

operation

KEEP CANNON

**Presented by the Clovis and Portales Communities
and the State of New Mexico**

1

2

3

4

**Alternatives to the
Recommended Closure of Cannon Air Force Base**

**Submitted to the
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
July 15, 2005**

**Prepared by Clovis and Portales Communities
and the State of New Mexico**



Table of Contents

Title Page	Tab A
Table of Contents	Tab B
Alternative Scenario No. 1	Tab C
(Remove Cannon from DOD Closure List)	
COBRA Model Community Excursion	Attachment 1
Base Cost Comparison	Attachment 2
Alternative Scenario No. 2	Tab D
(Move Oceana missions to Moody; New A-10 Wing at Cannon)	
Estimated Costs	Attachment 3
Notional COBRA Analysis for Scenario No. 2	Attachment 4
Alternative Scenario No. 3	Tab E
(Move Oceana missions to Seymour Johnson; SJ F-15E's to Cannon)	
Notional COBRA Analysis	Attachment 5
Alternative Scenario No. 4	Tab F
(Move Shaw missions to Cannon; Close Shaw)	
Estimated Costs/Savings	Attachment 6
Alternative Scenario No. 5	Tab G
(Move Luke flying missions to Cannon; Close or realign Luke)	

- **Note: Personnel & payroll data taken from AFI 65-503 Cost and Planning Factors, <https://aftoc.hill.af.mil/>**
- COBRA Standard Factors for payroll are higher and listed as the following: Officer: \$124,972, Enlisted: \$82,399, Civilian: \$59,959



**Recommendation:**

Remove Cannon from DOD Recommended Closure List

Discussion:

- Reject DOD recommendation to close Cannon by majority vote of Commissioners.
- Retain current F-16 mission at Cannon.

Justification:

- Cannon was incorrectly scored with regard to multiple Military Value criteria.
 - Removal of Cannon from the recommended closure list allows the AF and DOD to correct a significant error produced by a flawed Military Value assessment process.
 - Closure of Cannon presents an unprecedented and unacceptable economic impact.
 - Net Present Value (NPV) projected cost savings from closure are significantly reduced (Attachment 1 – Community Excursion).
 - DOD projected NPV cost savings inexplicably increased from \$1.3B to \$2.7B in the last few weeks before release of BRAC recommendations.
 - Cannon has the lowest cost per flying hour in ACC and is comparable to or lower than its peers in several cost categories (Attachment 2 – Cost Comparison Table).
 - Cannon is un-encroached with regard to the base, and its airspace and range complexes are controlled by Cannon and unrestricted for military use.
 - Cannon has infrastructure to support return of F-16 squadrons from overseas and/or realignment from other CONUS bases.
 - Proposed F-16 force structure negatively impacts recruiting, retention, training and quality of life.
- 
- 

Attachment 1

COBRA Model Community Excursion June 12, 2005

- On June 12, one community COBRA Excursion was completed by modifying the DOD Recommendation COBRA for Cannon's closure recommendation – COBRA USAir Force 0114V3 (125.1c2).CBR. The results are reported below.
 - Modification to Air Force COBRA assumptions: Retained all eliminated personnel to support force structure moves and relocated them to Nellis AFB as the most likely installation to receive the bulk of personnel.
 - Result: The changes in significant cost/savings data are displayed in the table below with the most significant presented in **bold** font. The Air Force Recommendation COBRA data is presented in the first row for comparison to the "Keep 100% Excursion" results displayed in the second row in **red**.
 - As demonstrated, when personnel incorrectly eliminated by the Air Force are added back in recognition that military personnel can not be separated from force structure savings without consideration for readiness implications, the recommended action's savings evaporate.
 - While it is true some personnel will be eliminated by closure actions, assuming all personnel are retained establish a counterpoint to the Air Force's assumption that nearly all will be eliminated.
 - It is clear that retention of the necessary operational, maintenance and support needed at receiving locations will significantly reduce the financial case for closing Cannon AFB.
 - To test the impact of eliminating installation support personnel, two additional excursions were completed. The first eliminated 10 officers, 10% of enlisted and 20% of civilian personnel. The second excursion rephased the action to 2008 so all MILCON could be completed before additional personnel arrived at receiving locations. Results are displayed in the table in rows four and five. While there are still small savings, the *NPV is reduced by approximately 94%*.

Scenario	Payback Period (Years)	Costs/Savings (\$K)				
		20 - Year NPV	1-Time Cost	Personnel (2006 – 2011)	Total (2006 - 2011)	Annual Total Recurring
Recommendation Scenario	Immediate	-2,706,756	90,101	-772,995	-815,558	-200,497
Keep 100%	Never	169,913	86,976	109,997	118,100	6,197
Minus BOS*	5	-157,059	118,010	-654	22,269	-19,342
Minus BOS & Rephase Action	5	-151,997	118,160	530	39,293	-19,342

- *BOS is Base Operating Support and Payroll
- Excursion: COBRA USAir Force 0114V3 (125.1c2) COMM 1 June 12 05.CBR.

Attachment 2

Base Cost Comparison Cannon vs. Luke/Shaw/Hill

The table below displays a comparison of basic elements used in COBRA Analyses by the Air Force to assess the “cost of doing business” at losing and receiving locations. The values were taken from the Static Base Input Screens of Air Force COBRA Models completed during the BRAC 2005 DOD Deliberative Process. The elements displayed are:

- Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) for the COBRA 2005 “Standard Officer (O-3 with dependents)” and “Standard Enlisted (E-5 with dependents).” These values vary by Zip Code of assigned installation.
- Civilian Locality Pay (CLP) for the COBRA 2005 “Standard Civilian (GS-9, Step 5). CLP varies by Locality Pay Region in which installations are located. If no specific area is defined, the value is set at the “Rest of United States.”
- Per Diem Rate from Federal Pay Tables.
- Sustainment and Sustainment Payroll. Sustainment is maintenance and repair activities necessary to keep an inventory of facilities in good condition.
- Base Operating Support (BOS) and BOS Payroll. BOS is the cost of operating facilities in good condition to support the assigned units and their missions.

The table demonstrates the cost advantages of doing business in Clovis, NM, versus higher cost areas.

Bases	BAH Officer	BAH Enlisted	Civilian Locality Pay Factor	Per Diem Rate	Sustainment Total + Payroll	Base Operating Support (BOS) Payroll + Non Payroll
Cannon	\$ 915	\$704	1.109	\$ 86	\$20,008	\$33,461
Luke	\$1,197	\$962	1.109	\$154	\$22,564	\$44,307
Delta	\$ 282	\$258	0	\$68	\$2,396	\$10,846
Shaw	\$1,060	\$807	1.109	\$89	\$17,770	\$35,267
Delta	\$145	\$103	0	\$3	(\$2,238)	\$1,806
Hill	\$911	\$724	1.109	\$108	\$52,691	\$129,774
Delta	(\$4)	\$20	0	\$22	\$32,683	\$96,313

(\$XXX) - Greater cost than Cannon

(\$XXX) - Lesser cost than Cannon



Alternative Scenario No. 2

Recommendation:

Close or Realign NAS Oceana Missions to Moody AFB and Realign Moody AFB Missions to Cannon AFB

Discussion:

- Roll F-18 and possibly F-14 assets at Naval Air Station Oceana to Moody AFB.
- **A-10 Scenario:** Move A-10's to Cannon AFB as follows:
 - A-10's from Eielson AFB (Instead of Moody AFB) - **15**
 - A-10's from Pope AFB (Instead of Moody AFB) - **36**

 - **Total A-10's at Cannon after re-alignment - 51**

- **F-16 Scenario:** Realign F-16s at Cannon AFB as follows:
 - Retain all current Block 40 and 50 F-16 aircraft at Cannon AFB;
 - Block 40's In Place - **24**
 - Block 50's In Place - **24**

 - Singapore F-16 Block 52 squadron will move to Luke AFB, Arizona.

 - Realign all Cannon AFB Block 30 aircraft to: 115th Fighter Wing, Dane County Regional Airport, Truax Field Air Guard Station, Wisconsin (three aircraft), 114th Fighter Wing Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station South Dakota (three aircraft), 150th Fighter Wing Kirtland Air Force Base, (three aircraft), and 113th Wing Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland (nine aircraft).

 - **Total F-16's at Cannon after re-alignment - 48**

- Total Aircraft at Cannon AFB following realignment (F-16 and A-10) **99**
- Capacity at Cannon AFB per BRAC report (fixed wing ramp space) **153**
- Contingency Surge Capacity at Cannon AFB following realignment **54**

Justification:

- If all NAS Oceana flying missions roll to Moody AFB; allows for extensive future cost savings from closure of an expensive, encroached facility and eliminates costly programmed increases in the future.

- If F-14's stay at Oceana:
 - Retains three installations with high military value but better leverages their value to DOD for training and the readiness of future forces.

- Reduces growing pressure from local communities advocating the complete closure of NAS Oceana “Master Jet Base” based on concern for the increased noise and environmental consequences of bedding down the F/A-18 “*Super Hornet*.”
 - Increases the operational capability of NAS Oceana to support the F-14 “*Tomcat*” and other remaining aircraft. Retains credible “operational placeholder” at NAS Oceana for the replacement of the *Tomcat*.
 - Relieves imperative for the Navy to obtain property and construct an additional Outlying Landing Field (OLF) for Carrier Landing Practice in Virginia or Northern North Carolina.
 - Mitigates encroachment at Oceana which makes continued operations there unsustainable.
- If Oceana either closes or is realigned and A-10’s roll to Cannon AFB:
 - Retains Moody AFB as a DOD installation and leverages its air-to-air and air-to-ground training venues to support fleet requirements on the East Coast.
 - Retains Cannon AFB as an installation that is very cost-effective; sustainable; un-encroached, and protected from encroachment for more than the 20-year BRAC 2005 planning window; with diverse terrain, great training space, and highly favorable weather.
 - Reduces operational costs at bases in far more expensive areas and takes advantage of low infrastructure costs for this alternative at Cannon AFB (See Attachment 3).
 - Mitigates the fact that if the Oceana mission is moved to Moody AFB, Moody may not support all 8 Navy squadrons and the (BRAC) proposed A-10 wing (See Attachment 4).
 - Takes advantage of an ideal combination of features and qualities at Cannon AFB to support the increasingly important Close Air Support mission in the transformed Army through flexible, responsive and reliable training platforms, such as:
 - Good proximity to Army Infantry/Armor Bases for Joint training:
 - Cannon AFB, New Mexico to Fort Hood, Texas: 340 nautical miles;
 - Cannon AFB, New Mexico to Fort Bliss, Texas: 220 nautical miles

Attachment 3

Estimated Costs at Cannon for Alternative Scenario 2

Additional Infrastructure Requirements

(Based on reduction in F-16's and increase in A-10s)

Existing Officer Billets at Cannon AFB	266
Existing Enlisted Billets at Cannon AFB	3249
Existing Civilian Billets at Cannon AFB	363
<hr/>	
Total Existing Personnel:	3878
Less one (1) Block 30 F-16 Squadron (Officer)	49
Less one (1) Block 30 F-16 Squadron (Enlisted)	630
Less one (1) Block 30 F-16 Squadron (Civilian)	12
<hr/>	
Proposed Personnel Reduction:	(691)
Proposed Additional Officer Billets (A-10 Wing, 44x2)	88
Proposed Additional Enlisted Billets (A-10 Wing, 572x2)	1144
Proposed Additional Civilian Billets (A-10 Wing, 11x2)	22
Proposed Additional Officer Billets (A-10 Wing Staff)	25
Proposed Additional Enlisted Billets (A-10 Wing Staff)	48
Proposed Additional Civilian Billets (Wing Staff)	6
<hr/>	
Total Proposed A-10 Personnel:	1333
Total Proposed Base Personnel Load:	4520

Assume dining hall/fitness center/etc. can accommodate increase of 1 squadron

Estimated Additional Officer Bachelor Housing Requirement	40 units
Estimated Additional Enlisted Bachelor Housing Requirement	300 units
Vacant Housing Units in Municipal Area per BRAC scenario: (Accommodate surge during transition)	3,553
Estimated Additional Officer Bachelor Housing Cost	\$7,000,000
Estimated Additional Enlisted Bachelor Housing Cost (three buildings 1+1 standard)	\$35,000,000
New 30,000 sqft Child Care Facility	\$6,300,000
A-10 Weapons Systems Maintenance/Ranging Facility	\$4,800,000
A-10 Simulator Facility (Relocation)	\$3,500,000
Total Estimated Additional Infrastructure Requirements	\$56,600,000
Completion in FY08/09 through Design-Build contract	

Attachment 4

Notional COBRA Analysis for Scenario No. 2

- On July 10, two community COBRA Excursions were completed by modifying the Navy Alternative COBRA for the realignment of NAS Oceana to Moody AFB. COBRA DON-0153 (OCE – MOODY) 050422 COBRA 6.10.CBR. The entire scenario could not be modeled based on lack of data for Moody AFB assigned forces and relocation costs. However, the part of the action closing NAS Oceana and relocating forces to either Moody AFB or Navy Base X was completed. The nature of data available and assumptions means these analyses can be considered no more than notional. The changes and results are reported below.
- **Community Changes – Excursion 1.**
 - Moved personnel originally programmed to realign to Moody AFB as modeled by the Navy.
 - Added USAF Base X so Air Force Moody personnel could be realigned vice eliminated as done in the Navy’s analysis. The Navy treated Air Force personnel as “Non-BRAC Program Losses.” This was incorrect.
 - Result: The significant cost/savings data are displayed in the table below. As demonstrated, the scenario could produce significant savings for the Navy annually, but the execution is so expensive the payback period is 15 years.
 - Of note, is the very large MILCON program in the Navy’s cost analysis. \$345.171 Million is assumed to be required, most for mission facilities. This seems excessive since Moody AFB previously hosted fighter aircraft and is currently a fully operational aviation facility.

Scenario	Payback Period (Years)	Costs/Savings (\$K) *				
		20 - Year NPV	1-Time Cost	Personnel (2006 – 2011)	Total (2006 - 2011)	Annual Total Recurring
Community Excursion 1	15	19,030	534,240	-43,554	461,534	-42,399

*Negative numbers are savings

- **Community Changes – Excursion 2.**

- All changes made for Excursion 1 remain.
- Deleted approximately \$124.4 Million in construction projects associated with airfield-related infrastructure to test sensitivity of the scenario to the MILCON program and adjust for existence of facilities at Moody assumed to be useable by Oceana force structure.
- Coded Oceana for closure. There are still 3,000+ personnel remaining after closure so additional costs would be incurred for their relocation, but available data does not permit reasonable modeling by the community.
- Shutdown 100% of NAS Oceana facilities.
- Result: The significant cost/savings data are displayed in the table below. As demonstrated, the scenario could produce both 20-year and annual savings for the Navy and provide a payback period in 10 years. Note the caveat above about additional costs that could not be estimated.

Scenario	Payback Period (Years)	Costs/Savings (\$K) *				
		20 - Year NPV	1-Time Cost	Personnel (2006 – 2011)	Total (2006 - 2011)	Annual Total Recurring
Community Excursion 2	10	-121,654	409,795	-43,554	329,897	-44,122

* Negative numbers are savings

While the community can “suggest” results from COBRA Modeling, only DOD has the data necessary to properly analyze the totality of Alternative Scenario No. 2.



Alternative Scenario No. 3

Recommendation:

Close or Realign NAS Oceana Missions to Seymour Johnson AFB and Realign Seymour Johnson AFB Missions to Cannon AFB

Discussion:

- Close Oceana and move F-18's, and possibly F-14's, to Seymour Johnson AFB
- Move current F-15E Wing from Seymour Johnson AFB to Cannon AFB
- Retain current Block 40 and Block 50 F-16 squadrons at Cannon

Justification:

- If only F-18's move from NAS Oceana to Seymour Johnson AFB:
 - Retains three installations with high military value, but better leverages their value to DOD for training and the readiness of future forces.
 - Reduces programmed increases in operations at a current, severely encroached installation.
 - Reduces growing pressure from local communities advocating the complete closure of NAS Oceana "Master Jet Base" based on concern for the increased noise and environmental consequences of bedding down the F/A-18 "Super Hornet."
 - Increases the operational capability of NAS Oceana to support the F-14 "Tomcat" and other remaining aircraft. Retains credible "operational placeholder" at NAS Oceana for the replacement of the *Tomcat*.
 - Relieves imperative for the Navy to obtain property and construct an additional Outlying Landing Field (OLF) for Carrier Landing Practice in Virginia or Northern North Carolina.
 - Retains Seymour AFB as a DOD installation and leverages its air-to-air and air-to-ground training venues to support fleet requirements on the East Coast.
 - Allows the Air Force to maximize the value of air-to-air, air-to-ground and joint regional training venues/opportunities of Cannon AFB based on assignment of longer range F-15E "Strike Eagle."
 - Retains an installation that is un-encroached and protected from encroachment for more than the 20-year BRAC 2005 planning window.
 - Reduces operational costs at a base in a far more expensive area.

- If all Oceana flying missions move from NAS Oceana to Seymour Johnson AFB:
 - Allows for extensive future cost savings from closure of an expensive, encroached facility and eliminates costly programmed increases in the future.
- If Oceana either closes or is realigned and F-15E's roll to Cannon AFB:
 - Retains Seymour Johnson AFB as a DOD installation and leverages its air-to-air and air-to-ground training venues to support fleet requirements on the East Coast.
 - Retains Cannon AFB as an installation that is very cost-effective; sustainable; currently un-encroached, and protected from encroachment for more than the 20-year BRAC 2005 planning window; with diverse terrain, great training space, and highly favorable weather.
 - Allows the Air Force to maximize the value of air-to-air, air-to-ground and joint regional training venues/opportunities of Cannon AFB based on assignment of longer range F-15E "*Strike Eagle*."
 - Reduces operational costs at a base in a far more expensive area and takes advantage of low infrastructure costs for this alternative at Cannon AFB (See Attachment 5).
 - Allows the Air Force to realize significant cost savings from the realignment of Seymour Johnson AFB missions to Cannon AFB (See Attachment 6).

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Attachment 5

Notional COBRA Analysis for Scenario No. 3

- On July 3, a community COBRA Excursion was completed by modifying the DOD Alternative COBRA for the realignment of Seymour Johnson AFB's F-15E's to Mountain Home AFB, ID. COBRA USAir Force 0051v3 (119Zc3).CBR. The results are reported below.
- **Community Changes.**
 - Moved all except 10% of assigned personnel to Cannon AFB in recognition that some support personnel positions would be eliminated if Seymour Johnson were closed. The Air Force COBRA scenario did not close the base; therefore, the detail needed to perform an apples-to-apples analysis of alternatives is not available to the community. This action increased the number of personnel programmed by the Air Force by a factor of 6.7.
 - Used the Air Force MILCON programmed for Mountain Home AFB and all other costs as a "baseline" for analysis.
 - Multiplied all MILCON and costs by 6.7 to inflate costs by the same level of magnitude as personnel. This is clearly not an ideal methodology, but it does provide "a way" to test the impact of moving more personnel than originally modeled.
 - Result: The significant cost/savings data are displayed in the table below. As demonstrated, the scenario could produce significant savings for the Air Force both during the implementation period and over the next 20 years. This assessment could only be completed for the Air Force portion of the action (and in a notional manner, as explained above). While realignment of NAS Oceana missions to Seymour Johnson AFB would incur costs for DOD, those costs would be allocated to the Navy. As a "snapshot" of the impact on the Air Force, moving Seymour Johnson AFB missions to Cannon AFB would appear to be very attractive. Only DOD has the data necessary to properly analyze the totality of Alternative Scenario No. 4.

Scenario	Payback Period (Years)	Costs/Savings (\$K) *				
		20 - Year NPV	1-Time Cost	Personnel (2006 - 2011)	Total (2006 - 2011)	Annual Total Recurring
Community Excursion 2	2 years	-456,933	104,912	-83,889	-31,015	-43,860

* Negative numbers are savings



Alternative Scenario No. 4

Recommendation:

Shaw AFB Missions to Cannon AFB, Close Shaw AFB

Discussion:

- Reject the DOD recommendation to Close Cannon AFB.
- Place Shaw AFB on the BRAC Commission “Add” list for closure.
- Realign Cannon AFB for F-16 Block 50 operations.
 - Current Block 30’s and Block 40’s realign per recent BRAC recommendations.
 - Retain the existing Cannon AFB F-16 Block 50 squadron.
- Close Shaw AFB and move 20th Fighter Wing F-16’s to Cannon AFB
 - 3 squadrons (79th, 77th and 55th) of 24 each F-16C/D Block 50’s to Cannon.
- Results in 96 total Block 50 F-16’s (well within base ramp and hangar capacity) at Cannon AFB.
- Realign CENTAF and 9th Air Force to other locations.

Justification:

- Cannon was incorrectly scored with regard to multiple Military Value criteria, and if scored correctly has a higher MCI score than Shaw.
- Net Present Value (NPV) projected cost savings from closure of Cannon are significantly reduced (Tab C, Attachment1 – Community Excursion).
- Cannon has the lowest cost per flying hour in ACC and is comparable to or lower than Shaw in several cost categories (Tab C, Attachment 2 – Cost Comparison Table).
- Cannon is un-encroached with regard to the base, and its airspace and range complexes are controlled by Cannon and unrestricted for military use.
 - Moreover, the community has a 50-year history of action to ensure Cannon AFB cannot become encroached.
- Cannon has significantly better flying weather than Shaw.
- Cannon has more realistic and more valuable ranges and training areas.
- Cannon has infrastructure to support a large F-16 wing and the return of F-16 squadrons from overseas.
- Scenario retains USAF plan to reduce from three operational F-16 bases to two.

Attachment 6

Estimated Costs/Savings for Alternative Scenario 4

1) Personnel Cost Savings for Elimination of 20th Wing:

Officer: 175 x \$98,448 = \$17,228,400

Enlisted: 1,955 x \$55,712 = \$108,916,960

Civilian: 50 x \$57,239 = \$2,861,950

\$129,007,310/yr savings x 20yrs = \$2,580,146,200

2) Personnel Cost Savings for Elimination of Shaw AFB Overhead Billets:

Officer: 250 x \$98,448 = \$24,612,000

Enlisted: 2,000 x \$68,886 = \$137,772,000

Civilian: 200 x \$57,239 = \$11,447,800

\$173,831,800/yr savings x 20yrs = \$3,476,636,000

3) Cost Savings following Closure of Shaw AFB (Overhead & Operating Costs):

Shaw AFB Sustainment Budget (annual) 15,776,000

Shaw AFB BOS Non Payroll (annual) 19,707,000

Shaw AFB BOS Payroll (annual) 15,560,000

Shaw AFB Family Housing Budget (annual) 6,780,000

Total Shaw AFB Annual Operating Budget \$57,823,000

Note: Remaining Shaw AFB billets transfer with 9th Air Force and USCENTAF

4) One-Time Operational Infrastructure Costs (for additional F-16 Squadron):

Allowance for transport of Operational Support Equipment 1,200,000

Allowance for improvements to communications infrastructure 900,000

New Squadron Facilities (Ops, Avionics, Maint, etc.) 14,200,000

Total Operations Infrastructure Requirements \$16,300,000

5) One-Time Quality of Life (QOL) Infrastructure Requirements:

Total Existing Cannon AFB Personnel: 3,878

+ (One Add'tl F-16 Squadron at Cannon AFB)

Proposed Additional Officer Billets 49

Proposed Additional Enlisted Billets 630

Proposed Additional Civilian Billets 12

Total Proposed Cannon AFB Base Personnel Load 4,569

Estimated Additional Officer Bachelor Housing Requirement 0 units

Estimated Additional Enlisted Bachelor Housing Requirement 200 units

Vacant Housing Units in Municipal Area/BRAC scenario is 3,553 units

(Accommodate surge during transition)

Estimated Cost Additional Enlisted Bachelor Housing Requirement \$20,500,000

Estimated Allowance to Expand QOL Facilities (Gym, Child Care) \$6,000,000

Total Estimated QOL Infrastructure Requirements \$42,800,000

Attachment 6 (Continued)

Estimated Costs/Savings for Alternative Scenario 4

6) Summary of Cost Savings for Alternative Scenario 4*

<u>1st yr Payback</u> =	
\$302,839,110 (payroll savings) +	
\$57,823,000 (ops savings) –	
\$42,800,000 (One Time Cost)	= \$317,862,110
2nd yr through 20th year recurring annual savings	= \$360,662,110
<u>20 yr payback</u> for this alternate scenario	= \$5,425,000,000
Compare 20 yr NPV of DOD “Close Cannon” Scenario	= \$2,707,000,000
<u>Delta</u> (Close Shaw vs. Close Cannon)	= \$2,718,000,000



Alternative Scenario No. 5

Recommendation:

Move Luke AFB Missions to Cannon AFB, and Close or Realign Luke AFB

Discussion:

- Close or realign Luke AFB and move its missions to Cannon AFB.

Justification:

- Closes or realigns flying mission for current, severely encroached installation.
- Retains Cannon AFB as an installation that is very cost-effective; sustainable; currently un-encroached, and protected from encroachment for more than the 20-year BRAC 2005 planning window; with diverse terrain, great training space, and highly favorable weather.
- Realigns forces within the Southwest thus minimizing relocation costs.
- Allows DOD to maximize the value of Cannon AFB training venues by collocating both air-to-air and air-to-ground weapon platforms.
- Retains ability of units to use the Goldwater, Melrose and White Sands Missile Range Complexes.