

DCN 8257

AUG 24 2005

Received

After reading about half of the DOD BRAC proposals, which includes some very dry reading. I have given a good deal of thought to some of the proposals that were put forth, many of which made sense and some that did not. I have spent a good deal of time over that past few years going, what if? Here, I will put forth some of those thoughts and ideas, although this letter is focused primarily toward the USAF, I will be mentioning all of the services during this article. Several ideas presented here will involve other services. The intent of this letter is to show several options to improve our ability to operate in the "Joint" environment, not just among the AD, AFRC & ANG, but among all of the services. The following options, some of which are BRAC issues and some that are not, these can be used in any number of combinations, depending on how well each option can be utilized. There are several additional ideas that will be put forth in this article, that only effect one or two units. This article will show how numerous AD, ANG/ArNG and Reserve installations can be closed without a large hit to the Force Structure. This letter is not intended to replace the DOD-BRAC proposal, merely to offer the Commission other options. I have listed only a limited number of Army and Navy installations, this is because I have not had the time to properly review and study their proposals, nor have I listed the numerous small Guard & Reserve Centers for the same reason. The following Options, some of which are beyond the Commission's Mandate are offered to the Commission as Recommendations to future review by the DOD.

BRAC Recommendations, Option One: We need to consider combining the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve Command into a single organization: The New Air National Guard or "NANG". (And consider combining the ArNG and the ARC into one organization.) Numerous times during this letter I will refer to the "NANG" or the "Guard", I will be referring to what are now AFRC/ANG units, but these units should be combined. This will require a great deal of work. Numerous rules & regulations while need to be changed, some form of congressional action will be needed. The NANG will need to be more like the AFRC, but it would remain under the control of each state, as the ANG. This needs to be done for several reasons. **First:** Having both organization may sound reasonable, both fulfill a variety of missions and have separate chains of command. While this is true, it also requires duplicate organizations at many levels: Wings, Groups & Squadrons, this duplication of resources cost money. Under the NANG, the AFRC Numbered Air Forces would remain, but they would become more regional (4th AF-Western, 10th AF-Central & 22nd AF-Eastern US) rather than mission (fighter v heavy) specific. The ANG 1st AF would remain and continue to be tasked to NORAD for the CONUS air defense mission (Operation Noble Eagle-ONE). 16 units would fall under 1st AF; half of these units would be dual-tasked. These units would stand alert at 12 locations around the perimeter of the US and 4 locations across the interior of the US. **Second:** By creating the NANG, operational flexibility will be increased in areas such as inter-flying of aircraft and crews, associate units, etc. This is because the AFRC is set up with more Active Duty controls, while the ANG is set up more to ensure state control. We must find a way to combine these two institutions into a single effective, flexible, operational arm of the USAF. **Third:** At several locations around the country, ANG and AFRC units are co-located. If they fly the same or similar aircraft, these units must be combined. An example would be: At Minneapolis-St Paul IAP, MN - the ANG with a Sq of C-130s while across the runway the AFRC has a Sq of C-130s. These two wings would merge to form a "new" wing flying 2 Squadrons of C-130s and would become part of the MN ANG. At several locations around the country, the AFRC/ANG flies a squadron of C-130s next to a squadron of KC-135. While in a neighboring state the same aircraft mix has occurred. We need to look at consolidating aircraft type together. An example of this is Selfridge ANGB, MI and Milwaukee IAP, WI. (Some of these are addressed by the DOD BRAC proposal.) **Forth:** At some locations around the country, there are ANG and AFRC units flying different aircraft types (fighter v heavy) from the same place. Those units flying fighters (F-15s or F-16s) and tankers (KC-135s) would be combined to form an Air Intervention Wing (AIW). The original idea for this was the 366th WG at Mountain Home AFB, ID (with fighters, bombers & tankers all assigned to the same wing). An example would be: at Andrews AFB, MD - the ANG F-16 unit would combine with the co-located AFRC KC-135 unit to form a "new" AIW. Those units flying fighters (A-10s or F-16s) and airlift (C-130s) would be combined to form an Air Support Wing (ASW). An ASW would be teamed up with an Army (Active, Guard, or Reserve) Brigade or Division for training and deployments. An example would be: at Montgomery RAP & Maxwell AFB, AL - the ANG F-16 unit would join with the C-

130s to form a "new" ASW. The AIW & ASW will be discussed further in Option 12. **Fifth:** Consider adjusting the manning makeup for the NANG, not by cutting personal numbers, but by adjusting the mix of personal to include 10% Active Duty members assigned to each unit. This would be similar to the "Community Basing" concept, that the National Guard/Reserve Leadership have suggested. Additionally, consider a requirement (within reasonable limits) for all full-time guardsmen to complete a tour on Active Duty at some point during their career (during the E-5 to E-6 or O-3 to O-4 timeframe); this could include an overseas tour (this would not include remote assignments unless the member volunteers for a remote). This will allow for a vastly improved cross-flow of experience between the AD & the NANG. In Options 4 & 5, I will discuss "Total Force" issues, the merging of AD & NANG units i.e. the C-5 and KC-10 fleets, the C-17 and KC-135 schoolhouses. These units are what I refer to as "Total Force Units" or the "Total Force Concept". In these units, manning would be around 50/50 in Operations and 70/30 favoring the NANG in Maintenance and Support units. In non-flying units, such as the Air Forces Logistics Centers (discussed next) the manning ratio would be closer to 60/40 again favoring the NANG. These ratios are meant to be flexible, but should remain within +/- 5%. **Sixth:** the DOD-BRAC (USAF) Proposal calls for the creation of two new Air Forces Logistics Centers (AFLC). One, the Combat AFLC at Langley AFB and the other at Scott AFB, while this is a great idea, the locations chosen for the new AFLCs are not. The two reasons are: one, by locating these units at Headquarters Bases (ACC at Langley and AMC at Scott) the personnel assigned to these units will spend far too much time "showing off" their facilities to visiting DVs and HQ Staff instead of doing their jobs. Second, how will these units support CONUS and deployed units? Neither AFLC will have assigned Airlift; a better option would be to assign these units to the Guard. The NANG would form/reform two ANG Airlift Wings into Logistics Wings, one would be located at the Memphis IAP, TN (home of Fed Ex) and the other would be located at Louisville IAP, KY (home of UPS). The Guard already has units based at both locations and these units would reform to support the new mission.

BRAC Options, Option Two: Infrastructure Reduction: Consideration should have been given to relocating small AD and ANG/AFRC (or ArNG/ARC) units to other nearby bases. Any unit located within 50 miles of an AD Base or a larger ANG/AFRC base should have been considered for relocation (there would be some exceptions). Any unit located within 50-100 miles of the same should be given serious consideration for relocation. If a unit is located beyond 100 miles from another base, it should be on a case by case basis. I recently saw parts of some Congressional Hearings involving National Guard & Reserve Leadership. They seemed to be reluctant about to the idea of moving Guard/Reserve units onto AD Bases. My question for those leaders is: **Why?** Would you rather see those units moved to a nearby AD base or see them be inactivated? This should not be a turf war. Relocating units will save money, or have we forgotten this simple fact? Whose money is it? It's not my money nor is it your money; it belongs to the American People. If we are continually seen as wasting money to keep open sites when other options exist, are we really justifying the trust that is placed in us? Examples of this abound: **1)** in Hawthorne, CA, the LA AFS has "escaped" closure during all five BRAC rounds. There are only two or three square blocks of office buildings there. Why have they not been moved to March, Edwards, Vandenberg or Los Alamitos AAF? **2)** In Savannah, GA you have an ANG C-130 unit at Savannah IAP, 10 miles from Ft Stewart's Hunter AAF. **3)** In Jacksonville, FL the home of NS Mayport and NAS Jacksonville, the ANG has an F-15 unit at Jacksonville IAP and the ArNG has an AH-64 unit at Cecil Field. **4)** In Montgomery, AL you have an ANG F-16 unit and an ArNG UH-60 unit at the Montgomery RAP, 10 miles from Maxwell AFB. **5)** In OKC, OK you have an ANG C-130 unit at Will Rogers WAP, 12 miles from Tinker AFB. Under the current DOD proposal: this unit is scheduled to move to Tinker, but rather than close the ANGB the USAF want to move other units (from bases that are not on the closure list) into this facility, including a unit currently assigned to Tinker. **Why?** I could go on; the list would include all five services. Why are there so many examples of this around the country? It's time to say enough, if we are serious about reducing excess infrastructure, then we must look at relocating units and closing dozens of these bases and sites. How did these locations survive the last four BRAC rounds? Amazingly, almost all of them have survived the fifth round. Only one large ANG base in AK made it onto the BRAC list to relocate to a nearby AD base. Other units that are losing their aircraft were given new missions that of "Expeditionary Combat Support Elements" or "in anticipation of emerging missions" or

“Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility” or in place, rather than relocating them and closing the installations they currently use. My criteria for closing a base is three simple questions: 1) Size, does the base have the ability to gain a new or larger mission (surge capability)? Smaller bases that cannot gain or grow should be the first to be closed. 2) Location, where is the base located? A base that is surrounded by civilian infrastructure has very little growth potential without the high cost associated with land purchases. 3) Proximity of nearby bases? Can the mission of a base/unit be relocated a reasonable distance to another base? Moves up to 50 miles are very reasonable, 50-100 miles are reasonable, 100-200 miles are acceptable but should be limited and any move beyond 200 miles should be kept to a minimum. The current DOD-BRAC proposal has several units moving Detroit to Tampa (1200 miles), Pittsburgh, PA to Omaha, NE (900 miles), Fargo, ND to Knoxville, TN (1200 miles), Nashville to Dallas (700 miles), New Orleans to Denver (1400 miles) and Buffalo to Colorado Springs (1600 miles) & San Antonio (1650 miles). This is at best short-sighted, 75+% of the personnel assigned to these units will be unable to continue their service in the Guard or Reserve. Why do this when other options exist? Under this proposal the longest unit moves would be from Atlanta to Miami (700 miles) by a USN-R E-2C unit that the DOD proposes to move to New Orleans (500 miles), the next longest move is Schenectady, NY to Niagara Falls (300 miles), moving an ANG unit from a smaller ANGB to a larger ANG/AFRC Base on the closure list, a trade off, closing the smaller base and transferring the mission to a larger unit at a larger base. In this proposal, 39 Guard/Reserve installations are listed for closure/realignment with over 45 units assigned and 10 units are assigned to installations not listed for closure. 34 of these units relocate less than 50 miles (7 units join co-located units & 3 relocate to another part of the airfield/airport they are currently based at), 13 units relocate 50-100 miles (4 of these units, 2 in AL & 2 in CA, swap aircraft and equipment, personnel moves would be limited), 11 relocate 100-200 miles (2 of these units, 1 in PA & 1 in MD, swap aircraft and equipment, personnel moves would be limited) and 4 relocate over 200 miles (1 just over 200, 1 just under 300, 1 split 150/250 between 2 bases and 1 just over 700) to join other units and/or consolidate aircraft types together. Of the 9 USCG units that relocate, all relocate onto DOD or other USCG installations, 8 relocate less than 50 miles and the 9th move 125 miles. In the attached state by state listing, I have placed the distance (+/- 10 miles) that each Guard/Reserve unit would move i.e. unit X would relocate/move to base Y (Z miles). I have not included distances for AD units that would be moved for several reasons. But the main reason is that moving is a part of life in the AD, while Guard/Reservist normally remain in one location.

BRAC Options, Option Three: Joint Efforts, the current DOD Proposal goes to some length to include “Joint” and “Joint Bases”. But does not really do anything to promote Joint Operations, Joint Training or much Joint anything except renaming several bases as Joint Base this or that and transferring Medical Facilities to the Army is not really Joint-ness. If DOD truly wants to build or encourage Joint-ness then they should consider the following options: **1)** transfer the USN-R VR (fleet support/airlift) Squadrons (with C-9s, C-40s & C-130s), the USMC and the USMC-R VMGR (tanker/airlift) Squadrons (with KC-130F/R/Ts) to the NANG. Now, before someone start going about why it can't be done, let's consider several factors. **First:** Most of the USN-R's 10 or so VR squadrons only have 3-4 aircraft. They have bought 8, ordered a ninth C-40As and converted 2 squadrons, a third squadron will convert at a later date, each unit only has 3-4 aircraft. And the USMC and the USMC-R has only 6 squadrons of KC/C-130s spread over 5 locations in the US and Japan. **Second:** the USN & USMC would not lose any of the support that these units provide, it would actually increase the number of aircraft (& crews) available to perform these missions. How? The NANG would form 4 Fleet Support Squadrons (FSS) each with 8 C-40s, each of these units would be based at or near major USN Fleet Bases in WA, CA, FL & VA. While at several locations around the country, the NANG will have 2 C-130 squadrons at the same location. These units would gain the KC-130 mission. An example would be: at Youngstown, OH – the AFRC AW has 2 squadrons of C-130s, this unit would “gain” 8 KC-130s from the USMC bringing the total assigned to the unit to 24 aircraft. In addition to the regular airlift/airdrop mission, these units would gain the KC-130 mission. By FY-10, VMGR-152 (the USMC KC-130 squadron currently based in Japan) would be replaced by a Joint C/KC-130 squadron (w/4 C-130s & 4 KC-130s). This unit would be augmented by NANG C/KC-130 units (w/4C-130s & 4 KC-130s), with each NANG unit covering a 2 month rotation. This unit would support USMC operations in the Western Pacific Region. A similar Joint C/KC-130 unit would be

formed in Europe. **Third:** these units would adjust their manning to reflect the "Joint" (USAF 70% and USN-USMC 30%) nature of the missions being flown. A "flexible" leadership rotation (at all levels: flight, squadron, group & wing) would also occur. This would allow personnel to gain experience in a "Joint" environment at a much earlier point in their career. Some USN/USMC crewmembers assigned to the NANG may find themselves assigned to another "heavy" MDS unit. **Forth:** This would also reduce operating & training cost by consolidating all DOD C-130s under one service (and the USCG). **2)** Begin to merge or combine USN/USAF training units; an example of this would be moving Training Air Wing 1 from NAS Meridian, MS to Moody AFB, GA where it would join the 479th FTG to form Joint Flying Training Wing 1. This unit would be the first of several Joint training units. Another example would be the 82nd Training Wing at Sheppard AFB, TX this unit would become a Joint Technical Training Wing to conduct all ground training for the JSF. Sheppard is already set-up for the training mission and trains 50,000+ students each year. **3)** Combine the USN/USAF Flight Test Centers into one unit. By relocating the USN Flight Test units based at NAS Patuxent River, MD to Edwards AFB. This would place the two largest DOD flight test programs at one location and allow NAS Patuxent River to be closed. US Army flight testing should also be moved to Edwards. **4)** Joint Basing; relocate up to four squadrons of USN F-18s from NAS Oceana to Shaw AFB and up to four squadrons from NAS Lemoore to Mountain Home AFB. This would free up space at both Oceana and Lemoore and allow better interaction between USAF/USN units. Relocating the USN/USN-R P-3 and VR squadrons from NAS Whidbey Island to McChord AFB, from NS Point Mugu to March ARB and from NAS Brunswick to Otis ANGB. These moves (along with others listed in the state by state) would further encourage "Joint-ness" and would allow NAS Whidbey Is, NS Pt Mugu and NAS Brunswick to be closed.

BRAC Options, Option Four: Consider transferring all KC-10s and all C-5s to the NANG. This is a "Total Force" initiative, the KC-10s would go to the CA ANG at March ANGB – 2 squadrons w/ 15 aircraft, the NJ ANG at McGuire ANGB – 2 squadrons w/ 15 aircraft, the NC ANG at SJ AFB – 2 squadron w/ 15 aircraft, and the UT ANG at Hill AFB – 1 squadron w/ 8 aircraft. The C-5s would go to the CA ANG at Beale AFB – 2 squadrons w/ 20 aircraft, the MA ANG at Westover ANGB – 2 squadron w/ 20 aircraft, the NY ANG at Stewart ANGB – 2 squadrons w/ 20 aircraft, the TN ANG at Memphis ANGB (former NAS Memphis-NSA Mid-South) – 1 squadron w/ 12 aircraft, the TX ANG at Kelly Field – 2 squadron w/ 20 aircraft, and the WV ANG at Martinsburg ANGB – 1 squadron w/ 12 aircraft. These units would fall under the "Total Force Manning" concept. Currently KC-10s are assigned to AD/AFRC units at two locations. This option places KC-10s with 4 NANG units, 3 of which have operated KC-10s currently or previously. C-5s are assigned to one AD only unit (transferring to the AFRC), two AD/AFRC units, two AFRC units and two, soon to be three ANG units. This options enlarges the C-5 units at two AFRC and one ANG bases, it relocates them from two AD bases, one completely and one to a nearby base (60-70 miles away) with a different AFRC unit. One ANG unit moves to a "new" facility 25-30 miles away, this unit is going to build a new facility due to converting from C-141s to C-5s. This option will utilize 53 of the 59 KC-10s and 104 of the 115(+/-) C-5s currently in service. The remainder would be in PDM status. This will also lead to higher mission capable rates; it is well know that aircraft assigned to ANG units generally have a higher MC rate than those assigned to AD units. Under this option: Dover and Travis would each re-equip with two squadrons of new-built C-17s and two squadrons of KC-135Rs from Grand Forks.

BRAC Options, Option Five: Consider transferring all AETC Heavy MDS training to the NANG. C-5 training is currently being transferred to an AFRC unit in TX. The current BRAC proposal calls for several ANG KC-135 units to lose their aircraft; why not have these ANG KC-135 units combined with the AD to perform the KC-135 training mission? This Option only makes sense; ANG/AFRC personnel remain with the same unit for many, many years. Many stay in the same unit for their entire career, having this level of experience in the schoolhouse was common in the AD until a few years ago, the current AETC policy has over 95% of the instructors out of the schoolhouse within three to four years. Let me use this example: You would have the USN leave NAS Meridian, the MS ANG KC-135 unit based at Key Field, Meridian would move over (about 20 miles), where they are joined by the AL ANG KC-135 unit from Birmingham, AL (130 miles) and an AD squadron from Altus AFB, OK. This NANG ARW would have two squadrons and 20+ KC-135Rs. Its manning would be about 50/50 in the OG and closer to 70/30 favoring the ANG in the

MXG, MSG and MDG. This keeps experienced ANG personnel with the jet and frees up an AD squadron from the schoolhouse while keeping two ANG units gainfully employed.

BRAC Options, Option Six: Consider revising the F-22 basing plan due to the current budget short fall. This would be in line with the "consolidation policy" that appears to be randomly used in the current DOD-BRAC Proposal. The current F-22 basing plan has F-15C/Ds & F-22As being co-located at three bases (Tyndall, Langley & Elmendorf). Under this Option Langley and Tyndall would become F-22 only bases, while Eglin and Elmendorf would remain F-15 only bases. Langley would have four squadrons of F-22s; the 27th is currently converting, followed by the 71st and the 94th. Then reactivate the 48th FS (previously based at Langley, as the 48th FIS with F-15s) with F-22s. Langley would have four FS with 80+ F-22s and then the remaining F-15 squadrons at Tyndall would convert to F-22s. Tyndall's F-15s and the F-15 schoolhouse would move over to Eglin AFB allowing the 33rd FW to reactivate the 57th (previously at Keflavik with F-15s) and the 59th FS (previously at Eglin with F-15s) to be reactivated. The 325th FW would reform; the F-22 schoolhouse would have two squadrons, the 1st and the 2nd FS with 40+ F-22s and two operational F-22 squadrons, the 3rd and the 4th FS with 40+ F-22s. This would use most of the currently "funded" 180 F-22s. With additional funding; the 3rd WG at Elmendorf would convert to three squadrons with 60+ F-22s. After Elmendorf, Mountain Home would convert two squadrons of F-15C/Ds to F-22s. Mountain Home would then have two squadrons with 40+ F-22s and two squadrons with 40+ F-15Es. After that, Eglin would transfer its F-15C/Ds and the F-15 schoolhouse to the NANG and convert its four FS to F-22s. **BRAC Recommendations, Option Seven:** Consider continuing to purchase of the F-15E, this aircraft has proven to be one of the most capable in the GWOT. Continuing the purchase would allow four new AD units to be equipped with this aircraft (2 at Anderson AFB, Guam , 1 at Mountain Home AFB, ID & 1 in Alaska) and six ANG units to convert to this aircraft (w/20 aircraft each). four of these ANG units currently fly the F-16 (at Buckley, Great Falls, Sioux Falls and Syracuse) these aircraft would be transferred to other units or retired and two fly F-15A/Bs or C/Ds (Portland, OR & St. Louis, MO) these F-15s would be used to activate an ANG F-15 unit at McChord AFB under the WA ANG. This Option will require the purchase of an additional 200+ F-15Es, spread over 7 years (30 aircraft per year). This option will do several things. First: Provide new combat aircraft to the service, many of the aircraft that would be replaced are 20+ years old. Second: Provide a hedge against further delays with the JSF. Third: New aircraft will slow the **Wear & Tear** of the current fighter fleet; we are currently using airframe hours at a much higher rate (2 to 8 times based on the type) than originally projected when the current fleet was purchased, an average OIF mission last 6+ hours for a fighter, an OEF mission last 8+ hours. This option will cost about 10 Billion dollars, spread over 7 years (about 1.3 Billion per year). Based on \$50M per aircraft, with a multi-year contract the price should be lower. Under this option three ANG F-15 units would fly both the C/D and the E: the Buckley and Scott based ANG would have 8-9 F-15C/Ds assigned in addition to their 20 F-15Es to cover 1st AF/NORAD missions. The Klamath Falls, OR based ANG FW would have 18 C/Ds and 12 Es for the training mission

BRAC Recommendations, Option Eight: Consider continuing the purchase of the F-16s, not of the normal USAF Block 50s, but the new Block 62s. The Block 62s that we should buy would not be the current E/Fs that are currently being produced, but would be an improved version based on the two-seat "F". This new version would be the "G"; it would primarily be used for the "Wild Weasel" or SEAD mission. It would also be equipped to use JDAMs and LGBs for use when and where the SAM threat is reduced or removed. This version would allow the current Block 50/52 fleet to shift away from the SEAD mission and more toward the CAS/BAI mission. About 200 would be needed, enough for eight operational squadrons (two at Cannon, two at Nellis, two at Carswell and two at Madison), one training squadron (at Tucson) and some reserve (attrition) aircraft. The current F-16/50-HTS while effective, has some limitations when compared to the F-4G's AN/APR-47 system. The HTS does not have 360-coverage and the F-16 is limited to two weapons stations for air-to-ground ordnance, four stations without external tanks, with the corresponding reduced operational radius. The "G" with its improved mission avionics and over wing saddle tanks, would allow 360-coverage and four pylons for ordnance. This option will cost about Eight Billion dollars, spread over 7 years (about 1.1 Billion per year). Based on \$40M per aircraft. Additionally, we need to accelerate the conversion of F-16/42s with PW-220 engines to the newer PW-229 engines. The main hurdle for this is buying the new engines; the actual

replacement is done at the unit-level and takes 2-3 days. The PW-229 has a higher maintenance reliability rate and a 15-20% increase in performance over the current PW-220 use in most of the F-16/42 fleet. The conversion of all F-16/42 to PW-229s should be completed within 3-5 years.

BRAC Recommendations, Option Nine: Consider increasing the number of C-130Js (including EC-Js, HC-Js, KC-Js and J-30s) purchased each year up to 40. This should be done as a series of multi-year (four 3 year-120 & two 3 year-135 aircraft) purchases. Some of the current "problems" with the C-130s can be traced directly to our (the USAF/DOD) refusal to purchase new C-130H through-out the 1990s. Almost every C-130 purchased during the 1990s was thru congressional action for various ANG/AFRC units. This action was repeatedly labeled as pork-barrel spending by some, myself included. Had Congress not overridden the short-sightedness of the USAF & DOD, the current "problems" would be much worse. I believe that the C-130 is the only aircraft in the inventory in which the ANG/AFRC fleet is "younger" than its AD counterparts. Will we learn from this or will we do it again? Based on our history, I do not see us learning from our past mistakes. I would like to see all C-130E and all pre-1990 C-130Hs replaced by C-130J or C-130J-30s within five to ten years, in 10 years a FY-90 C-130 will be 25 years old. This would also include the USN and USMC C/KC-130 fleet. Additional issues involving the C-130J will need to be solved, as we do not have another aircraft capable of replacing the grounded and/or restricted C-130E/Hs, finally, all KC-130Js and J-30s should be capable of being refueled in-flight. Conversion order for the C-130Js would be: Cherry Point w/16 C-130J & 8 KC-130Js, Selfridge w/16 & 8 and Willow Grove w/8 & 4, this will complete the current order of 60 (40 Js & 20 KC-Js). Peoria w/8 J-30s, Willow Grove w/4 KC-Js, Puerto Rico w/8 Js & 4 KC-Js, Little Rock w/22 Js & 20 J-30s, North Island w/16 Js & 8 KCs, ID w/8 Js & 4 KCs, DM w/12 HC-Js & 2 Js and Reno with 4 J-30s would be the FY-07 order for 120 (56 Js, 32 J-30s, 20 KC-Js & 12 HC-Js). Little Rock w/28 Js & 24 J-30s, DM w/16 EC-Js, Peoria w/4 J-30s, Reno w/4 J-30s, Willow Grove w/16 Js & 8 KCs, Keesler w/8 KCs & 6 Js and PA w/6 Js would be the FY-10 order for 120 (56 Js, 32 J-30s, 16 EC-Js & 16 KC-Js). Pope w/32 J-30s, Patrick w/12 HC-Js & 2 Js, Carswell w/16 Js & 8 KC-Js, Youngstown w/16 Js & 8 KC-Js, Elmendorf w/16 Js & 8 KC-Js and AFSOC w/12 MC-Js & 3 Js plus 2 Js as BAI (at Little Rock) would be the FY-13 order for 135 (55 Js, 32 J-30s, 24 KC-Js, 12 HC-Js & 12 MC-Js). Ramstein w/12 Js & 6 J-30s, Yokota w/12 Js & 6 J-30s, Campbell Field w/16 Js & 8 KC-Js, Colorado Springs w/16 Js & 8 KC-Js, Niagara Falls w/12 LC-Js, 4 -Js & 4 (K)C-130Js, St Joseph w/6 Js, 6 J-30s & 4 KCs and AFSOCw/12 MC-Js & 3 Js would be the FY-16 order for 135 (69 Js, 24 KC-Js, 18 J-30s, 12 LC-Js & 12 MC-Js). AFSOC w/12 AC-Js, 12 MC-Js & 6 Js, NY w/9 HC-Js & 3 Js, CA w/9 HC-Js & 3 Js, WV w/12 J-30s, El Paso w/16 Js & 8 KC-Js and Savannah w/16 Js & 8 KC-Js plus 6 J/J-30s in BAI (3 Js at Little Rock and 3 J-30s at Pope) would be the FY-19 order for 120 (47 Js, 18 HC-Js, 16 KC-Js, 15 J-30s, 12 AC-Js & 12 MC-Js). AFSOC w/12 AC-Js, 12 MC-Js & 6 Js, WY w/12 Js, Minneapolis-St Paul w/24 J-30s, Dobbins w/16 Js & 8 KC-Js, AL w/12 Js, and Pope w/16 KC-Js plus 2 Js as BAI (at Little Rock) would be the FY-22 order for 120 (48 Js, 24 J-30s, 24 KC-Js, 12 AC-Js and 12 MC-Js). As C-130Js replace the E/Hs the Es and older (pre-1990) Hs would be retired to DM-AMARC, the newer Hs would be transferred to other units. Even with this accelerated purchase program, it will still take 20+ years to replace all of the "old" C-130s currently in service.

BRAC Recommendations, Option Ten: Consider continuing to modify/rebuild the KC-135E fleet into KC-135Rs (in additions to the current proposal to re-engine the E-3C & E-8C fleets). Under Pacer CRAG, over 560 KC-135s were modified with "glass cockpits" but only 460 have been modified to "R". While modifying an "E" to "R" cost about \$5M per aircraft, engine maintenance cost are reduced by over 90%, fuel capacity is increased by 7%, fuel consumption is reduced by 15%, and you "save" the estimated \$55-60M spent annually on "E" engine maintenance (fleet-wide). Life cycle cost savings are estimated at over \$1 to 3 Billion over the expected lifetime of the KC-135, 20+ years of further service. To finish converting the remaining Pacer CRAG modified "E" into "R" will cost about \$400M, over five to seven years, that is about \$75M per year. This is a hedge against the continuing delays with the "new tanker". It has been said by many that the KC-135E fleet is over 43 years old, what those same people don't say is that the last KC-135 rolled off the Boeing line in 1965. All of them E and R are 40+ years old. Under this option the ME, IL and UT ANG would "gain" all remaining KC-135Es. Each unit would

operate 12, plus 8 in-use reserve aircraft until they were converted to KC-135Rs, at which time they would be distributed to various ANG unit to bring up those units to 12 aircraft assigned.

BRAC Recommendations, Option Eleven: Consider forming five ANG Airborne Command Control Squadrons (ACCS) equipped with 9 E-2C each. These units would assist the E-3C fleet with missions that do not require an E-3, but since we have nothing else, we either over task the E-3s or do without. An example of this would be in Afghanistan, currently radar and radio coverage in this area is less than ideal. An E-2C unit TDY at K-2 or Manas would be an excellent asset to that AOR. The USN is currently buying E-2C; this purchase would be a follow-on multi-year order for 40-50 aircraft. In addition, these units would assist 1st AF/NORAD with ONE and border security/counter-drug operations. These units would be based in CA, FL, HI, TX & VA.

BRAC Recommendations, Option Twelve: Consider the formation of the "Global Power Group", the "Air Intervention Wing", the "Air Support Wing" and the "Battlefield Support Group". The "Global Power Group" or GPG would be a self-contained, rapidly deployable package of bombers and tankers that could respond or deploy anywhere in the world on short-notice (24-48 hrs). The GPG can be formed by transferring the 7th BW from Dyess to McConnell. McConnell would then transfer 2 squadrons of KC-135Rs to Ellsworth. These co-located units would then be divided to form two GPG, each with one squadron of B-1s and one squadron of KC-135s. Two additional GPG would be formed at Ellsworth. This option would also be used with the B-52 fleet: The 2nd BW at Barksdale would see its B-52 fleet adjusted to two operational squadrons and the schoolhouse and gain two squadrons of KC-135Rs from Fairchild. The 2nd BW would form two GPG. Barksdale's excess B-52s would be transferred to Fairchild AFB, WA to join the re-located 5th BW from Minot AFB. They would join two squadrons of KC-135Rs from the 92nd ARW and form two additional GPG. Currently, Bomber and Tanker crews rarely talk to each other, only at one or two deployed locations are they even based together. Why? They are our global power projection force, but they rarely talk to or see each other. By creating the GPG, these units will interact with each other on a daily basis. Each GPG will have a transportation capability built in, granted the KC-135 is not a C-5 or C-17, but it can move most of the stuff that a GPG would need. With four bases, each with two GPG formed, we would have 8 GPG available. With each set covering a 90 day/3 month window, a unit would only "stand alert" once a year. (If the B-2s were added, we would have 10.) The "Air Intervention Wing" or AIW, as we briefly covered in Option 1, is a NANG formation consisting of a squadron of fighters (F-15s or F-16s) and a squadron of KC-135s. These units would normally be co-located, but can be based separately. The idea for this unit is based upon the "on call" AEF unit, previously used for the 4th FW and the 366th FW, until it was decided to put them into the regular AEF bucket and the "on call unit" concept was shelved. ANG units would remain "on call" for two months (59 to 62 day, depending on the months), as opposed to the standard 60 days. If 12 of these units were to be formed, three would always be ready to go. Why three? Each unit would be "on call" for two months, but the units would not swap out at the same time. The swap outs would be a month apart, in this way the first unit would be in its second month, the second unit would be in its first month and a third unit would be preparing for its cycle. If the units were staged correctly there would always be a squadron of F-15s and a squadron of F-16s ready to go, the third squadron would depend on which unit was next in the rotation cycle. The "Air Support Wing" or ASW, also briefly covered in Option 1, is a NANG formation consisting of a squadron of fighters (A-10s or F-16s) and a squadron of C-130s. These units would normally be co-located, but could be based separately. These units would be "teamed up" with Army and/or Marine ground maneuver (Brigade-sized) units to provide CAS/BAI support to the Army and Marines. As with the AIW, the ASW would also have an "on call" rotation schedule. "Battlefield Support Group" or BSG would be the AD-ANG Big Brother of an ASW. Each BSG would have two fighter squadrons (A-10s or F-16s) and two squadrons of C/KC-130s, these units would not be collocated but would be "attached" to form the BSG. An example would be two F-16 squadrons from the 27th FW and the Guard C-130 AW at Carswell. This BSG would support an Army Division based at Ft Hood, TX. The BSG like the ASW would be a (more or less) permanent partnership between AF and Army/Marine (Division-sized) units. Each BSG and ASW C-130 squadron would include 4 KC-130s; these would be used as the USMC KC-130s are currently used for. These are air refueling of fixed wing and rotary aircraft (probe & drogue), rapid ground refueling of aircraft, ground vehicles and fuel dumps, as well as aerial delivery (air drop/air land) of personnel, equipment and supplies. The

BSG would also be formed to support USMC ground maneuver units; some BSG would include USMC F-18/AV-8B units with USAF C/KC-130 squadrons. The BSG would be capable of being split into two ASW.

Additional BRAC Recommendations, consider reforming the size of and number of fighter squadrons assigned to the fighter wings to four, up from the current two or three. And we need to standardize the strength of each operational flying squadron. We do not need to "plus-up" the number of aircraft in a squadron as much as we need to "right-size" the number assigned to each squadron and "plus-up" the number of squadrons in a wing. Prior to BRAC 88, the USAF had 36 FWE; a FWE was/is 72 Combat Coded Aircraft (CCA) or Primary Aircraft Authorized (PAA). The average FW had three squadrons and a handful had two while others had four and one or two had six. Today the USAF has about 20.5 FWE, and the average FW has two squadrons while about a third have three squadrons assigned. If we "right-size" our FS to 18 CCA/PAA (+ 3-4 spares), each FW with four FS would have 80+ aircraft assigned. Instead of having each FW assigned to one AEF, each FW would assign a squadron to an AEF cycle that way one FS is always on the road and/or one is getting ready to go. 18 aircraft would allow 12 jets to support OIF/OEF and have 6+ available for counter-drug operations or ONE support or home station requirements. If you use 24 PAA per FS as is currently proposed and as I originally planned, you will end up where we are now again in 10-15 years. Because not every unit will be able to keep 24 PAA, as units drop below 24, someone will adjust one base's number from 24 to 18 per FS to fill out other units. Then, once it has started it will continue until each base has 3 FS with 18, that will become 2 FS with 24 or 18, and we will be right back here again. Many of our current FW only have two FS assigned; over the past few years we have quietly inactivated many squadrons to keep other units at full strength. Kadena AB, Okinawa has gone from 3 F-15 squadrons to 2, Spangdahlem AB closed its F-15 unit, Eglin AFB went from 3 F-15 squadrons to 2, Shaw AFB has gone from 4 F-16 squadrons down to 2 and Moody AFB went from 3 FS to 0. Most of these aircraft simply went to other squadrons, or other bases. Now, how do we get to 4 FS per FW? This can be done thru several ways, combining ANG/AFRC units with the AD units, aircraft swaps/transfers as units change missions, bringing home some aircraft assigned overseas. An example would be: at Hill AFB, the AFRC 419th FW would transfer its jets to the co-located 388th FW, and become an Associate Unit. This would allow the 388th to reform with four squadrons. All AD/NANG FS (A-10s, F-15s & F-16s) would have 18 PAA (this would actually equal 21-22 aircraft in each FS). Bomb Squadron size would vary by type. B-1 & B-52 squadrons would have 15 PAA, with 6-8 in the training unit and the B-2 squadrons would have 8 PAA. C-17 units would have 12, KC-135 units would have 15 and C-130 units would have 18 PAA. In the NANG, Airlift and Air Refueling Squadrons would have 12 PAA. Locations with two C-130 squadrons would include 6-8 KC-130s, with noted exceptions. UAV Squadrons would have 16 (or 24). C-5 and KC-10 squadron numbers in Option 4. NANG units with two similar squadrons collocated would pool aircraft, fighters with 30 and heavies with 20, C-130 units would have 24 PAA (some C-130 units, due to their mission, would not have the KC-130 mission. These units would have 18-20 aircraft). Manning for collocated units should not decrease because of fewer aircraft, it would remain as if they were stand alone units.

Overseas USAF Realignment: In PACAF: 5th AF at Osan AB, ROK would transfer its units to the 7th AF and inactivate. Kunsan AB, ROK would be closed. The 35th FS with F-16/40s would move to Osan. The 80th FS with F-16/30 would relocate to the 27th FW. The 51st FW at Osan would reform with three squadrons, the 25th FS with 21 OA/A-10As would move down to Suwon AB, the 35th and the 36th FS would have 40+ F-16/40s. Misawa AB, Japan would be closed. The 13th FS and 14th FS would transfer 40+ F-16/50s to Shaw AFB. 11th AF at Elmendorf would reform as Alaskan Air Command. AAC would be dual-tasked to PACAF (for the PACCOM AOR) & to NORTHCOM (for the AAC AOR: 50N, out to the International Date Line, up to the North Pole). In USAFE: Spangdahlem AB, Germany would transfer 21 OA/A-10As to Aviano AB. The 31st FW would reform to the 510th with 21 OA/A-10As, 512th and the 555th with 40+ F-16/40s. At Keflavik, Iceland the 85th GP would reform as the ___ (any unit with a better history than the most relocated CONUS based training unit of WW2). The "new" 44th GP/WG, previously the 44th BG, "the Flying 8-Balls" of Operation Tidal Wave and Ploesti, would activate the "new" 81st FS (previously w/F-4s & A-10s at Spang) with 9 F-15C/Ds. The 81st FS would replace the rotations of F-15 & F-16s that have been going up to Iceland every 90 days since the 57th FS was

inactivated over 10 years ago. The 81st is an attempt to reduce personnel deployment rates when and where other options exist. Is it really better (for our people) to send endless rotations of 70-80 people and jets to Iceland or to PCS the needed people up there for 15 months or 2+ years? 75 people TDY year round equals 28,500 TDY days each year (365 + 5 days of overlap 3 times a year). Since the 57th FS was inactivated, we have "used" almost 300,000 TDY days supporting this deployment. It is time to say enough and reactivate a FS at Keflavik to support this mission.

Here is the state by state listing of how these options may be used to reduce overhead cost by relocating and/or re-aligning numerous units and closing excess bases. After each location, I have listed (the DOD Proposal).

In AL, at the Birmingham IAP (to lose aircraft/mission but remain open), the ANG 117th ARW w/KC-135Rs would transfer 4 each to AK and AZ, its personnel and equipment would relocate to Meridian ANGB, MS (130 miles) joining the 186th ARW and the KC-135 schoolhouse. This should be accomplished within 3-5 years. This would allow the Birmingham IAP ANG site to be realigned, transferred to the AL ArNG. The 117th would be reformed at Maxwell as the 117th AG. The ArNG F/131st AVN (HH) w/CH-47Ds would relocate to Maxwell AFB, while A/1-131st AVN (ASLT) w/UH-60s would relocate from Montgomery RAP and join its parent unit, the 1-131st AVN (AHB) and B/1-131st AVN (ASLT) w/UH-60s based at Birmingham IAP. At the Montgomery RAP (ANGB to gain aircraft and 60 personnel, ArNG not listed), the 187th FW w/F-16/30s would move to nearby Maxwell AFB (10 miles) and the ArNG A/1-131st AVN (ASLT) w/UH-60s would relocate up to Birmingham, the 187th would relocate within 1-3 years and A/1-131st AVN would relocate in 3-5 years. This would allow both the Montgomery RAP ANGB and the ArNG site to be closed. At Maxwell AFB (AFRC to gain aircraft, AD to realign and lose 1200 personnel), the 187th WG would transfer 16 F-16s to the 27th FW and gain 20 F-16/42s from Luke AFB. The AFRC 908th AW w/C-130H2s would gain 4 H2s from OH and transfer to the AL ANG as the 117th AG/164th AS (previously, an OH ANG C-130 unit). The 117th would join the co-located F-16 unit to form an ASW. Maxwell would also see the ArNG F/131st AVN (HH) w/CH-47Ds arrive from Birmingham. During FY-22/23, the 117th would retire its C-130H2s and convert to 8 Js & 4 KC-Js. The helicopter swap between Birmingham and Montgomery are unit/equipment moves, most of the personnel assigned to each unit would not move but would transfer in-place to the incoming unit.

In AK, at Anchorage IAP/Kulis ANGB (to be closed), the 176th WG w/C-130Hs, HC-130s & HH-60s would move over to Elmendorf AFB as proposed, allowing the Kulis ANGB to close. At Elmendorf AFB (AD to realign and lose 1550 personnel, ANG to "gain" aircraft and 600 personnel), the ANG 210th RQS w/HC-130Ns & HH-60Gs would split and form two "new" squadrons, the 210th RQS w/HH-60Gs would gain 4 HH-60Gs from DM and continue to perform the SAR/CSAR mission, the "new" 211th SOS would transfer its 3 HC-130Ns to DM and convert to 6 MC-130Hs, attached to the 176th WG. The ANG 144th AS w/C-130H2s and the AD 517th AS w/C-130Hs would form the "new" 176th AG. This unit would transfer 4 C-130H2s to Savannah, GA and 4 C-130H2s to Boise, ID and gain 8 C-130Hs from Milwaukee and 4 KC-130Rs from (USMC) VMGR-352. The 176th WG would be a "Total Force" unit and with two squadrons, the 144th, and the 217th AS (the reformed AD 517th AS) with 20 C-130Hs, 4 KC-130Rs and an ALF w/C-12Fs. During FY-16/17, the 176th AG would transfer 20 C-130Hs to Minneapolis-St. Paul and retire its 4 KC-130Rs and convert to 16 Js & 8 KC-Js and in FY-21; the 211th SOS would transfer its 6 MC-130Hs to Hurlburt Field and gain 6 MC-130Js & 2 Js. Elmendorf would also gain a USN squadron with 9 P-3Cs from NAS Whidbey Island, WA. The plan to base a squadron of C-17s at Elmendorf should be dropped. The 3rd WG would reform with the 12th & 13th FS with 40+ F-15C/Ds, the 14th FS with 20+ F-15Es and the 962nd with 3 E-3Cs. Under Option 6, Elmendorf's F-15C/Ds would remain until replaced by the F-22s, and then would go to various AD and ANG units. The F-15Es would remain at Elmendorf until the first squadron of F-22s is operational, then it would relocate to Eielson AFB joining a second F-15E squadron (Option 7). At Eielson AFB (to realign and lose 2900 personnel, ANG not listed), the 354th FW would keep its A-10s and F-16/40s until they were replaced by F-15Es or JSFs. The F-16/40s would transfer to Hill and the A-10s to DM or the FL ANG at Patrick. Eielson's 355th FS

would reform as the 19th FS. The ANG 168th ARW w/KC-135Rs would gain 4 from AL. The current DOD Proposal calls for Eielson to be basically closed and turned over to civilian contractors except for the ANG units. This flies in the face of statements by senior leaders that AK is an incredible training location. Who's going to train there? The nearest fighter or bomber unit outside of AK is in Idaho and they have enough space there for training. Additionally, AK strategic location and importance is being abandoned by the current proposal, AK and Guam are the closest US Territory to Asia. Meaning we do not need someone's permission to use them or the units based at them. Drawing down these units is at best, short-sighted and at worst, dangerous.

In AZ, at Phoenix-Sky Harbor IAP ANGB (to gain aircraft and 40 personnel), the ANG 161st ARW w/KC-135Rs would gain 4 from AL and relocate to Luke AFB (30 miles) and become the 161st WG/161st ARG, this would allow **the Phoenix-Sky Harbor IAP ANGB to be closed.** At the AF Research Lab in Mesa City (to be closed), relocate as proposed and allow **the AF Research Lab to be closed.** At Luke AFB (to lose 275 personnel), the 56th FW would transfer two F-16 squadrons, the 21st FS and the 425th FS to Cannon AFB, NM. This move would do several things: First, it would free up ramp space for the KC-135Rs. Second, it would relocate the RSAF & the RoCAF F-16 units to Cannon AFB. Third, it would reduce the number of F-16s assigned to Luke AFB (fewer jets in the pattern, less noise, PR, good neighbor reasons, etc.). The AFRC 944th FW w/F-16/32s would transfer its F-16s to the co-located 56th FW and become an associate unit, the 944th FG would reform as the 332nd FG (historical reasons) under the 162nd FW with two squadrons, the 301st and 302nd FS. Under Option 3 (Joint Training): Luke AFB would become the Primary Multi-Service JSF flying training base. Why did the training for F-15, the F-16 and the F-15E all start at Luke? First, better weather, AZ has more clear, sunny "flying days" than any other state and I've never heard of a unit in AZ doing Hurricane Evacuations. Second, range and airspace, as big as Eglin and its ranges are, they are small when compared to what AZ offers. Third, the D-M based RQG can provide SAR from its home base and SAR/CSAR is their primary job. Luke would transfer 60 F-16/42s to Maxwell (20), to Ft Wayne (20) and Luke's remaining F-16/42s would "top-off" the IA, OH and OK ANG F-16/42 units (5 ea). Luke would gain 40 F-16/25s from Ft Wayne (15), Duluth (10), and Burlington (15) and 30 F-16/32s from the 944th (15) and from Ft Smith (15). The 56th FW would reform with the 53rd, 54th, 55th, 61st, 62nd & 63rd FS. As the JSF training comes on-line, the F-16 training mission would be transferred to the AZ, FL & TX ANG and the F-16s would be transferred to Tucson. At Davis-Monthan AFB (not listed), the 355th FW w/OA/A-10s would be the delivery point for all "new" OA/A-10Cs, the 355th would have two training squadrons and one (or two) operational squadrons. The AFRC 943rd RQG would transfer 4 HH-60s to AK and the remainder to the co-located 563rd RQG and become an associate unit, reforming as the 243rd RQG under the ANG 161st WG. The 563rd RQG w/HC-130Ps and HH-60Gs would gain 3 HC-130Ns from AK and the HH-60s from the 943rd. The 563rd would activate OL-Bravo at Portland IAP with 3 HC-130s and 5 HH-60Gs, this would allow for the return of USAF Rescue assets to the Pacific Northwest. The 4-Bay ADA Facility at DM would be renovated and turned over to the 162nd FW. During FY-10/11, the 563rd would retire/transfer its HC-130s and convert to 12 HC-130Js and 2 Js and during FY-12/14, the 55th ECG w/EC-130Hs would convert to 16 EC-130Js & 2 C-130Js. At Tucson IAP (not listed), the ANG 162nd FW would retire its F-16/10s and gain 30+ F-16/25s from Ellington (15) and Fresno (15). As JSF training goes on-line, Tucson would gain over 100 F-16/25s and 30 F-16/32s from Luke. The 162nd would keep the /32s and the 50 "best" /25s for the training mission and retire the remaining F-16/25s. The 162nd FW would be dual-tasked to 1st AF with the ADA Commitment at DM. Under Option 8: the 162nd FW would retire its F-16/25s and gain 30 F-16/52s from Cannon and 20 F-16Gs. Tucson's end-strength would be: 1 FS w/F-16/32s, 1 FS w/F-16/52s and 1 FS w/F-16Gs. Additionally; the AZ ANG should activate a Reconnaissance Group with 2 squadrons and 32 Predators UAVs at Ft Huachuca's AAF. In AR, at Ft Smith RAP-Ebbing ANGB (to lose aircraft/mission and 75 personnel but remain open), the ANG 188th FW would transfer its F-16/32s to Luke AFB, relocate to nearby Ft Chaffee (10 miles) and reform as the 188th Reconnaissance Wing with two squadrons and 32 Predators. This would allow **the Ebbing ANGB to be closed.** At Little Rock AFB (to gain aircraft and 3800 personnel), the 314th AW w/C-130E/Js would transfer 4 C-130Js to Harrisburg, PA and gain the co-located 463rd AG w/C-130E, gain the relocating 317th AG w/C-130Hs from Dyess and "gain"

the co-located ANG C-130Es. The ANG 189th AW would become a full-up AW by "gaining" 24 C-130E/Hs and forming a second squadron. The "new" 189th AW would have two squadrons with 24 C-130E/Hs, converting to the 12 Js & 12 J-30s during FY-07/08. 189th AW would become the C-130J schoolhouse. As an AD/ANG schoolhouse unit, the 189th AW would fall under the "Total Force Manning Concept". The C-130H schoolhouse would transfer to the 94th AW at Dobbins ANGB as the 189th converts to 24 J/J-30s. KC-130 training would take place at the operational unit. Little Rock's 314th AW would reform with four operational squadrons with 64 C-130E/Hs, converting two squadrons, the 50th and 53rd with 32 C-130J and two squadrons, the 61st and 62nd with 32 C-130J-30 during FY-08/12. Little Rock would retire its C-130Es and transfer its C-130Hs to Yokota (to replace Yokota's C-130Es). Additional C-130J training would be done at Keesler on an "as required" basis during the conversion process. The current DOD Proposal will base 116 C-130s at Little Rock. Little Rock has one runway, this is unwise. This option bases 88 C-130s at Little Rock and leaves 32 at Pope AFB, NC, closer to their main customer: the US Army's 82nd Airborne.

In CA, at MCAS Miramar (to gain 70 personnel), VMGR-352 would transfer 4 KC-130R to Elmendorf and move to NAS North Island with 8 KC-130R. At NB Ventura County/Point Mugu-Channel Islands ANGB (ANGB to gain aircraft, NB to realign and lose 1500 personnel), under Option 3 (Joint Basing): the USN-R VP-65 with P-3s would relocate to March ANGB (125 miles). The USN Test Center and supporting units would relocate to Edwards AFB and NAWS China Lake. The USN E-2C squadrons and C-2 squadron would relocate would relocate to MCAS Miramar or NAS Lemoore. The ANG 146th AW w/C-130J-30s would transfer 4 aircraft to the RI ANG and 4 to Reno while gaining 8 C-130H2s from Reno and relocate to NAS North Island (190 miles). The USN-R VR-55 w/C-130Ts would gain 2 from Willow Grove, 2 from Andrews, 2 from New Orleans and relocate to North Island (190 miles). These moves would allow NB Ventura County/Point Mugu-Channel Is ANGB to be closed. At NAS North Island (not listed), under Option 3 (Joint Operations): the 146th and VR-55 would join USMC VMGR-352 with 8 KC-130R to the form the "new" 146th AMW. The 146th AMW would have the 146th AG with two squadrons, the 115th AS and the 352nd AS with 8 C-130H2s, 8 C-130Ts and 8 KC-130Rs and VR-57 (or the NANG 257th FSS) with C-40As. In FY-09/10, the 146th would transfer 8 C-130H2 to Dobbins, 8 C-130Ts to Edwards, 8 KC-130Rs to Peterson (4), Savannah/Hunter AAF (4) and convert to 16 C-130Js & 8 KC-130Js. At Edwards AFB (to gain 50 personnel), under Option 3 (Joint Operations): the 412th Test Wing would see arrival of the USN Flight Test units from Point Mugu and the USN Flight Test Center from NAS Patuxent River, MD. These units would combine to form the "new" 412th Flight Test Wing and the Armed Forces Test Pilot School. Edwards AFB would be renamed as the Edwards Armed Forces Flight Test Center. During FY-09/10, the 412th FTW would gain 8 C-130Ts from North Island, four would be used for Test support and 4 would be converted to DC-130T to replace the current 40+ year old DC-130As. The CA ANG would form a Test Group with two Flight Test Squadrons (associate units to assist the 412th) and a Flight Test Support Squadron to operate the C/DC-130Ts. NAWS China Lake (to gain 2500 personnel), would see the arrival of several USN Flight Test units from Point Mugu and NAS Patuxent River. NAWS China Lake would become the China Lake Annex of the Edwards AFFTC. At March ANGB (to lose 110 personnel), the ANG 163rd ARW w/KC-135Rs and the AFRC 452nd AMW w/KC-135Rs & C-141s, would merge forming the "new" 452nd AMW. It would have two squadrons of KC-135Rs, the 196th and the 336th, with 20 aircraft and one squadron of C-141s. This unit is currently converting to C-17s and under Option 5, would gain the C-17 schoolhouse and 10 C-17s from Altus AFB, OK. The 163rd AG would be activated to oversee the C-17 schoolhouse. The 163rd AG would form two squadrons, the 229th and 230th (reforming the 729th and 730th) with 20 aircraft. As an AD/NANG schoolhouse unit, the 163d AG would fall under the "Total Force Manning Concept". NAF El Centro would be the primary satellite field. Desert strips at MCB Twenty-nine Palms would also be used. Under Option 3 (Joint Basing): March would gain two USN P-3C squadrons, one USN-R squadron from Point Mugu and an AD squadron from NAS Whidbey Is, WA. These two squadrons would pool 20 aircraft. March's "other" runway (12/30) would be renovated and reopened for use as a C-17 assault strip or as a second runway, the ADA facility would be upgraded to a 4-Bay Facility. Under Option 4, March would transfer its KC-135Rs to various units and gain 15 KC-10s from Travis. At Las Angeles Air Station (not listed), the unit(s) based there would relocate to Los Alamitos AAF, Vandenberg or Edwards AFB.

This would allow **LA AFS to be closed**. At Onizuka AFS (to be closed), relocate as proposed and allow **Onizuka AS to be closed**. At Fresno IAP (to gain aircraft and 300 personnel), the ANG 144th FW w/F-16/25s would transfer 15 to Tucson and gain 20 F-15C/Ds from Langley AFB, CA (when the next squadron converts to F-22s). At Travis AFB (not listed), you would see several changes. Under Option 4, the 60th AMW would transfer 15 of its KC-10s to the 452nd AMW at March ANGB, 8 KC-10s to the UT ANG and the remaining KC-10s to the NC ANG. Travis would also transfer 20 of its C-5s to the AFRC unit at Beale and the remainder to various ANG units. The 60th AMW would then be re-equipped with 2 Squadrons of new-built C-17s and 2 squadrons of KC-135Rs from Grand Forks. The AFRC 349th AMW at Travis would convert one squadron for each type and swap some personnel and equipment with Beale (80 miles). Travis AFB would also see the construction of a new 4-Bay ADA Facility on the alert ramp to replace the "old" one that has been converted to other uses. This facility would be manned by the ND ANG. At Beale AFB (AFRC to lose aircraft and 180 personnel), the AFRC 940th ARW w/KC-135Rs would transfer 4 each to Milwaukee and Portland and become an associate unit to the 9th RW. Under Option 4: the 940th would transfer its aircraft and convert to C-5s with aircraft and personnel from Travis AFB (80 miles). The "new" 940th AW would have 2 squadrons, the 314th and the 317th (from McChord) with 20 aircraft. This option would require some renovation and enlarging of the existing AFRC ramp and facilities at Beale. The existing AFRC ramp can handle 16 C-5s in pull-in/push-back parking, the renovation and enlargement of the ramp would allow for 16 pull-through parking spots. One hanger and several smaller buildings would be removed along the AFRC ramp would need to be removed. Two or three C-5 hangers would need to be built. At CGAS Sacramento (not listed), at the former McClellan AFB, the HC-130s would relocate to Travis AFB. At CGAS San Francisco (not listed), at SF IAP, the HH-60s would relocate to the CG Base in Alameda or to Moffett Field. At CGAS Las Angeles (not listed), at LA IAP, the HH-65s would relocate to the CG Base in Long Beach or to Las Alamitos AAF. At CGAS San Diego (not listed), at San Diego IAP, the HH-60Js would relocate to NAS North Island. These moves would relocate USCG aviation assets to nearby CG Bases or DOD installations and allow **CGAS Sacramento, CGAS San Francisco, CGAS Las Angeles and CGAS San Diego to be closed**, without negatively affecting USCG capability. Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach (not listed) is NEW (Net Explosive Weight) restricted/limited by encroaching civilian housing and infrastructure. This, when combined with the requirement to ship explosives overland thru one of the largest and most densely populated urban areas in the Western US to support Seal Beach is "a problem" waiting to happen. NWS Concord (to realign: the inland area to be closed, the ocean loading terminal will be transferred to US Army) will soon face the same "issues" now facing Seal Beach. There are two options for these issues: 1) spend tens of millions of dollars to purchase the surrounding properties; this will not work for obvious reasons or 2) to close these two facilities. NWS Seal Beach and Concord NWS would transfer their assets to the Hawthorne, NV and to various USN/USMC West Coast Bases. This would allow both **the NWS Seal Beach to be closed and the NWS Concord to be realigned: downsized**. NWS Concord would close its main storage area; the bayside loading/ocean terminal would remain open. Additionally, when comparing Sierra Army Depot (not listed) against similar facilities in Umatilla, OR and Hawthorne, NV, you see how low Sierra rates against them. Both Umatilla and Hawthorne are better located and more easily served by various transportation modes than Sierra. Umatilla sits at the junction of I-82 and I-84 while Hawthorne is divided by US 95. Umatilla's road and rail links go northwest to Seattle, west to Portland and Astoria (an ocean loading terminal) and northeast to Fairchild and east to Mountain Home and SLC. Hawthorne's road and rail links go north to Fallon, Reno, Beale, Travis and the SF Bay (NWS Concord's ocean loading terminal) and south to Nellis, Arizona and southern CA. Both have airheads, unfortunately neither can be used without extensive renovations. However, Hawthorne can use NAS Fallon as an airhead, Fallon is 70 miles to the north and can handle 8+ C-5/C-17 aircraft. Sierra sit up in the Sierra Mountains 60+ miles north of Reno, the primary road access is US 395 to Reno. Rail links are also limited, east bound rail access is good while west bound must either go down the "Burma Road" thru Reno eastbound before going back thru Reno westbound or enjoy the scenic rail tour of northern CA. Sierra's airhead can handle 1 or 2 C-5/C-17 aircraft. Closing Sierra in addition to Seal Beach and Concord would free up resources that are tied up at these scattered locations and consolidate our assets at two "robust sized" facilities. **The Sierra Army Depot should be closed**. Last, the CA ANG

should activate an Airborne Command and Control Squadron (ACCS) at MCAS Miramar or NAS Lemoore with 9-12 E-2Cs and the 144th Reconnaissance Group with 2 squadrons and 32 Predator UAVs at MCB Camp Pendleton.

In CO, at Buckley AFB (to gain aircraft and 90 personnel), the ANG 140th WG w/F-16/30s would gain 4 from Springfield, IL. A 4-Bay ADA Facility would be constructed; this would be manned by the 140th, dual-tasked to 1st AF. Under Option 7: the 140th would transfer 12 F-16s to Carswell, 8 to Kelly Field and gain 20 new F-15Es and 9 F-15C/Ds from Scott. The 140th would continue under 12th AF, while being dual-tasked by 1st AF with the ADA Commitment. At Peterson AFB (to gain aircraft and 500 personnel), the AFRC 302nd AW w/C-130H3s would transfer 8 H3s to Pope AFB, NC and gain 16 Hs from Dyess AFB, TX. The "new" 302nd AW of the CO ANG would be a "Total Force" unit with two squadrons, the 231st and the 232nd AS (previously the 731st and the 732nd at McGuire), with 16 C-130Hs. In FY-09, this unit would gain 4 KC-130Rs from CA before converting to 16 Js & 8 KC-Js during FY-18/19. The 302nd would "team-up" with the Army at Ft Carson. At the USAFA (to lose Medical Facilities and 40 personnel), the proposal to move Medical Facility to Ft Carson is short-sighted, transferring a patient from the AFA to Ft Carson by ambulance take 30-45+ minutes depending on traffic. Leave the Medical Facilities at the AFA, Ft Carson is scheduled to gain over 4300 personnel and does not need the extra burden of dealing with AFA medical issues.

In CT, at Bradley IAP ANGB/ArNG (ANGB to lose aircraft/mission, 70 personnel and gain a limited non-flying mission and remain open, ArNG not listed), the 103rd FW w/A-10s would transfer its aircraft, equipment and personnel to Westover ARB, MA (25 miles) to join the 104th FW that will be relocating to Westover. This would allow **the Bradley ANGB to be realigned: transferred to the CT ANG.** The ArNG 2-126th AVN (GSAB), B/2-126th AVN (GS) w/UH-60s and Det. 1 G/104th AVN (HH) w/CH-47Ds would relocate across the runway into the ANG facilities from their current facilities. This would allow **the Bradley IAP ArNG facility to be closed.** At Sub Base New London (to be closed), this is the birthplace of the USN Submarine Service, it is the home of the USN Sub School, it is located within 10 miles for the only US company that builds submarines. These three reasons alone should be enough to keep the base open. Why? Having the Sub School located with the builders has a benefit that cannot be measured in dollars. The History, Heritage and Traditions of New London and the Sub School will be lost. There are some who will give lip-service to History and Tradition, but who will cast them aside at the first opportunity. What value do we place on Heritage? Some place very little on it. Let me use this example: there are today two commissioned warships in the USN, one has not been to sea in over 60 years and the other has only moved under its own power two or three times in the last 50 years. Why then does the USN keep these two ships in service? History, the first ship is a memorial (and a reminder, that no matter how safe we think the world is, there are some people out there who will always hate us and want to hurt or kill us) in Pearl Harbor. Heritage, the second ship will be forever linked to our country, she was one of six authorized by the Third Congress, signed into being by George Washington, she bear the name of our greatest document, she is undefeated in battle, she is America's ship and now she rest in Boston, the home of her Birth. Why do I mention these two noble ships? The reason the very simple, when we sacrifice (for whatever reason) a part of our history or heritage we are giving up our Traditions, we are giving up what makes us, who we are. If these two ships were not around or had never existed, would we still be Americans? Yes, but would we be how we are? Additionally, this will be the last AD Military Base in New England after NS Portsmouth and NAS Brunswick are closed. Why is the US Army & Navy abandoning its (historical) roots in New England?

In DE, at New Castle County Airport ANGB/ArNG (ANGB to lose aircraft/mission and 150 personnel but remain open, ArNG not listed), the ANG 166th AW w/C-130Hs would relocate to NAS Willow Grove, PA (55 miles) and join the new "Joint" C-130 Airlift Wing. This would allow **the New Castle Country AP ANGB to be realigned: transferred to the DE ANG.** The co-located ArNG C/2-126th AVN (CMD) w/UH-1Hs & OH-58s to move across the airfield into the ANG facilities and allow **the New Castle County AP ArNG site to be closed.** At Dover AFB (to gain 250 personnel), Under Option 4: the 436th AW would transfer it's C-5s to various ANG units, the 436th AW would become an AMW by re-equipping with 2 squadrons of new C-17s and 2 squadrons of KC-135s from Grand Forks AFB. The AFRC 512th AW would convert one squadron for each type.

In DC, the DC ANG 121st FS would transfer to the MD ANG, it is after all based at Andrews AFB in MD. At Bolling AFB (to lose 340 personnel), the DC ANG 113th WG would gain a squadron of helicopters with 12 H-60s or H-92s for general purpose transport missions. These would replace the UH-1s currently assigned to the 89th AW at Andrews AFB, MD. At Walter Reed Army Medical Center (to lose 5600 personnel), How can anyone justify downsizing one of the largest hospitals in the US Army? I guess that little "war on terror" thing in Iraq and Afghanistan ended and I missed the news.

In FL, at NAS Jacksonville (to gain 2000 personnel), the USN P-3 Wing would transfer one squadron with 9 P-3Cs to NS Roosevelt Roads, PR and gain a squadron with 12 P-3Cs from Brunswick, ME and "adjust" its P-3 units to two operational squadrons with 20 aircraft, one training squadron with 15 aircraft and a USN-R "associate" squadron. The USN-R VR-58 with C-40As would gain the C-40As from TX and join the NANG 179th AMW (previously OH ANG w/C-130s) as the 258th FSS. At Jacksonville IAP (to gain aircraft and 60 personnel), the ANG 125th FW w/F-15A/Bs would gain 6 F-15s from Tyndall and under Option 3 (Joint Basing) relocate to NAS Jacksonville (25 miles) within 1-3 years. The ADA Facility at Jacksonville IAP would remain; it can be separated from the ANGB and would remain in use after the ANGB is closed. At Cecil Field ArNG facility, Jacksonville (not listed), under Option 3 (Joint Basing): the ArNG 1-111th AVN (ATKBN) w/AH-64s would relocate to NAS Jacksonville (20 miles) or to NS Mayport (40 miles) within 5-7 years. These moves would allow the **Jacksonville IAP ANGB and Cecil Field ArNG site to be closed**. At MacDill AFB (to gain aircraft and 100 personnel), under Option 4: the 6th AMW would gain 18 KC-135Rs from Seymour-Johnson (9) and March (9). Also, the 310th AS would be transferred in-place to the ANG 179th AMW and the 179th would form an ANG KC-135 associate squadron. The 6th AMW would become the 6th ARW. At Patrick AFB (to lose 195 personnel), the 347th RQW with HC-130Ps & HH-60Gs would relocate from Moody AFB, GA (within 2 years). The AFRC 920th RQW would transfer its aircraft to the 347th RQW and become an "Associate" unit. In FY-14 the 347th RQW would retire its HC-130Ps and convert to 12 HC-130Js & 2 C-130Js. The FL ANG may form an A-10 squadron at Patrick for the RESCAP mission with 20 aircraft from Eielson. At Tyndall AFB (to lose 55 personnel), the 325th FW would transfer its 60+ F-15C/Ds to Eglin (40+), to Jacksonville (6) and to Mountain Home (15+) and the F-15 schoolhouse to Eglin AFB. Under Option 6: Tyndall would convert one additional F-15 squadron to F-22s for the training mission and two squadrons to F-22s for operational use. The 43rd and the 95th would reform as the 3rd FS and 4th FS. At Eglin AFB (to gain JSF training and 2200 personnel), under Option 6: the 33rd FW would gain two squadrons of F-15C/Ds from Tyndall AFB as that unit convert to the F-22s. The "new" squadrons would be the 57th and 59th FS. Eglin would also gain the F-15 schoolhouse from Tyndall AFB. The 33rd FW would reform with the 57th and 58th as operational squadrons and the 59th and 60th with the schoolhouse as training squadrons. The future JSF training site should be Luke AFB, AZ. Luke offers several advantages over Eglin for JSF training as previously listed. The only "advantage" that Eglin can offer is the inclusion of the "Joint Hurricane Evacuation Procedures" in the training program. Under Option 6: Eglin would transfer its F-15C/Ds to various Guard units and the F-15 schoolhouse to the OR ANG at Klamath Falls. Is relocating the 7th SF Group from Ft Bragg to Eglin the best idea? Relocating this unit to Ft Gordon, GA or Ft Campbell, KY may be a better option. While Eglin does have the space, the Eglin Range is not exactly where one would think that a SF Group would get the best training. Eglin's range is a weapons test range and the AC-130s from the 16th SOW at Hurlburt Field also use the range for weapons practice. At first glance basing the 7th SF Group at Eglin appears good, upon careful review this may not be a good idea. At Homestead ANGB (to gain aircraft and 70 personnel), the AFRC 482nd FW w/F-16/30s would gain 16 F-16/30s from Sioux Falls (8) and Syracuse (8) to form a second squadron, the "new" 95th FS. The 482nd would be dual-tasked by 1st AF with the ADA Commitment at Homestead. Under Option 8: the 482nd FW would retire its F-16/30s and gain 40+ F-16/50s from Shaw. Homestead would also gain the USN-R VAW-77 w/E-2Cs from NAS Atlanta; this unit, under Option 3 (Joint Operations): would become the core of the "new" 277th ACCS of the FL ANG. At USCG Clearwater (not listed), at St Petersburg-Clearwater IAP, the HC-130H and HH-60J would relocate to MacDill AFB. At CGAS Miami (not listed), at Opa Locka AP, the HU-25s, RU-38s, HH-65s and VC-4A would relocate to Homestead. This would allow **CGAS Clearwater and CGAS**

Miami to be closed. Additionally, the USCG HITRON w/MH-68As based in Jacksonville would also relocate to Homestead.

In GA, at Moody AFB (to swap aircraft and gain 575 personnel), the 347th RQW w/HC-130s & HH-60s move back to Patrick AFB, FL to gain the AFRC 920th RQW based there (within 2 years). This move would allow, under Option 3 (Joint Training): the USN TAW-1 to relocate from NAS Meridian, MS and join the 479th FTG to form the "new" Joint Flying Training Wing-1 (within 2-3 years). Moody would have the 433rd FTS w/T-38Cs, the 434th w/T-45As and the 435th & 436th w/T-6As. At NAS Atlanta/Dobbins ARB (NAS to close, ARB to gain aircraft and 120 personnel), the USN-R VR-46 would retire its C-9s, gain 4 C-130H2s from NY, reform as the 246th AS and join the AFRC 94th AW. The 94th AW w/C-130H2s would gain 4 H2s from TN, bringing the total assigned to 16 H2s. This unit would become the C-130H schoolhouse when Little Rock converts to C-130Js and would gain an additional 8 H2s from CA in FY-09. The USN-R VAW-77 would relocate to Homestead (700 miles). At Robins AFB (to lose aircraft and 30 personnel while gaining 780 contractors), the 19th ARG w/KC-135Rs would relocate to McConnell AFB, KS. The ANG 116th ACW would revert back to its original 93rd ACW designation (historical reasons). At Savannah IAP (to gain aircraft and 35 personnel), the ANG 165th AW w/C-130H2s would gain 4 H2s from AK and (within 3-5 years) move to nearby Ft Stewart's Hunter AAF (10 miles). The Combat Readiness Training Center would also relocate to Hunter AAF (the former SAC alert ramp would make a good "playground"). These moves would allow both **the Savannah Combat Readiness Training Center and the Savannah IAP ANGB to be closed.** At Hunter AAF, in FY-10 the 165th would gain 4 KC-130Rs from North Island. During FY-21/22, the 165th would retire its C/KC-130s and convert to 16 C-130Js & 8 KC-130Js.

In Guam, at Anderson AFB (to lose 95 personnel), the 36th ABW become the 36th WG and gain two squadrons of new F-15Es (Option 7), a squadron of F-15C/Ds with aircraft transferred from Langley AFB, VA and a squadron of KC-135Rs with aircraft transferred from Altus AFB, OK. The "new" squadrons would be the 561st & 562nd FS w/F-15Es (previously F-4E/Gs, deactivated at Nellis AFB & George AFB, CA), the 563rd FS w/F-15C/Ds (previously F-4E/Gs, deactivated George AFB, CA) and the 912th ARS (from Grand Forks AFB). The USN would also gain a squadron with 9 P-3Cs transferred from MCAS Kaneohe Bay, HI. Any remaining military aviation assets at Guam's civilian IAP would also relocate to Anderson. End strength at Anderson would be USAF: 40+ F-15Es, 20+ F-15C/Ds, 12 KC-135Rs and the USN: 12 P-3Cs and HC-5 with MH-60Ss.

In HI, at Hickham AFB (to lose 260 personnel), the ANG 204th AS w/C-130H3 would transfer 8 H3s to Pope AFB and become a C-17 "associate" squadron. At CGAS (ex-NAS) Barbers Point (not listed), the HC-130s and HH-65s would relocate to MCAS Kaneohe Bay or Hickham AFB. This would allow **CGAS Barbers Point to be closed.** At MCAS Kaneohe Bay (not listed), the USN P-3C Wing would transfer a squadron of 9 P-3Cs to Anderson AFB, Guam and would "adjust" to two squadrons with 20 aircraft. Additionally, the HI ANG would form the 275th ACCS with 9 E-2Cs based at Hickham AFB or MCAS Kaneohe Bay.

In ID, at the Boise Air Terminal (to gain A-10s and lose C-130s and 80 personnel), the ANG 189th AS w/C-130Es would transfer 4 C-130Es to IL and gain 4 C-130H2s from AK as placeholders. In FY-09/10, the 189th would transfer its 4 C-130H2s to the TN ANG at Campbell Field and gain 8 C-130Js & 4 KC-130Js. The co-located 190th FS w/OA/A-10As would gain 5 aircraft from DM. This would allow the 124th WG to become an ASW. At Mountain Home AFB (to swap aircraft and lose 570 personnel), the 366th FW/389th FS would transfer 20+ F-16/52s to the 430th FS at Cannon. Under Option 7: Mountain Home would gain a second squadron of F-15Es, the 480th FS. Under Option 6: Mountain Home would gain a second squadron of F-15C/Ds transferred from Tyndall, the reformed 389th FS. At a later date, Mountain Home's two F-15C/D squadrons would transfer their aircraft to various NANG units and convert to F-22s. Additionally, Mountain Home would gain up to four squadrons of USN F-18s from NAS Lemoore under an Option 3, Joint Basing Agreement.

In IL, at Scott AFB (to gain aircraft, 720 personnel and 85 contractors), the ANG 126th ARW w/KC-135Es would gain the MO ANG 131st FW w/F-15C/Ds relocating from St Louis IAP and would become the 126th WG. New facilities (an aircraft parking ramp, hanger, Ops and MX buildings) would need to be built for the F-15s. These facilities would be built between the current 126th ramp and the alert facility. The 126th would activate the 131st FG to oversee F-15

operations and the 126th ARG for KC-135s. The 4-Bay ADA Facility would be renovated and turned over to the 126th WG/131st FG. Under Option 7: the 131st would transfer 9 F-15C/Ds to the CO ANG at Buckley AFB and gain 20 F-15Es. The 131st would remain under 9th AF, while being dual-tasked to 1st AF with 9 F-15C/Ds for the Scott ADA commitment. Under Option 10: the 126th ARG would gain 12 KC-135Es from Sioux City (8) and Topeka (4), this unit would have 20 KC-135Es until they are modified into KC-135Rs, then keep 12 KC-135Rs and transfer the remainder to other units. The AFRC 932nd AW would not convert to the C-40; it would transfer its personnel and equipment to the IL ANG and reform as the 232nd AG, this NANG associate unit would form two squadrons to assist the AD 375th AW. The 375th AW would reform; the 375th AG would have 52nd, 53rd and 54th AS with 36 C-21As to cover the CONUS/NORTHCOM region. The "new" 376th Global Security Group would gain the AFMC (DIA/DSCA) Embassy Support Flights, the 376th would form the 456th, 457th, 458th and 459th AS with 48 C-12C/Ds at Scott and 16(+) locations around the globe. The C-12C/Ds would be modified to C-12 R/T/U configuration. At Capitol MAP, Springfield (to lose aircraft/mission, 160 personnel and gain a limited non-flying mission and remain open), the ANG 183rd FW w/F-16/30s would transfer 12 to the 27th FW, 4 to Buckley and relocate to Scott (95 miles) and join the 126th WG/131st FG. This would allow **the Capital MAP ANGB to be closed.** At Peoria RAP (to gain aircraft and 35 personnel), the ANG 182nd AW w/C-130E/H3s would transfer 2 H3s to Pope AFB and gain 4 C-130Es from ID. In FY-07, this unit would retire its C-130Es and gain 8 C-130J-30s and 4 additional J-30s in FY-12.

In IN, at Grissom ARB (ARB not listed, Navy-Marine Reserve Center to close), the AFRC 434th ARW w/KC-135Rs would gain 4 under Option 10 and transfer to the IN ANG as the 434th WG. The 4-Bay ADA Facility would be renovated and turned over to the 122nd FW. At Ft Wayne IAP (to gain aircraft and 310 personnel), the ANG 122nd FW would transfer it 15 F-16/25 to Luke, gain 20 F-16/42s from Luke, relocate to Grissom ANGB (60 miles) and join the 434th WG as the 122nd FG/163rd FS. The 434th WG would form an AIW. This would allow **the Ft Wayne IAP ANGB to be closed.** At Terre Haute IAP (to lose aircraft/mission and 135 personnel but remain open), the ANG 181st FW w/F-16/30s would transfer 12 to the 27th FW and 4 to Great Falls. The unit would then become a RW by converting to Predator UAVs with two squadrons, the 113th and the 170th (from Springfield, IL) and 32 UAVs.

In IA, at Sioux Gateway AP, Sioux City (to gain aircraft and 200 personnel), the ANG 185th ARW would transfer 8 KC-135Es to Scott AFB and gain 10 KC-135Rs from Niagara Falls (8), March (2) and 2 under Option 10. At Des Moines IAP (to gain aircraft and 50 personnel), the ANG 132nd FW would gain 5 F-16/42s from Luke AFB. The 132nd and the 185th would form an AIW.

In KS, at McConnell AFB (AD to gain aircraft and 730 personnel while ANG will lose aircraft/mission and 210 personnel), the ANG 184th ARW w/KC-135Rs would transfer its aircraft to the co-located 22nd ARW. It would then gain the co-located AFRC 931st ARG to become an NANG associate ARW with two squadrons, the 117th (from Topeka) and the 127th ARS (with a total of 36-48 crews). The 22nd ARW would gain 12 KC-135Rs from Robins; the 22nd ARW would have four squadrons with 60 KC-135R/Ts. Under Option 12: McConnell AFB would gain the 7th BW w/B-1s from Dyess AFB, and would transfer two squadrons of KC-135Rs to Ellsworth AFB, SD. These units would then be divided to form two "Global Power" Groups (GPG), each with one squadron of B-1s and one squadron of KC-135s. The 184th would become a WG with the 117th ARS and the 127th BS. At Forbes Field ANGB, Topeka (to gain aircraft and 250 personnel), the ANG 190th ARW w/KC-135D/Es would transfer 4 Ds to Offutt and 4 Es to Scott and become a RW by converting to Predator UAVs. The "new" 190th RW would form two squadrons, the 161st and the 177th RS (both previously KS ANG F-4/F-16 squadrons at McConnell) with 32 UAVs. This unit would relocate to Ft Riley's Marshall AAF (60 miles) allowing **the Topeka-Forbes Field ANGB to be closed.**

In KY, at Louisville IAP (to gain aircraft and 6 personnel), the ANG 123rd AW w/C-130H2s would relocate to Campbell AAF, Ft Campbell, KY (180 miles). Under Option 1: the NANG 123rd Logistic Wing would be formed to operate the "new" Combat Air Forces Logistic Support Center or "The Louisville Defense Logistics Center" using the 123rd current facilities. If the LSC were to need additional space, it would be located at Ft Knox, KY (about 30 miles to the south). The 123rd would fall under the Total Force Manning concept. At Campbell AAF, the former AW would join the 118th AW relocating from Nashville, TN with personnel, equipment and 4 C-130H2s. The

118th AW would have two squadrons, the 105th and the 165th AS and 12 C-130H2s. In FY-10, the 118th would gain 4 H2s from ID and 8 KC-130Ts from Willow Grove, this unit would transfer/retire its H2s & KC-Ts and convert to C/KC-130Js during FY-17/18.

In LA, at New Orleans the ANG 159th FW w/F-15s is co-located with the AFRC 926th FW w/A-10s while at Barksdale the AFRC 917th WG has both B-52s and A-10s. Since all three types are clearly needed at this time (F-15s to support 1st AF/NORAD with ONE and B-52s & A-10s to support the GWOT), the best option would be to move the A-10s from Barksdale to New Orleans and move the F-15s over to Ellington Field, TX. At Barksdale AFB (AFRC to gain aircraft and 65 personnel), the AFRC 917th WG would transfer its A-10s to NAS New Orleans and its B-52s to the co-located 2nd BW and become a NANG associate BG with 2 squadrons (with a total of 36-48 crews). The 2nd BW would then have 4 B-52 squadrons (3 operational, plus the training squadron) and 50+ B-52s. Under Option 12: Barksdale would transfer a squadron of B-52s to Fairchild AFB, gain two squadrons of KC-135Rs from Fairchild and form two GPG. The NANG would convert one squadron to the KC-135R. At NAS New Orleans (ANG to gain aircraft and 125 personnel, AFRC to lose aircraft/mission and 310 personnel, NAS to gain), the USN-R VR-54 would transfer 2 C-130Ts to Pt Mugu, convert to P-3Cs and join the co-located VP-94 in a single squadron with 10 P-3Cs. The ANG 159th FW would transfer its F-15s to Ellington Field; gain the A-10s from Barksdale and the co-located AFRC A-10 unit. The "new" 159th FW would have two squadrons, the 122nd FS and the 206th FS (reformed 706th) with 30 OA/A-10s. The ADA facility would be replaced with a new 4-Bay Facility. The USN-R VFA-204 with F-18s would retire 12 F-18A/Bs and gain 21 F-18C/Ds from NAS Lemoore, CA. This unit would be dual-tasked to the USN with 12 F-18s and to 1st AF with 9 F-18s for ADA Commitment.

In ME, at NAS Brunswick (to lose aircraft/mission and 2500 personnel but remain open), two P-3 squadrons, each with 9 aircraft would relocate, one squadron would go to NAS Sigonella (to cover the Mediterranean) and the other would move to NAS Keflavik (to cover the North Atlantic). The remaining two squadrons, each with 12 aircraft would relocate; one going to NAS Jacksonville, FL and the other along with the USN-R VP-92 would relocate to Otis ANGB, MA (200 miles). The USN-R VR-62 would transfer 2 C-130Ts to Niagara Falls and also relocate to Otis. This would allow **NAS Brunswick to be closed**. At Bangor IAP (to gain aircraft and 240 personnel), under Option 10: the ANG 101st ARW w/ KC-135Es would gain 12 KC-135Es from Knoxville (8) and McGuire (4). This unit would have 20 KC-135Es until they are modified into KC-135Rs, then the unit would keep 12 KC-135Rs and transfer the remainder to other units.

In MD, at Andrews AFB (to gain 490 personnel), the DC ANG 121st FS w/F-16/30s would transfer to the MD ANG. It would then combine with the co-located AFRC 459th ARW w/KC-135Rs to form the "new" 459th WG. The 121st would transfer 15 F-16/30s to Duluth and gain 20 F-16/40s from Hill AFB. The 459th WG would gain 2 KC-135Rs from March and 2 under Option 10. The USN-R VR-53 would transfer 2 C-130Ts to Pt Mugu and join the 459th WG. The AF Flight Standards Agency (w/ 3 C-21As would relocate to Kirtland AFB. At NAS Patuxent River (to gain 85 personnel), the Naval Air Warfare Center – Aircraft Division, VX-20, VX-21, VX-23, the USNTPS, along with VX-1 and their associated units would relocate to Edwards AFB, CA. This should allow **NAS Patuxent River to be closed**. At Martin State AP/Warfield ANGB (to gain A-10s and lose C-130s and 120 personnel), the ANG 175th WG would see some changes. The ANG 135th AG w/C-130Js would relocate to NAS Willow Grove (110 miles) and the PA ANG A-10s from Willow Grove would relocate to Martin St AP. The 175th WG would be re-designated as the 175th FW with two squadrons, the 103rd FS and 104th FS with 30 OA/A-10s.

In MA, at Barnes MAP/ANGB (to gain aircraft and 105 personnel), the ANG 104th FW with A-10s would relocate to nearby Westover ARB (12 miles) and join the 103rd FW with A-10s from Bradley IAP/ANGB, CT. This will allow **the Barnes MAP ANGB to be closed**. At Westover ARB (to gain 80 personnel), the AFRC 439th AW with C-5As would form a second squadron, the 326th AS (from Dover) and plus-up to 20 C-5s with aircraft from Dover. Westover would gain the two A-10s units relocating from Barnes and Bradley to form the "new" 103rd FW. The 103rd would have an OG, MXG & some support assets. The 103rd would have two squadrons, the 118th FS and 131st FS with 30 OA/A-10s. Manning for other base agencies would increase to support the 103rd. At Otis ANGB (ANGB to close, USCG site to remain open), the ANG 102nd FW with F-15A/Bs would plus-up to 20 F-15s and continues its ADA Commitment for 1st AF. Otis would gain the RI ANG 143rd AW from Quonset State AP with 8 C-130J-30s and 4 from CA, the 143rd would

gain the USN-R VR-62 from Brunswick. VR-62 would convert to the C-130J-30 and the two units would merge to form the "new" 143rd AG/143rd AS with 12 C-130J-30s under the 439th AW. Otis would also see the arrival of two squadrons of USN P-3Cs (one AD and one USN-R) with 20 aircraft from Brunswick. The ArNG C/1-126th AVN (LUH) with UH-1Hs would relocate to Quonset State AP (90 miles) and join its parent unit, the ArNG 1-126th AVN (LUHB). End strength at Otis would be the ANG: 20 F-15s in one squadron, 12 C-130J-30s in one squadron and the USN/USN-R: 20 P-3Cs in two squadrons.

In MI, at Selfridge ANGB (AFRC to lose aircraft and 80 personnel, ANG to gain aircraft and 240 personnel), the ANG 127th WG w/F-16/30s & 191st AG w/C-130Es and the AFRC 927th ARW w/KC-135Rs, the 927th would transfer 8 KC-135Rs to Milwaukee, its personnel and equipment to the 127th WG and the 927th would be inactivated. The 191st AG/171st AS w/C-130E would form a second squadron, the 109th AS (previously MN ANG w/C-130s). The 191st AG would retire 8 C-130Es and gain 16 C-130Js and 8 KC-130Js after Cherry Point complete its conversion (within 2 years). The 127th WG/107th FS w/F-16/30s would transfer 12 to the 27th FW, 4 to Madison and reform with two squadrons, the 107th and 162nd FS (previously OH ANG w/F-16s) and 30 OA/A-10As gained from Battle Creek and Whiteman. The 127th would form a BSG (or split to form two ASW). At Battle Creek ANGB (to be closed), the ANG 110th FW w/OA/A-10s would transfer its 15 OA/A-10As to Selfridge (as proposed) and reform as the 110th RW with two squadrons and 32 Predators.

In MN, at Minneapolis-St Paul IAP (not listed), the ANG 133rd AW w/C-130H3s and the AFRC 934th AW w/C-130H2s sit across the runway from each other. The 934th would transfer 8 H2s to Charleston, WV and gain 8 H3s from Martinsburg, WV. The 934th would then transfer its personnel, equipment and aircraft to the co-located 133rd AW, the 934th would then inactivate and the "new" 133rd AW with two squadrons, the 95th and the 97th (from McChord) with 16 C-130H3s would remain. During FY-16, the 133rd AW would gain 20 C-130Hs from AK and transfers its 16 H3s to BAI. In FY23 the 133rd would retire its Hs and convert to 24 C-130J-30s. And if space is available or made available, both of the units would consolidate at one site. At Duluth IAP (not listed), the ANG 148th FW w/F-16/25s would transfer 10 to Luke, 5 to Atlantic City and gain 20 F-16/30s from Andrews (16), Kirtland (4) and would continue its 1st AF tasked Tyndall ADA Commitment. This unit would transfer 20 F-16/30s to Carswell and gain 20 F-16/50s from Shaw when that unit converts to the JSF.

In MS, at NAS Meridian (to lose 15 personnel), the USN Training Air Wing-One w/T-45s (and currently retiring its T-2s) would move to Moody AFB and join the "new" Joint Flying Training Wing-1 (Option 3 - Joint Training). At Meridian RAP-Key Field ANGB/ArNG (ANGB in DOD Proposal to lose aircraft/mission and 175 personnel but remain open, ArNG not listed), the ANG 186th ARW w/KC-135Rs would move to NAS Meridian (20 miles), the "new" ANGB, joining the AL ANG KC-135 unit relocating from Birmingham IAP, AL. This move will require the two runways at Meridian ANGB to be lengthened from the current 8,000 ft to 10,000+ ft and the third from 6,400 to 9,000+ ft. The ArNG G/185th AVN (HH) w/CH-47Ds would also move to the "new" ANGB. These moves would allow for both **the Key Field ANGB and the ArNG site to be closed**. This unit would gain 10 KC-135Rs and the KC-135 schoolhouse from Altus AFB, OK. As an AD/ANG schoolhouse unit, the 186th ARW would fall under the "Total Force Manning Concept". The "new" 186th ARW would have two squadrons, the 106th and the 153rd ARS, with 20 KC-135Rs. This unit would operate the KC-135 schoolhouse for 19th AF/AETC. At Keesler AFB (to lose 400 personnel), the AFRC 403rd WG/OG would split, the 53rd WS w/ WC-130Js would reform as the 403rd WRG/ 53rd WS and the 815th AS w/C-130Js would reform as the 403rd AG with two squadrons, the 215th and 216th AS with a "part-time" C-130J schoolhouse mission assisting Little Rock "as required". Additionally, the 81st TW would begin a phased, 10 year transfer of the AETC Technical Training Center to Goodfellow AFB, TX. The 403rd AW would transfer to the MS ANG. The 403rd WRG would continue its mission as "Hurricane Hunters" and the 403rd AG would gain 6 C-130Js and 8 KC-130Js in FY-12. The 403rd AG would then be "attached" to the A-10 FW at New Orleans to form a BSG. Additionally, **the Combat Readiness Training Center at Gulfport-Biloxi RAP would be closed**.

In MO, at Lambert-St Louis IAP (to lose aircraft/mission and 250 personnel but remain open), the ANG 131st FW w/F-15s would relocate to Scott AFB, IL (35 miles). That would be a move across state lines and the unit would transfer to the IL ANG. This move would also allow **the Lambert-St**

Louis IAP ANGB to be closed. At Rosecrans MAP, St Joseph (to gain aircraft and 35 personnel), the ANG 139th AW w/C-130H2s would gain 4 H2s from OH. During FY-17/18, this unit would retire its H2s and convert to 6 C-130Js, 6 C-130J-30s & 4 KC-130Js. At Whiteman AFB (AFRC to gain aircraft), the AFRC 442nd FW w/A-10s would transfer its 15 OA/A-10s to Selfridge, join the MO ANG and reform as the 442nd BW with a B-2 associate squadron.

In MT, at Great Falls IAP (to lose aircraft/mission and 105 personnel but remain open), the ANG 120th FW w/F-16/30s would gain 4 from Terre Haute and relocate to nearby Malmstrom AFB (10 miles) following the renovation of the runway and aircraft parking ramp to support aircraft operations again. This move would allow the **Great Falls IAP ANGB to be closed.** At Malmstrom AFB (not listed), the 4-Bay ADA Facility would be renovated for use by the 120th. This 1st AF assigned unit currently does not have an ADA Commitment. The ADA Facility at McChord AFB, WA would be reactivated and manned by the 120th FW. Under Option 7: this unit would transfer 12 F-16s to 27th FW, 8 to Kelly Field and gain 20 F-15Es (and transfer to 12th AF). At which time the McChord ADA commitment would pass to the WA ANG. The 341st SW would gain two squadrons of Global Hawks with 32 UAVs and become the 341st WG until the 91st SW relocates from Minot, then the 341st would become the 341st RW under 8th AF/ACC. The 125th FW would either transfer its aircraft to BAI and become a Global Hawk associate unit or form an associate RS (with 18-24 crews). Malmstrom AFB would begin the construction of 50 additional "silos" along the eastern edge of the Rocky Mountains; these silos would be built over a ten year period. This would allow the 91st SW and the remaining 50 ICBMs to relocate from Minot.

In NE, at Lincoln IAP ANGB (not listed), the ANG 155th ARW w/KC-135Rs would transfer 8 to McGhee Tyson, relocate to Offutt AFB (75 miles) and become an associate WG to the 55th WG. This move would allow the **Lincoln IAP ANGB to be closed or realigned, transferred to the NE ArNG.** At Offutt AFB (to lose 100 personnel), the 55th WG would gain 4 KC-135Ds from Topeka for use as training aircraft and for possible conversion to RJ configuration.

In NV, at Reno-Tahoe IAP (to lose aircraft/mission and 145 personnel but remain open), the ANG 152nd AW would swap its 8 C-130H2s with Pt Mugu for 4 C-130J-30s and relocate to the nearby Reno-Stead AP (15 miles), next to the ArNG aviation unit based there. This move to Reno-Stead AP would require funding for construction of new facilities (Ops & MXs buildings, Hangers, aircraft parking ramp and new taxiways) and would allow the **Reno-Tahoe IAP ANGB to be closed.** The 152nd would gain 4 C-130J-30s in FY-08 and 4 more in FY-11. NAS Fallon (to lose 5 personnel) would gain the EA-6B Wing from NAS Whidbey Is, WA. The Hawthorne Army Depot (to be closed) would be transferred to a Joint-Service logistics/munitions unit and become the primary Western US ordinance storage location for the DOD. Reasons listed in CA section above. The ANG Aerial Port Flight at Reno-Stead would "deploy" to NAS Fallon, as required, to handle air shipments; the ArNG would form/place a transportation-support unit at Fallon (or Reno) to move cargo from Hawthorne to Fallon and Nellis. At Nellis AFB (to gain aircraft and 1400 personnel), the 57th WG would transfer 5 F-16/52s to Cannon AFB. The 57th WG would reform the Weapons Squadrons from the current "blind man throwing darts" randomness to the 306th thru the 313th WPS; all of these squadrons have flown F-4s and/or F-16s. The 53rd WG/422nd TES would be joined by the 421st TES (currently w/F-16s at Hill) to assist with the OT&E mission.

In NH, at Pease ANGB (to gain aircraft and 50 personnel), the ANG 157th ARW w/KC-135Rs would gain 2 KC-135Rs from March ANGB and 2 under Option 10.

In NJ, at McGuire AFB (ANG to lose aircraft/mission, Base to gain aircraft and 535 personnel), the ANG 108th ARW w/KC-135Es would transfer 12 to the UT ANG and 4 to the ME ANG. Under Option 4: the co-located 305th AMW would transfer 15 KC-10As to the 108th ARW, 12 KC-10As would go to the NC ANG and 12 C-17A to the co-located AFRC 514th AMW. The 514th would gain a second squadron of C-17As and then the 514th would reform under the ANG 108th AMW. The 108th would have two squadrons, the 141st and the 150th ARS with 15 KC-10s and two squadrons, the 207th and the 209th (previously the AFRC 707th and 709th AS) with 20 C-17s. The 108th WG would fall under "Total Force Manning Concept". At Atlantic City IAP (to gain aircraft and 275 personnel), the ANG 177th FW w/F-16/25s would gain 5 from Duluth and relocate to McGuire AFB (50 miles). This move would allow for the **Atlantic City IAP ANGB to be closed.** The ADA Facility would remain; this facility is separate from the ANGB and will remain in use after the ANGB is closed. The 177th would transfer 20 F-16/25s to DM-AMARC, gain 40+

F-16/40s from Hill and form a second FS. After gaining the F-16/40s the 177th FW would transfer to 9th AF and the 1st AF ADA Commitment would go to the VT ANG.

In NM, at Cannon AFB (to be closed), the 27th FW w/F-16/30/40/50s would swap 20+ F-16/50s with McEntire for 15+ F-16/52s and gain 20+ F-16/52s from Mountain Home and 3-5 from Nellis. Cannon would transfer 21 F-16/40s to Hill and 20 F-16/30s to the Fargo, ND ANG. The 27th FW would gain 36 F-16/30s from Hill (15) and Kunsan (21) and two squadrons from Luke, the 425th FS (RSAF) w/F-16/42/52s and the "new" 431st FS (RoCAF, the former 21st FS) w/F-16/20s. The "new" 405th FW (previously at Luke) would form to oversee these F-16 squadrons; they would be joined by the 428th FS (RSAF) w/F-16/52s and the "new" 429th & 430th FS (USAF) with 40+ F-16/52s from the 27th FW. The 405th would have an OG & an MXG, and would use Cannon's support assets (MG & MSG). The 27th FW with three FS and 36 F-16/30s would relocate to Dyess AFB to replace the departing 7th BW (Option 12). When the 27th FW (OG & MXG) relocates, the MG & MSG would be transferred to the 405th FW. This option would also allow additional overseas F-16 operators to form temporary or permanent training units at Cannon.

Under Option 8: Cannon would transfer its F-16/52 to the AZ ANG at Tucson (30) and Nellis (10) while gaining 40+ F-16Gs. At Kirtland AFB (to gain aircraft and 200 personnel), the ANG 150th FW w/F-16/30s would transfer 4 to Duluth and 4 to Burlington and combine with the 58th SOW to perform the Special Ops Training mission. The 150th SOW would form the 150th Test Group to support the DSE mission with 9 F-16/30s and 3 C-21As. The Test Group would fall under the ANG Test Center at Tucson, AZ. The 150th TG would gain F-16/50s when they become available. Kirtland would gain the AF Flight Standard Agency from Andrews, the Advanced Instrument School from Randolph and the Global Air Traffic Operations Program Office from Tinker. This would co-locate these agencies with the AF Safety Center and the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center at Kirtland. The AFFSA C-21s would be "attached" to the 150th TG. At Holloman AFB (to lose 15 personnel), the current ADA site would be renovated and enlarged to a 4-Bay Facility. It would be manned by the 301st FW & VMFA-112, both based at Carswell. The German Air Force Tornado Training Unit at Holloman would be designated as the 479th FG (previously at Holloman with AT-38s) with two squadrons, the 20th and 21st FS

In NY, at Niagara Falls IAP ANGB (to be closed), the ANG 107th ARW w/KC-135Rs and the AFRC 914th AW w/C-130H3s, the 914th would transfer 4 H3s to Pope, its personnel, equipment and 4 H3s would join the co-located 107th ARW and the 914th AW would be inactivated. The 107th would transfer 8 KC-135Rs to Sioux City, IA then reform as the 107th AG, gain 2 C-130Ts from NAS Brunswick, 2 (ex-USMC-R) KC-130T-30 and the personnel and equipment of the 914th. At Schenectady County AP-Stratton ANGB (not listed), the ANG 109th AW with LC/C-130H2/3s would transfer 4 C-130H2s to Dobbins and relocate its personnel, equipment and 4 LC-130Hs to Niagara Falls IAP (290 miles) and "gain" the 107th. The "new" 109th AW would have two squadrons, the 136th and the 139th (from Stratton) with 4 C-130H3s, 4+ LC-130H2/3s, 2 C-130Ts and 2 KC-130T-30s. This move would do three things: first, consolidates these two C-130 units together. Second, allows a larger unit to perform the LC-130 mission. And third, allows the **Stratton ANGB to be closed**. The 109th would gain 6 additional C-130H3s as they became available. During FY-18/19, this unit would retire its various H models and convert to 12 LC-130Js, 4 Js and 4 (K)C-130Js. The (K)C-130s would not have the wing A/R Pods fitted and be used for transporting fuel for Op Deep Freeze. At Stewart ANGB (not listed), under Option 4: the ANG 105th AW w/C-5s would gain 8 C-5s from Dover. Under Option 3 (Joint Operations): the USMC-R VMGR-452 would transfer 8 KC-130Ts to Willow Grove and 4 to Youngstown-Warren RAP, then merge with the co-located ANG 105th AW and convert to the C-5. Some of the USMC C-130 personnel transfer to the ANG C-130 units at Willow Grove (150 miles) or at Otis ANGB, MA (250 miles). The 105th AW would have two squadrons, the 137th and the 452nd AS with 20 C-5s. At Syracuse IAP (not listed), the ANG 174th FW w/F-16/30s would transfer 8 F-16s to Carswell, 8 to Homestead and gain 24 F-16/40s from Hill.

In NC, at Charlotte/Douglas IAP (to gain aircraft and 5 personnel), the ANG 145th AW w/C-130H3s would relocate its personnel, equipment and 8 C-130s to Pope AFB (150 miles), at Pope, the 145th would transfer its 8 H3s to the 43rd AW and become an associate AG. This move would allow the **Charlotte/Douglas IAP ANGB to be closed**. At Pope AFB (to realign, Pope AFB to US Army, AD to lose 25 C-130s & 36 A-10s and 6400 personnel, AFRC/AD to gain 16 C-130s and 2300 personnel), the 43rd AW w/C-130Es would gain 30 C-130H3s from NC (8), HI (8),

CO (8), NY (4) and IL (2) allowing the 41st AS to replace their C-130Es with 15 C-130H3s and the 2nd AS to replace their C-130Es with 15 H3s and transfer all assigned C-130Es to Little Rock. The 43rd would gain 8-10 additional H3s as they become available. The co-located 23rd FG would remain with two squadrons, the 74th and 75th FS and 40+ A-10A/Cs. The 43rd AW would gain 36 C-130Js during FY-17. At MCAS Cherry Point (to lose 630 personnel), under Option 3 (Joint Operations): VMGR-252 with KC-130F/R/Js and VMGR-253 with KC-130Fs would transfer to the NC ANG and reform as the 107th AW of two squadrons, the 252nd and the 253rd AS, The "new" 107th AW would continue converting to KC-130Js but would adjust to 16 C-130Js and 8 KC-130Js. The KC-130Fs would be retired, the KC-130Rs would be transferred to other units. The 107th AW would form a BSG with the USMC. At Seymour-Johnson AFB (AFRC to gain aircraft and 360 personnel), under Option 4: the AFRC 916th ARW w/KC-135Rs would transfer 8 to MacDill and gain 15 KC-10s from McGuire (12) and Travis (3), The 916th would reform under the NC ANG as the 145th WG/916th ARG with two squadrons, the 77th and the 78th ARS (from McGuire). This unit would fall under the "Total Force Manning Concept".

In ND, at Grand Forks AFB (to lose aircraft/mission and 2600 personnel but remain open), the 319th ARW w/KC-135Rs would transfer 48 KC-135Rs to other units. Under Option 4: two squadrons of KC-135Rs would move to Travis AFB and two squadrons would move to Dover AFB. This would allow **Grand Forks AFB to be closed**. At Minot AFB (not listed), the 5th BW w/B-52Hs would be relocated to Fairchild AFB, WA. The 91st SW with Minuteman 3s would transfer 50 ICBMs to FE Warren AFB, WY to replace the "Peacekeeper" ICBMs that are being removed from service. 50 more ICBMs would relocate to Malmstrom AFB at a date TBD and the remaining 50 would relocate to FE Warren AFB or be placed into storage as WRM assets. This would allow **Minot AFB to be closed**. Minot AFB would be the only base that would remain open beyond the BRAC 7 year limit, due to the time required to relocate the ICBM force. At Hector Field, Fargo (to lose aircraft/mission but remain open), the ANG 119th FW w/F-16/15s would transfer its F-16/15s to DM-AMARC and gain 20 F-16/30s from Cannon. The 119th would maintain the ADA commitment at Langley until replaced by the VA ANG at which time they would gain the ADA commitment at Travis. Under Option 6: the 119th FW would transfer its F-16/30s to Carswell and gain 20 F-15C/Ds from Elmendorf.

In OH, at Springfield-Beckley MAP/ANGB (to lose aircraft/mission and 290 personnel but remain open), the ANG 178th FW w/F-16/30s would transfer 12 F-16s to the 27th FW, 4 to Sioux Falls and relocate to nearby Wright Patterson AFB (10 miles) and join the AFRC 445th AW. This would allow **the S-B MAP ANGB to be closed**. At Wright Patterson AFB (to gain 420 personnel and 75 contractors), the AFRC 445th AW with C-141Cs would gain the personnel and equipment from the 178th FW. The 445th would be re-designated as a WG when it gains the "new" 178th FG. The 445th WG would convert to the C-17 with two squadrons, the 356th and the 357th (previously an AFRC C-130 unit at Maxwell) and 20 C-17As. 178th FG would gain the 89th AS, re-designated as the 89th FS (this unit flew F-4s & F-16s at WP until converting to C-141s) this unit could begin flying the MiG-29s that were purchased several years ago (or this unit could gain F-5s or F-16s for the aggressor mission). This unit would be dual-tasked as both an Aggressor unit and as an OT&E unit. Basing this unit at WP allows them to work closely with some of "the folks" who call WP home. This unit would start out with a small number of MiG-29s (about 8-10) but should grow over the next few years. There are several hundred MiG-29s out there, some of our friends have them and so getting spare parts should not be a big problem. The 178th could also form a squadron w/Su-27s at a later date. At Rickenbacker ANGB (to gain 1 person), the ANG 121st ARW w/KC-135Rs would grow to 20 under Option 10. At Mansfield Lahm MAP/ANGB (to be closed), 179th AW w/C-130H2s would transfer 4 to St Joseph, MO and 4 to Maxwell, its personnel and equipment would relocate to Youngstown-Warren RAP (120 miles) joining to AFRC 910th AW. This would allow **the Mansfield Lahm MAP ANGB to be closed**. At Youngstown RAP (to gain 8 personnel), the 910th AW would gain 4 KC-130Ts from the VMGR-452 and 4 from the VMGR-234 and reform with two "new" squadrons with 16 C-130H2s and 8 KC-130Ts. This unit would convert to 16 Js & 8 KC-Js during FY-14/15. At Toledo Express AP (to gain aircraft and 125 personnel), the ANG 180th FW would gain 3-5 F-16/42s from Luke AFB. The 180th FW would form an AIW with the 121st ARW.

In OK, at Altus AFB (to lose 15 personnel), under Option 5: the 97th AMW with C-17s and KC-135Rs would transfer 10 KC-135Rs and the tanker schoolhouse to the MS ANG at the "new"

Meridian ANGB. 12 KC-135Rs would transfer to Anderson AFB, Guam and join the 36th WG. The C-17 squadron and the C-17 schoolhouse would relocate to March ANGB, CA and join the 163rd AG of the CA ANG. The C-5 schoolhouse is already moving to Kelly Field, TX. These changes would allow **Altus AFB to be realigned into a Combat Readiness Training Center.** At Will Rogers WAP, OKC (to lose aircraft/mission but remain open), the ANG 137th AW with C-130H2s would transfer 8 aircraft to Little Rock and relocate to nearby Tinker AFB (12 miles) and join the KC-135R unit. This move would allow **the Will Rogers WAP ANGB to be closed.** At Tinker AFB (AFRC to gain aircraft and 350 personnel), the AFRC 507th ARW with KC-135Rs would combine with the re-locating ANG personnel to form the NANG 137th WG. The 137th WG would form the 507th ARG with 2 squadrons, the 185th and 465th ARS and 20 aircraft and the 137th OG to oversee the 970th AACS and the 971st ACCS (an NANG associate unit to the USN Strategic Communications Wing One at Tinker). At Tulsa IAP (to gain aircraft and 100 personnel), the ANG 138th FW would gain 5 F-16/42s from Luke AFB. This unit would team up with the ARG at Tinker and form an AIW.

In OR, at Portland IAP ANGB (to lose aircraft/mission but remain open, AFRC to lose aircraft/mission, total loss of 560 personnel), the ANG 142nd FW w/F-15A/Bs would gain the co-located AFRC 939th ARW w/KC-135Rs and form the NANG 142nd WG. The 939th ARG would gain 4 KC-135Rs from Beale. Under Option 7: the 142nd FG would transfer 20 F-15s to McChord and gain 20 F-15Es. This unit would form an AIW with F-15A/Bs or Es and KC-135Rs. Portland would also see the activation of the 563rd RQG OL-B with 3 HC-130s and 5 HH-60s. The ADA Commitment would relocate to McChord when the WA ANG re-activates the 318th FS. At Klamath Falls IAP ANGB (not listed), the ANG 173rd FW w/F-15s would gain 9 F-15C/Ds from Eglin & Tyndall to support its training mission, under Option 7: the 173rd FW would also gain 12 F-15Es for the training mission. The 4-Bay ADA Facility would be placed in active status and the 173rd would gain a 1st AF tasked ADA Commitment. The Umatilla Army Depot (to be closed) would be transferred to a Joint-Service logistics/munitions unit and become the secondary Western US ordinance storage location for the services. Reasons listed in CA section above.

In PA, at Pittsburgh IAP ANGB & ARB (ANGB not listed, ARB to be closed), the ANG 171st ARW would remain with two squadrons and 20 KC-135Rs, while the co-located AFRC 911th AW with C-130H2s would be split up, some personnel and equipment join the co-located 171st ARW, the 8 C-130H2s would go to the USN-R at Willow Grove, some personnel and equipment would relocate to Youngstown-Warren RAP, OH (80 miles) and the remaining personnel, equipment would go to Harrisburg IAP (175 miles). This would allow the 911th AW to be inactivated and **the Pittsburgh IAP ARB to be closed.** At Harrisburg IAP (not listed), the ANG 193rd SOW would activate an AS with 4 C-130Js from Little Rock for the Senior Hunter mission and SOW support, this squadron would gain 6 additional Js in FY-11. The 193rd would not have KC-130s. At NAS Willow Grove (to be closed), The ANG A-10s would relocate to Martin St AP (110 miles) and join the MD ANG. The "new" 111th Airlift Wing (former A-10 FW) would gain the co-located 913th AW with 8 C-130Es, the relocating DE ANG AW with 8 C-130H2s, the relocating MD ANG AG with 8 C-130Js and 8 KC-130Ts from (NY based) VMRG-452. During this time, VR-64 would transfer its 2 C-130Ts to Pt Mugu and gain 4 C-130H2s from the AFRC 911th AW, USN-R VR-52 would retire its C-9s and transfer its personnel and equipment to VR-64. VP-66 would transfer its P-3 to New Orleans and reform as VR-66 with 4 C-130H2s from the 911th. Under Option 3 (Joint Operations): the two USN-R C-130 units at Willow Grove (w/8 C-130H2s) would join the NANG C-130 units forming the 111th AW. The 111th would form two "new" AGs, the 135th AG (previously the MD ANG C-130s) with 16 C-130H2s and 8 KC-130Ts in two squadrons, the 264th and the 266th AS (reformed USN-R VR squadrons), and the 166th AG (previously the DE ANG C-130s) with 8 C-130Es, 8 C-130Js in two squadrons, the 327th and the 328th (from Niagara Falls) AS. The 166th AG would replace the 8 Es with 8 Js and 4 KC-130Js, after Cherry Point & Selfridge complete their conversion to C/KC-130Js and gain additional 4 KC-130Js in FY-08/09. The 135th AG would form a BSG with the MD ANG A-10 FW. The 166th AG would form a BSG with the MA ANG A-10 FG. The 111th AW would be a true Joint Forces unit. The 135th would transfer its C-130H2s and 4 KC-130Ts to Ramstein and 4 KC-130Ts to Yokota and convert to C/KC-130Js in FY-11/12.

In PR, at Luiz Munoz Marin IAP/Muniz ANGB (not listed), the ANG 156th AW w/C-130Es would move to NS Roosevelt Roads (35 miles). At CGAS Borinquen (not listed), at Rafael Hernandez

AP, the HU-25s and HH-65s would re-locate to NS Roosevelt Roads. These moves would allow both the **Muniz ANGB** and **CGAS Borinquen to be closed**. At NS Roosevelt Roads (current status unknown), the USN would gain a squadron of 9 P-3Cs transferred from NAS Jacksonville, FL. Counter-Drug operations (Coronet Oak & Coronet Nighthawk) at various locations in the Eastern Caribbean Basin would relocate to NS Roosevelt Roads (certain counter-drug operations will not be able to relocate). A permanent detachment of three E-2C aircraft would also be based here, manned by both TDY and permanently assigned personnel. In FY-09, the 156th WG would retire its C-130Es and convert to 8 C-130Js and 4 KC-130Js. The 156th would gain a squadron of Predators in FY-12. *I am unsure of the current status of NS Roosevelt Roads; if it is now closed please disregard the relocation options for Puerto Rico. I knew that the USN was drawing down NSRR but do not know if it has been closed. If the USN has allowed NSRR to close, this was a short-sighted and unwise decision. NSRR is/was the only US Military Base south of the CONUS on US Territory.*

In RI, at Quonset State AP ANGB (to gain aircraft and 45 personnel), the ANG 143rd AW w/C-130J-30s would relocate to Otis ANGB, MA (90 miles) and gain 4 J-30s from CA. This would allow the co-located ArNG 1-126th AVN (LUHB) and A/1-126th AVN (LUH) w/UH-1Hs to move into the current ANG facilities. C/1-126th AVN (LUH) with UH-1Hs would join its parent unit moving from Otis ANGB, MA. This would allow the **Quonset State AP ANGB to be realigned: transferred to the NE ArNG**.

In SC, at McEntire ANGB (to gain aircraft and 425 personnel), the ANG 169th FW w/F-16/52s would swap its 15 F-16/52s with the 27th FW for 21 F-16/50s. The 169th FW would then transfer its aircraft in place to the 20th FW and become an "associate" unit. At Shaw AFB (to gain 815 personnel), the 20th FW would gain 40+ F-16/50s from Misawa AB, Japan. These two bases would merge to form "Shaw-McEntire AFB". The 20th FW would become a "super wing" with Shaw having three FS, the 78th, 79th & 80th with 60+ F-16/50s and McEntire having two FS, the 76th & 77th with 40+ F-16/50s and the co-located ArNG 1-151st AVN (ATKHB) w/AH-64s. The 169th would gain the 1st AF ADA Commitment at Charleston AFB. Shaw would gain up to four squadrons of USN F-18s from NAS Oceana under an Option 3 Joint Basing Agreement. Shaw-McEntire would convert to the JSF after Hill AFB. Shaw-McEntire would transfer its 90+ F-16/50s to Homestead (40+), Burlington (20+), Duluth (20+) and remaining aircraft to BAI. At Charleston AFB (not listed), the 4-Bay ADA Facility would be renovated and turned over to the 169th FW.

In SD, at Joe Foss Field, Sioux Falls (to gain aircraft and 55 personnel), the ANG 114th FW w/F-16/30s would gain 4 from Springfield, OH. Under Option 7: this unit would transfer 12 F-16s to Carswell, 8 to Homestead and gain 20 F-15Es. At Ellsworth AFB (to be closed), the 28th BW would gain the B-1 training mission from Dyess AFB, TX. The 28th BW would then have three squadrons (two operational & one training squadron) with 36 B-1B assigned. Under Option 12: Ellsworth AFB would gain two squadrons of KC-135Rs from McConnell AFB, KS. These co-located units would then form two GPG.

In TN, at Memphis IAP (to gain 8 personnel), the 164th AW with C-5s would move to NSA Mid-South (formerly NAS Memphis). An ANG Logistic Wing would be formed to operate the "new" Mobility Air Forces Logistic Support Center or "The Memphis Defense Logistics Center" using the 164th current facilities. If the LSC were to need additional space, it would be located at NSA Mid-South (about 25 miles to the north). Relocating the C-5 operation to NSA Mid-South will require a major construction project, the 8,000 ft runway would need to be lengthened to at least 10,000 ft, an aircraft parking ramp for 10-12 C-5s, two-three hangers and OPs and MXs facilities would need to be built. Amazingly, funding for 3 new hangers, support facilities, a new ramp, taxiway and refueling system (to be completed by Dec 08) was provided for at Memphis IAP. NSA Mid-South (to gain 1000 personnel), the base would gain the ANG C-5 flying operation and any LSC assets that could not be housed at the MDLC. NSA Mid-South would become Memphis ANGB. At Nashville IAP (to lose aircraft/mission and 190 personnel but remain open), the ANG 118th AW w/C-130H2s based would transfer 4 H2s to Dobbins and relocate its personnel, equipment and 4 H2s to Campbell AAF, Ft Campbell, KY (60 miles) joining the KY ANG. This would allow for the **Nashville IAP ANGB to be closed**. At McGhee Tyson ANGB, Knoxville (to gain aircraft and 240 personnel), the ANG 134th ARW would transfer 8 KC-135Es to Bangor and gain 12 KC-135Rs from Lincoln (8), Grand Forks (2) and 2 under Option 10.

In TX, at NAS Fort Worth (NAS to gain 310 personnel, ANG to gain aircraft, AFRC to gain aircraft and total gain of 110 personnel), (the old Carswell AFB) the AFRC 301st FW w/F-16/30s at Carswell ANGB would act as drop off point for all F-16/30 en-route to DM-AMARC. The 301st would gain the ADA Commitment at Holloman AFB, dual-tasked by 1st AF (shared with the co-located USMC-R VMFA-112). Under Option 8: the 301st would retire its F-16/30s and gain 40 F-16Gs and the Holloman ADA Commitment would pass full-time to VMFA-112. The ANG 136th AW w/C-130H2s would gain 8 H2s from the OK ANG. Under Option 3 (Joint Operations): the USN-R VR-59 would transfer its 3-4 C-40As to the FL ANG, its personnel and equipment would join the 136th AW and VR-59 would be inactivated. The co-located USMC-R VMGR-234 would transfer 4 KC-130T Youngstown-Warren RAP, OH and then join the 136th with 8 KC-130T to form the "new" 136th AW of two squadrons, the 181st AS and the 234th AS with 16 C-130H2s and 8 KC-130Ts. This unit would transfer/retire its H2s and transfer its 8 KC-130Ts to the new TX ANG unit at Biggs AAF and convert to 16 Js & 8 KC-Js during FY-14/15. This unit would form a BSG "attached" to the 27th FW at Dyess. The USMC-R VMFA-112 would retire its F-18As and gain 21 F-18C/Ds from NAS Lemoore. This unit would be dual-tasked to the USMC with 12 F-18s and to 1st AF/NORAD with 9 F-18s to man the ADA Commitment at Holloman. At Kelly Field, Lackland AFB (to realign), the ANG 149th FW w/F-16/30s would gain 16 from Buckley (8) and Great Falls (8) and form a second squadron. The AFRC 433rd AW with C-5s is gaining the C-5 schoolhouse and additional C-5s, the "new" 433rd would have two squadrons with 20 aircraft, under the TX ANG. These two units would continue the F-16 and the C-5 training mission for 19th AF/AETC. The 149th would retire its F-16/30s and gain 40+ F-16/40s from Hill when that unit converts to the JSF. The DOD Proposal to relocate the STAMP function to the KS ANG at McConnell AFB is unwise. The Munitions Storage Area at McConnell is too small to effectively support this mission. Kelly Field is 10 miles from the Lackland Annex Munitions Storage Area and has a C-5 unit assigned. Relocating this function to McConnell will require overland shipments to travel 600 miles from San Antonio to the airhead at McConnell (and ship explosive thru at least 3 major population centers). If this function is to be relocated, it should go to Hill AFB, UT. The Hill AFB Munitions Storage Area is one of the largest in the USAF. At Brooks City Base (to be closed -2500 personnel), relocate assigned units as proposed and allow **Brooks City Base to be closed**. Dyess AFB (to gain aircraft and 375 personnel) would see many changes. Under Option 12: the 7th BW with B-1s would relocate to McConnell AFB and the B-1 schoolhouse would move to Ellsworth AFB. The 317th AG with C-130Hs would transfer 16 C-130Hs to Peterson AFB and relocate to Little Rock AFB with 16 C-130Hs. Then, the 27th FW with three squadrons and 36+ F-16/30s would relocate from Cannon AFB, NM. They would be joined by 72+ F-16/30s from Great Falls (12), Montgomery (12), Springfield, IL (12), Terre Haute (12), Selfridge (12) and Springfield, OH (12) to form the "new" 27th FW. The 27th would be a "super wing" having six FS, the 522nd, 523rd, 524th, 525th (previously w/F-15s at Bitburg), 526th (previously w/F-16s at Ramstein) and the 527th (previously an F-5/F-16 aggressor sq) with 120+ F-16/30s. This WG would be divided to form three BSG; each with two F-16 squadrons and the C/KC-130s from Carswell, Keesler and Biggs. (The Keesler unit will not have KC-130s until after FY-12 and the Biggs unit will not be formed until FY-11/12. Each BSG would be teamed up with an Army unit at Ft Hood or Ft Bliss, TX. At Dyess, the 27th FW would become the first USAF JSF Wing (w/ 6 FS and 120+ F-35s). At Ellington Field (to lose aircraft/mission but remain open), the ANG 147th FW would transfer 15 F-16/25s to the Tucson and convert to 20 F-15A/Bs from New Orleans. The 147th FW would continue its home station ADA Commitment. The current ADA facility would be renovated and enlarged to a 4-Bay Facility. At Goodfellow AFB (not listed), the 17th TW would begin a phased, 10 year plan for gaining the AETC Technical Training Center from Keesler AFB, MS. This will require funding for construction of new facilities. Additionally, at Biggs AAF, Ft Bliss (Ft Bliss to gain 11500 personnel), the TX ANG would activate the 147th RG with two squadrons and 32 Predators and during FY-11/12; the 136th AW would form an AG with two squadrons and 16 C-130Hs & 8 KC-130s. This unit would form a BSG with 2 F-16 squadrons at Dyess and "team-up" with Army maneuver units at Ft Bliss and convert to C/KC-130Js, during FY-20/21. At Hondo MAP (not listed), during FY- 09/10, the TX ANG would activate the 149th RG with two squadrons and 32 Predator UAVs.

In UT, at Hill AFB (AFRC to lose aircraft, Base to lose 140 personnel), the AFRC 419th FW with F-16/30s would transfer 15 to the co-located 388th FW, and become an "associate" FG. The

388th would gain 21 F-16/40s from Cannon and transfer 15 F-16/30s to Cannon. The 388th would reform with four FS, the 34th, 43rd, 90th & the re-activated 16th FS (previously F-16s at Hill). A 4-Bay ADA Facility would be built at Hill either on the former SAC alert ramp or opposite from there across the runway. The 419th FG would gain the 1st AF tasked Hill ADA commitment. The 388th would convert to the JSF after the 27th FW. Hill's 80+ F-16/40 would go to Kelly Field (40) and McGuire (40). At Salt Lake City IAP ANGB (not listed), the ANG 151st ARW with KC-135Es would move to Hill AFB (30 miles) and become the 151st WG. This would allow **the SLC IAP ANGB to be closed**. Under Option 10: the 151st would gain 12 KC-135Es from McGuire; the 151st would have 20 KC-135Es until they are modified into KC-135Rs. Under Option 4, this unit would convert to KC-10s with aircraft from Travis.

In VT, at Ethan Allen ANGB, Burlington (to gain aircraft and 55 personnel), the ANG 158th FW with F-16/25s would transfer 15 to Luke and gain 20 F-16/30s from Richmond (16) and Kirtland (4). The 158th is currently assigned to 1st AF but does not have an ADA Commitment; this unit would gain the Atlantic City ADA Commitment from the NJ ANG. The 158th would retire its F-16/30s and gain 20+ F-16/50s from Shaw when that unit converts to the JSF.

In VA, at CGAS Washington (not listed), at Reagan National AP, the USCG aviation unit would relocate to Andrews AFB. This will allow **CGAS Washington to be closed**. At Richmond IAP (to lose aircraft/mission but remain open), the ANG 192nd FW w/F-16/30s would transfer 16 to Burlington and move its personnel and equipment to Langley (90 miles) and become an F-22 associate unit. This move would allow **the Richmond IAP ANGB to be closed**. At Langley AFB (to gain aircraft and 750 personnel), the 1st FW would gain the relocating ANG 192nd FW as an associate unit. Under Option 6: the 1st FW would gain a forth F-22 squadron the 48th FS (previously F-15A/Bs, at Langley). With Langley converting to the F-22s, the F-15s would go to Anderson AFB, Guam (1 squadron) and various ANG F-15 units (the remainder). The 192nd FG would gain the 1st AF tasked the Langley ADA commitment from the ND ANG. At Norfolk NS (NS Norfolk to gain 2800 personnel), under Option 3 (Joint Operations): the USN-R VR-56 would retire 4 C-9s, gain 8 C-40As and reform as the 256th FSS of the VA ANG 192nd AG.

In WA, at Fairchild AFB (ANG unit to lose aircraft and 195 personnel), the ANG 141st ARW w/KC-135Rs would transfer its aircraft to the co-located 92nd ARW and become an "associate" unit. The 92nd ARW would have 4 flying squadrons and 60 KC-135R/Ts. Under Option 12: Fairchild would gain the 5th BW with B-52Hs from Minot and a squadron of B-52Hs from Barksdale. The 92nd ARW would transfer 2 squadrons of KC-135Rs to Barksdale and become the 92nd WG. The 92nd WG would then form two GPG. The 141st ARW would become a WG and activate a B-52 associate squadron. At Spokane IAP ArNG facility (not listed – I am unsure of the current status of this facility), the ArNG unit would relocate to Fairchild AFB and allow **the Spokane IAP ArNG site to be closed**. At NAS Whidbey Island (to gain 135 personnel), two squadrons of P-3Cs, each with 9 aircraft would relocate, one squadron would go to Elmendorf AFB, AK (to cover the Northern Pacific and Artic) and the other would go to Kadena AB, Okinawa (to cover the Western Pacific), the remaining two squadrons each with 12 aircraft would relocate with one going to March ANGB, CA and the other, along with the USN-R P-3 squadron would relocate to McChord AFB (130 miles). The USN EA-6B Prowler Wing would relocate to NAS Fallon, NV. Under Option 3: The USN-R VR-61 with C-9s would retire its aircraft, gain 8 C-40As, move to McChord AFB and reform as the 261st FSS of the WA ANG. These moves would allow **NAS Whidbey Island to be closed**. At McChord AFB (to lose 550 personnel), under Option 3 (Joint Basing): the USN would relocate two VP squadrons (one USN & one USN-R) with 20 P-3Cs from NAS Whidbey Is. Under Option 7, the WA ANG would re-activate the 318th FS with 21 F-15s from Portland. The 318th would gain the 1st AF ADA Commitment at McChord. The ADA and squadron facilities for this unit are already in place at McChord. End strength at McChord would be the USAF: w/48+ C-17As in 4 AD & 2 associate squadrons, WA ANG: 20 F-15C/Ds in 1 squadron, 8 C-40As in 1 squadron and USN/USN-R: 20 P-3s in 2 squadrons.

In WV, at Eastern WV RAP, Martinsburg (to gain 10 personnel), the ANG 167th AW w/C-130H3s is converting to C-5s. It would transfer 8 H3s to Minneapolis-St Paul. At Yeager AP, Charleston (to lose aircraft/mission and 155 personnel but remain open), the ANG 130th AW with C-130H2/3s would transfer 4 H3s to Cheyenne, WY and gain 8 H2s from Minneapolis-St Paul.

In WI, at Gen Mitchell IAP ANGB/ARB, Milwaukee (ANGB not listed, ARB to be closed), the AFRC 440th AW with C-130Hs would transfer 8 C-130Hs to Elmendorf, AK and gain 8 KC-135Rs

from Selfridge, MI and 4 KC-135Rs from Beale. This unit would then combine with the co-located (across the runway) ANG 128th ARW with KC-135Rs to form the "new" 128th ARW with two squadrons, the 95th and the 126th ARS and 20 KC-135Rs under the WI ANG. This will require funding for new construction, as neither of the current facilities is large enough to support this increase. After a new study and review, **one of the Milwaukee facilities would be closed.** At Dane County RAP, Madison (to gain aircraft and 55 personnel), the ANG 115th FW with F-16/30s would gain 4 from Selfridge. Under Option 8: this unit would retire its F-16/30s and gain 40 F-16Gs and form a second FS.

In WY, at FE Warren AFB (not listed), the 90th SW would replace its 50 MX missiles with Minuteman 3s transferred from Minot AFB, ND. With funding, 50 new ICBM silos would be built along the eastern edge of the Rocky Mountains. At Cheyenne RAP (to gain aircraft and 75 personnel), the 153rd AW with C-130H3s would gain 4 C-130H3s from Charleston, WV.

This list shows 60+ bases and facilities (4 AF Bases, 2 AF Stations, 1 AF Research Lab, 4 Naval Air Stations, 2 Naval Weapons Station, 1 Naval Base, 1 Army Depot, 9 USCG air stations, 2 CRTCs, 33 ANG/AFRC and 6 ArNG facilities) that can be realigned or closed while allowing the units to relocate, in many cases less than 50 miles to other bases. AD & USCG Bases to be Realigned or Closed: Altus AFB, (R: CRTC), Grand Forks AFB (C), Minot AFB (C), Brooks City Base (C), LA AFS (C), Onizuka AFS (C), Mesa City AF Lab (C), NAS Meridian (R: to ANG for KC-135 schoolhouse), NAS Whidbey Island (C), NAS Brunswick (C), NAS Patuxent River (C), NWS Seal Beach (C) NWS Concord (R: Downsize), NB Ventura County/Point Mugu-Channel Islands ANGB (C), Sierra Army Depot (C), CGAS Sacramento (C), CGAS San Francisco (C), CGAS Las Angeles (C), CGAS San Diego (C), CGAS Clearwater (C), CGAS Miami (C), CGAS Barbers Point (C), CGAS Borinquen (C), CGAS Washington (C), the Gulfport-Biloxi Combat Readiness Training Center (C), the Savannah Combat Readiness Training Center (C). Guard & Reserve facilities to be Realigned or Closed: Birmingham IAP ANGB (R: to AL ArNG), Bradley IAP ANGB (R: to CT ArNG), New Castle County AP ANGB (R: to DE ArNG), Quonset State AP ANGB (R: to RI ArNG), Montgomery RAP ANGB (C), Kulis ANGB (C), Phoenix-Sky Harbor ANGB (C), Ft Smith-Ebbing ANGB (C), Jacksonville IAP ANGB (C), Savannah IAP ANGB (C), Capital MAP, IL ANGB (C), Ft Wayne IAP ANGB (C), Topeka-Forbes Field ANGB (C), Barnes MAP ANGB (C), Lambert-St Louis IAP ANGB (C), Meridian RAP ANGB (C), Great Falls IAP ANGB (C), Lincoln IAP ANGB (C or R: to NE ArNG), Reno-Tahoe AIP ANGB (C), Atlantic City IAP ANGB (C), Stratton ANGB (C), Charlotte/Douglas IAP ANGB (C), Springfield-Beckley MAP ANGB (C), Mansfield Lahm MAP/ANGB (C), Will Rogers WAP ANGB (C), Pittsburgh IAP ARB (C), Muniz ANGB (C), Quonset State AP ANGB (R: merge with ArNG site), Nashville IAP ANGB (C), SLC IAP ANGB (C), Richmond IAP ANGB (C), Milwaukee IAP ANGB/ARB (1: C), Montgomery RAP ArNG facilities (C), Bradley IAP ArNG facilities (C), New Castle County AP ArNG facilities (C), Cecil Field ArNG facilities (C), Meridian RAP ArNG facilities (C) and Spokane IAP ArNG facilities (C).

*if you have ANY questions or need to contact me:
please call (561) 719-0446, this is my sister MARLA'S
cell phone. Please Ask her to contact IVAN & give
her a phone # that I can call. I currently live
in the UK.*

Thanks