,071
Other Civilian	290	3,666,535
Private Sector	349	2,364,345
TOTAL	4,885	$147,203,288

Source: *Economic Impact Assessment FY04*, 27th Fighter Wing, Cannon AFB

Table 5 identifies 2004 construction and procurement spending (input) at Cannon on contractors with a presence in the local area or on contract awards requiring the use of locally supplied goods and services.

[3] Excludes federal and private sector employment benefits

Table 5. 2004 Construction and Procurement Spending at Cannon AFB

	Dollar Amount
Construction Contracts	
Operations & Maintenance	$11,787,281
Military Family Housing	90,999
Nonapropriated Fund	133,000
AAFES	105,000
Military Construction Program	0
Subtotal	$12,116,280
Procurement: Services, Materials, Equipment and Supplies	
Service Contracts	$9,000,000
Utilities and Energy	3,907.588
Telecommunications	1,351,800
Subtotal	$14,259,388
Commissary, Base Exchange, Health and Education	
Defense Commissary Agency	$487,895
Health CHAMPUS & Tri-Care	6,719,868
Tuition Assistance	979,000
Per Diem (Off-Base Meals)	273,000
Lodging	471,900
Subtotal	$8,931,663
TOTAL PROCUREMENT, CONSTRUCTION	**$35,307,331**

Source: *Economic Impact Assessment FY04*, 27th Fighter Wing, Cannon AF

Data Analysis

This report uses the method of input-output (I/O) modeling, a scientifically reliable method for measuring the economic consequences of spending. Two databases are secured for this purpose: (1) The IMPlan Pro (v 2.0.125) database, adopted by the New Mexico Department of Labor for economic analyses, is employed to determine the impact of military contract and procurement spending and the impact of household spending by military and civilian employees. (2) The Regional Industrial Multiplier System (RIMS II) database, generated by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Department of Commerce, is used for verification and generating employment impacts in the education sector, a sector that was modified for local conditions.

Two analyses are conducted: The first determines impacts to employment, labor income and industrial output in Curry County (Clovis) only. This analysis follows the 2005 BRAC guidance – to identify impacts in existing communities in the vicinity of the military installation. A second analysis calculates impacts to the combined region of Curry and Roosevelt counties. This second analysis more accurately accounts for the impact of residents of a 150-unit military housing complex located in Portales (Roosevelt County), west of the campus of Eastern New Mexico University.

For both analyses, employment at Cannon is divided into manpower categories for military personnel, civilian military employees, and base contractors. Some 349 private sector jobs are deemed residentiary and are removed from the input data to prevent the positions from being counted twice (i.e., bank tellers, credit union employees).

Whenever possible, FY 2004 data is used for the analysis. A GDP Price Index deflation factor of 0.9617 is applied when calibrating dollars between 2004 and 2002.

The IMPlan and RIMS II databases allow for the calculation of economic impact or, from another perspective, the loss to the community should Cannon be closed or realigned to a location outside the state. Under no circumstance do the models predict or encourage the closing of Cannon AFB, nor do they predict the expansion or consolidation of the base.

Below are several assumptions of I/O modeling that should be taken into account when interpreting the results:

- Impacts are calculated as numerically linear and proportional;
- Each industry is assumed to have unlimited access to the materials necessary for its production;
- Changes in the economy are assumed to affect an industry's output but will not alter the mix of materials and services that are required to make an industry's products; and

- Each industry is treated as if it provides a single, primary or main product, and all other products of that industry are viewed as byproducts.

FINDINGS

Tables 6 shows summary data on the economic impact of Cannon AFB on employment (jobs), labor income (payrolls), and total industry output (materials, services, labor, and inter-industry dependencies) in Curry County. Table 7 provides details of the summary data.

Table 6. Economic Impact Summary – Curry County Only

	Direct	Indirect	Induced[4]	Total	Area Employment	Impact
Employment (number of jobs)	5,058	66	1,608	6,732	22,015	30.58%
Payroll (thousands of $)	313,040	1,680	36,030	350,750	1,077,395	32.56%
Industry Output (thousands of $)	330,460	4,450	114,790	449,700	1,660,180	27.09%

Source: *Economic Impact Assessment FY04*, Cannon AFB

Table 7. Summary Details – Curry County Only

	Construction & Procurement	Military & Civilian Appropriated Payroll	Totals
Employment (number of jobs)			
Direct	522	4,536	5,058
Indirect	66	0	66
Induced	86	1,522	1,608
Total	674	6,058	6,732
Payroll (thousands of $)			
Direct	15,000	298,040	313,040
Indirect	1,680	0	1,680
Induced	1,920	34,110	36,030
Total	18,600	332,150	350,750
Industry Output (thousands of $)			
Direct	32,420	298,040	330,460
Indirect	4,450	0	4,450
Induced	6,120	108,670	114,790
Total	42,990	406,710	449,700

Source: *Economic Impact Assessment FY04*, Cannon AFB and *Procurement Guidance and Data*, http://www.dior.whs.mil/peidhome/guide/procoper.htm

[4] Generated by consumer spending of those employed by Cannon AFB and its vendors

Tables 8 shows summary data on the economic impact of Cannon AFB on the Curry-Roosevelt area. Table 9 provides details of the summary.

Table 8. Economic Impact Summary – Curry and Roosevelt Counties Combined

	Direct	Indirect	Induced[5]	Total	Area Employment	Impact
Employment (number of jobs)	5,071	63	1,622	6,756	29,820	22.66%
Payroll[6] (thousands of $)	304,900	1,660	36,940	343,500	1,506,229	22.81%
Industry Output (thousands of $)	322,430	4,570	107,700	434,700	2,409,210	18.04%

Source: *Economic Impact Assessment FY04*, Cannon AFB

Table 9. Summary Details – Curry and Roosevelt Counties Combined

	Construction & Procurement	Military & Civilian Appropriated Payroll	Totals
Employment (number of jobs)			
Direct	535	4,536	5071
Indirect	63	0	63
Induced	82	1,540	1,622
Total	680	6,076	6,756
Payroll (thousands of $)			
Direct	14,830	290,070	304,900
Indirect	1,660	0	1,660
Induced	1,800	35,140	36,940
Total	18,290	325,210	343,500
Industry Output (thousands of $)			
Direct	32,360	290,070	322,430
Indirect	4,570	0	4,570
Induced	5,840	101,860	107,700
Total	42,770	391,930	434,700

Source: *Economic Impact Assessment FY04*, Cannon AFB and *Procurement Guidance and Data*, http://www.dior.whs.mil/peidhome/guide/procoper.htm

[5] Generated by consumer spending of those employed by Cannon AFB and its vendors

Based on the RIMS II multipliers for local and state education, some 32 direct and induced employment impacts were identified as missing from the education sector in the Curry-Roosevelt impact area. The positions were added manually to the impact tables with their added salary and output measures.

Cannon AFB is responsible for $917,500 in federal impact aid to the State of New Mexico. This spending is not included in the current analysis because impact dollars for education are reallocated to schools throughout the state.

COMPARISON WITH AIR FORCE FINDINGS

Table 10. shows a comparison of employment impacts generated for Curry County, the Curry-Roosevelt area, and for Curry County, using the Air Force EIT calculator.

Table 10. Employment Impact Comparison – Curry County, Combined Curry-Roosevelt, Air Force

	Direct	Indirect	Induced[7]	Total	Area Employment	Impact
Curry County only	5,058	66	1,608	6,732	22,015	30.58%
Curry and Roosevelt counties	5,071	63	1,622	6,756	29,820	22.66%
Air Force EIT	2,824	0	1,956	4,780	23,348	20.47%

In comparing employment impacts, the Air Force defines its impact area as the Clovis Micropolitan Statistical Area, or Curry County. No analysis is performed by the Air Force for Portales or Roosevelt County. The Air Force EIT uses a cumulative multiplier of 1.69 in generating indirect/induced employment impact for the possible closing of Cannon. By comparison, the IMPlan and RIMS II databases generate several hundred multipliers, each coded specifically to one of more than 400 industry sectors.

The Air Force uses FY2007 authorized manpower statistics to determine employment impact, which until recently were considered classified and unavailable to the public. The new information highlights what appears to be a planned downsizing from 2005 staffing levels of 1,534 military employees. This apparent reduction in active duty personnel would occur regardless of BRAC. For the Air Force economic impact analysis, the lower staffing level has the effect of reducing the employment impact. The IMPlan/RIMS II

[7] Generated by consumer spending of those employed by Cannon AFB and its vendors

analysis, on the other hand, works from 2004 manpower data, providing perhaps a more realistic picture of the potential for regional job losses.

Walker Air Force Base

The closing in 1967 of Walker AFB in Roswell, New Mexico, offers an historic precedent when reviewing the potential impact of closing Cannon AFB. Located 96 miles south of Clovis, Roswell is among the leading cities in east-central New Mexico. Like Clovis, Roswell is surrounded by large tracts of public lands and maintains commercial businesses that support a substantial farm and ranch community. In the year prior to closure of Walker AFB, the city of Roswell recorded a population of some 48,000 people. Three years later, after the air base was closed, the city's population had fallen 30%. The 2000 Census—taken 33 years after Walker AFB's closure--places Roswell's population at 45,293, still somewhat smaller than its population in the mid-1960's. If Roswell's experience is a guide, the IMPlan/RIMS II calculation of the potential loss of 30.58% of all jobs in Clovis/Curry County appears realistic.

Lack of a Weighted Factor

The potential impact of Cannon AFB to local jobs, payrolls and industrial output is considerable. Although economic impact is one of the eight BRAC criteria and is included within the evaluation data elements, it is not calculated as an independent or weighted factor in assigning final value to any military installation. In the case of Cannon AFB, regional economic impact is a significant factor.

SUMMARY

Among bases listed by DoD for potential reduction or closure under BRAC, the recommendation to close Cannon AFB appears the harshest of all in terms of its impact on the nearby community. The *Base Closure and Realignment Report* stated:

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4,780 jobs (2,824 direct jobs and 1,956 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Clovis, NM, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 20.5 percent of economic area employment,

This estimate poses the largest single job loss as a percentage of community employment of all the BRAC recommendations. Among bases recommended for realignment or closure, Cannon's potential impact in area jobs exceeds the second largest impact by nearly twice.

This report makes an argument that the full impact of Cannon AFB on the local community may, in fact, be greater than estimates generated by the Air Force. Impact analyses using IMPlan and RIMS II multipliers find a larger 30.58% potential loss in local jobs, or the potential loss of one in every three existing jobs in Curry County alone. A combined study area that included Curry and Roosevelt counties identifies a potential employment loss of 22.66% of the area's jobs.

While arguments can be made regarding the validity of the Air Force employment numbers, it is fair to say, no matter which analysis is adopted, that the potential impact to the Clovis-Portales community is sizable. Impacts that reach more than 5-10% of regional jobs are rare. A cursory review of New Mexico history finds that, if Cannon were to close, the potential economic impact would likely be among the worst ever to occur in the state. If Cannon were to close, it is also likely that the nearby communities of Clovis and Portales might never fully recover within the lifetimes of the current residents.

References

"Economic Impact Assessment FY04," publication of the 27th Fighter Wing. Cannon AFB, NM. pp. 1-10.

Military 'Procurement Guidance and Data" spreadsheet, found online at www.dior.whs.mil/peidhome/guide/procoper.htm

Online Labor Market Information (MLI) database, New Mexico Department of Labor, found at www.dol.state.nm.us

ATTACHMENT A

BRAC 2005 Selection Criteria

Military Value

(1) The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.

(2) The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.

(3) The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.

(4) The cost of operations and the manpower implications.

Other Considerations

(5) The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.

(6) The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

(7) The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.

(8) The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities.

From the Base Closure and Realignment Report, *Vol. 1, Chap.3, p. 18.*

ATTACHMENT B

```
COBRA PERSONNEL/SF/SUSTAINMENT/RECAP/BOS DELTAS REPORT (COBRA v6.10)
Data As Of 5/4/2005 4:29:12 PM, Report Created 5/20/2005 8:36:26 AM
Department : USAF
Scenario File : C:\Documents and Settings\COBRA Working\COBRA USAF 0114V3 (125.1c2) Close
Cannon.CBR
Option Pkg Name: COBRA USAF 0114V3 (125.1c2) Close Cannon
Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF
Personnel
Base Start* Finish* Change %Change
---- ------------ ------------ ------------ -------
Cannon AFB 2,769 0 -2,769 -100%
Andrews AFB 8,057 8,170 113 1%
Dane County Regional 284 342 58 20%
Kirtland AFB 6,702 6,717 15 0%
Joe Foss Field AGS 284 343 59 21%
Nellis AFB 8,080 8,340 260 3%
BASE X (AIR FORCE) 2,940 2,978 38 1%
Hill AFB 16,501 16,723 222 1%
----- ------------ ------------ ------------ -------
TOTAL 45,617 43,613 -2,004 -4%
Square Footage
Base Start Finish Change %Change Chg/Per
---- ------------ ------------ ------------ ------- --------
Cannon AFB 2,199,000 0 -2,199,000 -100% 794
Andrews AFB 4,691,000 4,693,350 2,350 0% 21
Dane County Regional 727,000 727,000 0 0% 0
Kirtland AFB 6,137,000 6,137,152 152 0% 10
Joe Foss Field AGS 411,000 411,000 0 0% 0
Nellis AFB 4,658,000 4,679,756 21,756 0% 84
BASE X (AIR FORCE) 1,947,403 1,947,403 0 0% 0
Hill AFB 9,124,000 9,133,513 9,513 0% 43
----- ------------ ------------ ------------ ------- --------
TOTAL 29,894,403 27,729,174 -2,165,229 -7% 1,080
Base Operations Support (2005$)
Base Start* Finish* Change %Change Chg/Per
---- ------------ ------------ ------------ ------- --------
Cannon AFB 14,662,144 0 -14,662,144 -100% 5,295
Andrews AFB 42,038,028 42,466,408 428,379 1% 3,791
Dane County Regional 2,986,836 3,039,079 52,243 2% 901
Kirtland AFB 68,705,420 68,811,295 105,874 0% 7,058
Joe Foss Field AGS 2,017,418 2,053,313 35,895 2% 608
Nellis AFB 36,538,603 37,393,538 854,935 2% 3,288
BASE X (AIR FORCE) 18,380,156 18,497,109 116,953 1% 3,078
Hill AFB 69,390,813 70,179,466 788,653 1% 3,552
----- ------------ ------------ ------------ ------- --------
TOTAL 254,719,419 242,440,208 -12,279,211 -5% 6,127
COBRA PERSONNEL/SF/SUSTAINMENT/RECAP/BOS DELTAS REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 2
Data As Of 5/4/2005 4:29:12 PM, Report Created 5/20/2005 8:36:26 AM
Department : USAF
Scenario File : C:\Documents and Settings\COBRA Working\COBRA USAF 0114V3 (125.1c2) Close
Cannon.CBR
Option Pkg Name: COBRA USAF 0114V3 (125.1c2) Close Cannon
Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF
Sustainment (2005$)
Base Start Finish Change %Change Chg/Per
---- ------------ ------------ ------------ ------- --------
Cannon AFB 10,698,123 0 -10,698,123 -100% 3,863
Andrews AFB 16,474,241 16,477,898 3,657 0% 32
Dane County Regional 2,579,767 2,579,767 0 0% 0
Kirtland AFB 30,365,709 30,366,031 322 0% 21
Joe Foss Field AGS 1,554,571 1,554,571 0 0% 0
Nellis AFB 25,094,105 25,157,424 63,319 0% 243
BASE X (AIR FORCE) 8,161,604 8,161,604 0 0% 0
Hill AFB 33,939,303 33,964,665 25,362 0% 114
----- ------------ ------------ ------------ ------- --------
TOTAL 128,867,423 118,261,960 -10,605,462 -8% 5,292
Recapitalization (2005$)
Base Start Finish Change %Change Chg/Per
```

Cannon AFB	10,933,499	0	-10,933,499	-100%	3,948
Andrews AFB	15,551,057	15,554,602	3,545	0%	31
Dane County Regional	1,603,688	1,603,688	0	0%	0
Kirtland AFB	20,908,530	20,908,795	264	0%	18
Joe Foss Field AGS	903,025	903,025	0	0%	0
Nellis AFB	19,915,315	19,975,827	60,512	0%	233
BASE X (AIR FORCE)	6,909,608	6,909,608	0	0%	0
Hill AFB	28,009,115	28,029,421	20,306	0%	91
TOTAL	104,733,836	93,884,965	-10,848,871	-10%	5,414

Sustain + Recap + BOS (2005$)

Base	Start	Finish	Change	%Change	Chg/Per
Cannon AFB	36,293,766	0	-36,293,766	-100%	13,107
Andrews AFB	74,063,326	74,498,908	435,582	1%	3,855
Dane County Regional	7,170,291	7,222,534	52,243	1%	901
Kirtland AFB	119,979,660	120,086,121	106,461	0%	7,097
Joe Foss Field AGS	4,475,014	4,510,909	35,895	1%	608
Nellis AFB	81,548,023	82,526,789	978,766	1%	3,764
BASE X (AIR FORCE)	33,451,368	33,568,321	116,953	0%	3,078
Hill AFB	131,339,231	132,173,552	834,321	1%	3,758
TOTAL	488,320,678	454,587,134	-33,733,544	-7%	16,833

Plant Replacement Value (2005$)

Base	Start	Finish	Change	%Change	Chg/Per
Cannon AFB	1,322,953,349	0	-1,322,953,349	-100%	477,773
Andrews AFB	1,881,677,862	1,882,106,862	429,000	0%	3,796
Dane County Regional	194,046,247	194,046,247	0	0%	0
Kirtland AFB	2,529,932,186	2,529,964,186	32,000	0%	2,133
Joe Foss Field AGS	109,265,980	109,265,980	0	0%	0
Nellis AFB	2,409,753,071	2,417,075,071	7,322,000	0%	28,161
BASE X (AIR FORCE)	836,062,557	836,062,557	0	0%	0
Hill AFB	3,389,102,918	3,391,559,918	2,457,000	0%	11,067
TOTAL	12,672,794,17	011,360,080,821	-1,312,713,349	-10%	655,046

ATTACHMENT C

Cannon AFB Largest Contract Awards to New Mexico Companies, 2004

Business	Location	Amount	Code	Name of Product/Service
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	6072	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	8622	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	4426	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	-68326	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	4606	Z199	Maint/Other Miscellaneous Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	5588	Y299	All Other Non-Building Facilities
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	-13269	Y199	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	1648	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Albuquerque Surveying Co. Inc.	Alb	26212	R404	Land Surveys, Cadastral Svcs (non-construction)
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	5786	Y199	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	57678	Y199	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	4837	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	25592	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Albuquerque Surveying Co. Inc.	Alb	20883	R404	Land Surveys, Cadastral Svcs (non-construction)
WT Denton Mechanical Inc.	Clovis	26557	J045	Maint & Repair of Eq/Plumbing & Heating Equipment
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	25761	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	9642	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
DMJMH+N Inc.	Alb	10000	C211	Architect-Engineering Services
DMJMH+N Inc.	Alb	16037	C211	Architect-Engineering Services
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	2720	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	9328	Z199	Maint/Other Miscellaneous Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	7240	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	1473	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
DMJMH+N Inc.	Alb	2690	C211	Architect-Engineering Services
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	2567	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
MV Industries, Inc.	Alb	0	Y299	All Other Non-Building Facilities
Geo-Test, Inc.	Santa Fe	8794	F015	Well Drilling/Exploratory Services
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	2029	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	3559	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Geo-Test, Inc.	Santa Fe	16511	F015	Well Drilling/Exploratory Services
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	8213	Z199	Maint/Other Miscellaneous Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	16711	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	21763	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	2991	Z199	Maint/Other Miscellaneous Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	2437	Z299	All Other Non-Building Facilities
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	3101	Y299	All Other Non-Building Facilities
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	1117	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	1485	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	31382	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	936346	Y124	Airport Runways
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	12035	Z199	Maint/Other Miscellaneous Buildings
Gerald A. Martin LTD	Alb	8046	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	-11592	Y119	Other Administrative & Service Buildings
MV Industries, Inc.	Alb	-168613	Z249	Maint/Other Utilities
United Enterprise Builders, Inc.	Clovis	158000	Y300	Restoration Activities
United Enterprise Builders, Inc.	Clovis	-1444	Z119	Maint/Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	679346	Z119	Maint/Other Administrative & Service Buildings
Cumbre Construction Inc.	Alb	40120	Z213	Maint/Mine Fire Control Facilities
Cumbre Construction Inc.	Alb	39558	Z124	Maint/Airport Runways
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	-2452	Z222	Maint/Highways, Roads, Streets & Bridges
Nick Griego & Sons Construction	Clovis	416980	Z222	Maint/Highways, Roads, Streets & Bridges
Dick's Electric, Inc.	Melrose	1999	Z119	Maint/Other Administrative & Service Buildings