

10 August 2005

Inquiry Response

Re: BI-0204,CT-0837,Gen Mitchell ARS Pavement Evaluation and MCI Questions

Requester: Mr. Ken Small (BRAC Commission Staff)

Question 1: A review of General Mitchell ARS' points lost for the Airlift MCI reveals that there may have been errors in calculating particular formulas. Please verify the accuracy of the calculations for the following categories.

Installation Pavements Quality. For this category, Mitchell received zero out of a possible 11.95.

When the data from Questions 1235 and 1236 are plugged into the formula, Gen. Mitchell receives a score of 100 for runway pavement suitability (which accounts for 50% of the overall score for this category). 50% of a score of 100 equals 50 plus zero scored for apron pavement suitability equals 50. Thus, based on the formula Gen. Mitchell ARS should have received half of the points or 5.98 for this category (as did Gen. Mitchell AGS).

Answer 1: We reviewed the formula and discovered an error as well. It was an installation data entry error that prevented Gen Mitchell ARS from receiving full credit. Attachment 1 explains the problem we found and how it was corrected.

Question 2 : Hangar Capability. For this category, Mitchell received a score of 0.9 out of a possible 3.32.

The data from Question 19 shows Mitchell to have two hangars that are greater than 6000 gross square feet, have a facility code 1, 2, or 3, and have a door opening greater than 131 feet. The total square footage of these two hangars is 65,180. Thus, based on the formula Gen. Mitchell ARS should have received the total 3.32 points for this category.

Answer 2: The published answer in Volume V is correct. The recalculated score reflects a misunderstanding of the formula. The total calculated raw square footage used in the published score agrees with the total presented above: 65,180 square feet. The raw score, however, must then be pro-rated and compared against the highest calculated raw score received by any installation. The best installation's calculated raw score was considerably higher than 65,180 square feet, which is why Gen Mitchell scored low by comparison.

Question 3: Though Question 1246 "Proximity to Low level Routes Supporting Mission" asks about SR routes, they are not factored into the corresponding formula.

Please explain why these slow low-level routes are not taken into account in the MCI formula for Question 1246 for the Airlift category?

Please recalculate and confirm the number of points Gen. Mitchell ARS lost for this Question.

Answer 3: There were a large number of questions asked of many sources to assess an installation's military value. Ultimately, of the more than 2,000 questions asked, not all were used to score installations. The Air Force, after review, determined the slow route element was not a relevant issue. Slow routes (SR) are published and flown at speeds below 250 knots. They are not scheduled. Any aircraft flying below 250 knots can accomplish the same training by using visual flight rules without using a slow route. The Base Closure Executive Group decided, therefore, to focus scores on more meaningful instrument and visual routes that are more restrictive in nature, flown at speeds above 250 knots, and have published hours of operation.

No installations in any MCI were scored using collected slow route data. Gen Mitchell ARS lost no points due to the slow route omissions.

Question 4: According to the BCEG minutes for the March 3, 2005 meeting, Gen. Mitchell was slated to receive 8 PAA from Mansfield Lahm MAP AGS, under scenario S319. The COBRA data accompanying that scenario shows no MILCON costs required to add an additional 8 C-130s to Gen. Mitchell ARS. However, the capacity analysis for Gen. Mitchell shows a cost of \$5.5 million to add a full squadron (16 PAA) at Gen. Mitchell. Please explain what this amount accounts for.

Answer 4: Scenario S319 proposed moving only 4 PAA to General Mitchell ARS with the other 4 PAA recommended to move to Little Rock AFB. Therefore the end state at General Mitchell as proposed in S319 would be a total of 12 PAA. No MilCon would be required to bed down 12 PAA at General Mitchell since 12 aircraft had been previously assigned there prior to recent force structure reductions.

The initial cost estimate to increase to 16 PAA at General Mitchell, as included in the MAJCOM capacity briefing, included the following:

Add/alter Sq ops	\$2.0M
Add/alter general purpose shops	\$1.8M
Add/alter support facilities	\$1.2M
Design	<u>\$0.5M</u>
Total Milcon	\$5.5M

Question 5: The recommendation to close Gen. Mitchell ARS transfers all manpower to Pope/Ft. Bragg. The concern is that this closure will have a negative impact on recruiting and retention given that the Milwaukee/Chicago area will no longer have an AFR strategic presence. Moreover, it is estimated that 80 percent will not move to North Carolina and as a result training costs will increase while operational readiness will decrease. Please comment.

Answer 5: Reductions in force structure and commensurate consolidation of the C-130 fleet into effectively sized units inevitably results in a smaller number of installations that will have reserve component C-130s assigned. The intent of the Air Force is to locate force structure in a way that enhances mission effectiveness. For reserve component force structure, this does mean placing force structure at locations that include recruitable populations. However, this does not mean that reserve component units will be retained in every population center. The Air Force will continue to capitalize on the recruitable population in the vicinity of General Mitchell by retaining, and growing the size of the Air National Guard KC-135 unit at General Mitchell AGS. We expect that some of the personnel assigned to General Mitchell ARS will elect to continue their military affiliation by joining units of the Air National Guard at General Mitchell AGS.

Approved

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. L. Johansen', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

DAVID L. JOHANSEN, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Base Realignment and Closure Division

Attachment:
Impact of Question 1235 Data Entry Errors

Impact of Question 1235 Data Entry Errors

Issue: A data entry error in Question 1235 resulted in inaccurate MCI scores for three installations: General Mitchell ARS, Wisconsin; Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport (EWVRA) Shepherd AGS, West Virginia; and McConnell AFB, Kansas. Six other installations had similar errors, but a rerun of data showed no change in MCI scores.

MCIs Affected: Airlift, C2ISR, SOF/CSAR, TANKER, UAV/UCAS

Background: A question received asked why the Airlift Mission Compatibility Index (MCI) runway scores for General Mitchell ARS and General Mitchell AGS were different. A comprehensive review of the data revealed hidden spaces in the response fields that preceded unit-entered data for "runway identifier" in the response to question 1235, Installation Pavements. This prevented the WIDGET Analysis Tool from providing appropriate credit to General Mitchell ARS for runways (MCIs: Airlift, SOF/CSAR, and UAV/UCAS). A review of all data provided by all installations showed errors affecting MCI scores for two additional installations: EWVRA Shepherd AGS (MCIs: Airlift, SOF/CSAR), and McConnell AFB (MCIs: Airlift, C2ISR, Tanker).

This data entry error occurred at the input source, the installation, and was most likely a copy error from an existing database into the web-based WIDGET question response. The spaces were not visible in the responses during the certification process, so the error was neither detected nor corrected.

Corrective Action: Installation runway identifiers for nine installations were corrected to remove spaces preceding runway identifiers. The Analysis Tool was then rerun. A review of MCI scores indicated no significant affect on Air Force recommendations. EWVRA Shepherd and McConnell AFB retain or grow their missions, as documented in "Department of the Air Force Analysis and Recommendations, BRAC 2005, Volume V." Only General Mitchell ARS closes, and the recommendation remains unaffected after considering the new information.

Impact of Data Correction on General Mitchell ARS Recommendation:

The BCEG placed single missions at single locations. Though both General Mitchell AGS (KC-135s) and General Mitchell ARS (C-130s) are two distinct installations, they share a common runway and airfield operating environment. Only one mission is recommended to remain at General Mitchell IAP, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: the ANG KC-135 mission.

Further review of MCI data confirms Gen Mitchell AGS (KC-135s) is the more desirable installation due to greater ramp space with a significantly better PCN (weight bearing capacity) and in-ground refueling points. Additionally, Gen Mitchell ARS (C-130s) remains one of the two lowest scoring Reserve airlift mission locations. The other, Niagara Falls ARS, New York, is also recommended for closure.