



Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) verses per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than loosing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere...Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the


criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.



Sincerely,
Gary L. Foster Jr.
MSgt, USAF Retired



Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) versus per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than losing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere... Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the

criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.



Sincerely,

Gary L. Foster Jr.

MSgt, USAF Retired

 RECEIVED
06172005

Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) versus per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than losing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere... Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the


criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.



Sincerely,

Gary L. Foster Jr.

MSgt, USAF Retired

06172005

Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) verses per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than loosing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere...Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the


criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.



Sincerely,
Gary L. Foster Jr.
MSgt, USAF Retired



RECEIVED
06172005

Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) verses per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than loosing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere...Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the

criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.


Sincerely,
Gary L. Foster Jr.
MSgt, USAF Retired



RECEIVED
06172005

Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) verses per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than loosing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere... Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the

criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.



Sincerely,
Gary L. Foster Jr.
MSgt, USAF Retired

RECEIVED
06172005

Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) verses per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than loosing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere... Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the


criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.



Sincerely,
Gary L. Foster Jr.
MSgt, USAF Retired



Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) verses per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than loosing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere...Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the

criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.



Sincerely,
Gary L. Foster Jr.
MSgt, USAF Retired



Base Realignment and Closure Committee,

I am writing this letter in response to the recent decision to close Cannon AFB, NM. After the long anticipated release of base closures, I wasn't surprised to see Cannon on the BRAC list. I was however shocked to see it and Ellsworth as the only two operational Air Force bases selected for closure. After reading the BRAC report, I found it strange that more bases were not considered, especially in light of the criteria published by the BRAC for use as a guide to select bases for closure, of which Cannon does not fall within, but was still selected.

The BRAC report cites net worth as one of the reasons Cannon was selected over Hill AFB, Utah. Understanding that there are two commands assigned to Hill, as a base in its entirety, the non-selection may be justified. However, in the day and age of operations tempo, it is important to maintain war fighting capability with the ability to rapidly deploy anywhere in the world and maintain a realistic training environment free of potential safety hazards. In the past there were numerous airspace infractions at Hill AFB with the international airport and local community because of the wing's flying operations. There were also munitions storage concerns and limited space during munitions transportation operations. Aligning the fighter wing with similar model/design/series (MDS) bases increases personnel, equipment and parts availability and reduces supporting a single point of contact (3 fighter squadrons) verses per say a base with six or more fighter squadrons. It also gives the material command needed space for operations and the depot facilities the ability to expand in the future. Furthermore, the economic impact of losing the 388th FW would be far less significant to the Ogden/Salt Lake City area than loosing Cannon would be to Clovis. Not to mention the flying weather at Hill is not as good year round as at Cannon. With the inability to expand operational resources at Hill AFB, it seems to make more sense to realign the 388th FW elsewhere... Cannon would be a great choice!

As for Luke AFB, Arizona, it has been a target in past BRACs and rumored to have been a leading candidate during this round of base closures. It has been speculated that the consideration of Luke for closure and the fact that it remains to be left off the list is closely related to Senator John McCain's political clout and influence. In my opinion base closures shouldn't be a political issue as they most often are, but an issue of maintaining a strong military and doing what is right. Not what benefits those who have a personal interest. This is a decision that affects all Americans not just politicians. Regardless, there are other reasons why Luke should be a potential base for closure in lieu of Cannon, primarily from a safety perspective. With high performance aircraft, a mishap involving an F-16 upon departure or approach at Luke would have a potentially catastrophic outcome because of the increased population around the base as opposed to one in the Cannon area. Another consideration is how Phoenix would be affected by the closure of the base. In smaller communities, the reliance upon the military from an economical perspective is much greater than a city the size of Phoenix, as stated in the BRAC report. As for the retired population around most military installations, the smaller communities don't have the resources available to offset losing a military installation as those people in or near a major city or metropolitan area. So based on the

criteria published by the BRAC prior to the selection of bases for closure, Cannon should have not been considered ahead of Luke, yet alone selected for closure in its place.

In a time when the operations tempo because of the situations throughout the world requires the sacrifices of many military members and their families, it seems a shame to close any base that directly supports those operations, whether it be Cannon, Hill, Luke, or any other base. But of all bases considered for closure, Cannon should not be one of them.

I have used Hill and Luke as examples of why Cannon should be left open and others considered for closure, but the possibilities are much greater and the end result should be a stronger more capable military with a reduction in the amount of bases and a tax dollar savings to the country. Expanding Cannon and closing a different base makes much more sense.

What does Cannon have to offer that other bases not selected for closure don't? Well for one, I can say the Clovis community is the most supportive community of the military I have ever seen or heard of. As a retiree, having been stationed at nine different bases and having experienced previous base closures, I feel qualified to make that statement. Furthermore, Cannon has expansion potential in both already established space and future expansion, again supported by the community. Expansion and Growth at Cannon AFB will also not interfere with community activities or growth. It has great airspace training space and a bombing range. It is also in better proximity to other bombing ranges within the region than other bases, and if as expected the proposal/initiative to allow super sonic speed is accepted, Cannon will also have that at its disposal. There is also the issue of those affected by noise around highly populated areas in relation to those with less people. So Cannon has as much if not more to offer the military than other bases not selected for closure and the economic impact will be far greater to the Clovis community if Cannon is closed then to most other areas.

So in conclusion, taking into account, Cannon's assets, the criteria established by the BRAC for selecting bases for closure and finally the net worth of Cannon in comparison to other bases, it is very disturbing to see Cannon on the BRAC list. Please consider amending this decision and rightfully removing Cannon from the closure list.



Sincerely,
Gary L. Foster Jr.
MSgt, USAF Retired