

Library Printing SW 2005

Title of Item: Clearinghouse Q & A

Installation or Community: Gen Mitchell ARS

Source: DoD

Certified by: J

Analyst: J. CRUZ Received: _____

6 July 2005

Inquiry Response

Re: BI-0094 - MCI scores Gen Mitchell ARS

Requester: Mr. Ken Small (BRAC Commission)

Question:

Our reading of Vol V of the OSD Report to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission is:

On the MCI for the Airlift mission, Fort Wayne IAP AGS scored 42.32 and ranked 91; Gen. Mitchell AGS scored 41.98 ranked 95; and Gen. Mitchell ARS scored 33.77 and ranked 130.

On the MCI for the Fighter mission, the scores and rankings for these three installations were more closely aligned. Gen. Mitchell ARS scored 34.5 and ranked 129; Fort Wayne scored 34.49 and ranked 130; and Gen. Mitchell AGS scored 33.55 and ranked 135.

- 1.) Please explain what differentiated these three installations, particularly Gen. Mitchell AGS and ARS, given that they use the same runway, airspace, and range.
- 2.) Also, DoD is recommending that Fort Wayne gain aircraft from two higher ranked installations. According to the report (Vol I, Part 2 of 2, Air Force - 20), this action was justified given Fort Wayne's recruiting record. Please explain whether Gen. Mitchell ARS's recruiting record was also considered in your scenario analyses and provide the recruiting/retention statistics for each unit in the latest enumerated period.
- 3.) Originally (as of March 2005), Gen. Mitchell ARS was not considered for closure or realignment. Please describe what transpired to change this. What was the "MilVal correction" referred to in the April 19, 2005 BCEG minutes?

Answer 1:

The primary differentiating feature between General Mitchell ARS and General Mitchell AGS are the respective aircraft parking aprons. The data reported by the units shows the parking apron of General Mitchell AGS includes an in-ground hydrant refueling system and the apron at General Mitchell ARS does not. When the metrics of the Airlift MCI are applied, this has a significant effect. Also, the data indicate that the apron at General Mitchell AGS has a higher weight-bearing capacity than the apron at General Mitchell ARS. However, the weight-bearing capacity difference did not affect the MCI score because at both installations the reported apron square yardage was below the threshold to earn credit for apron within the airlift MCI metrics.

Fort Wayne is currently a fighter base. Therefore, there are many areas where scores are different between Fort Wayne and the two General Mitchell installations due to the current configuration of the installation for its current mission. For instance, Fort Wayne scores lower in "Ability to support large scale mobility deployment" and "Fuel dispensing rate" but scores higher in "Cost of operations/manpower" and "Geo-locational factors" (due to proximity to low-level routes and drop/landing zones). Differentiation between Fort Wayne and the other two installations occurs across the spectrum of criteria and attributes within the airlift MCI.

SAF/IEBB is currently investigating an anomaly in the runway data reported by General Mitchell ARS. Regardless of the resolution of this anomaly, General Mitchell ARS will still score lower than General Mitchell AGS due to the parking apron qualities mentioned above.

Answer 2:

Recruiting records were considered by the BCEG in preparing the BRAC recommendations. Data on historical manning levels was collected from the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve for the period of 1999 to 2003. Historical manning performance is a reflection of both recruiting and retention at reserve component installations. The manning data for the Air National Guard can be found in the Air Force data, section 20, question 1256. The manning data for the Air Force Reserve can be found in the Air Force data, section 25, question 1263. For convenience, an internet source of this data is at: http://www.dod.gov/brac/minutes/brac_databases.html

Answer 3:

Even though General Mitchell ARS and General Mitchell AGS use the same civilian airfield for their military flight operations, they are distinctly, and legally separate military installations. Therefore, each installation accomplished separate responses to the Air Force data calls and each installation received MCI scores and rankings for each MCI mission. During development of Power Point slides for use by the Base Closure Executive Group, the airlift MCI ranking for General Mitchell AGS was inadvertently shown on the slide as the ranking for General Mitchell ARS. The "MilVal correction" noted in the April 19th minutes denotes the action of showing the correct airlift MCI ranking for General Mitchell ARS. The BCEG was specifically briefed on this correction to the visual aids used during deliberative sessions.

Approved



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

8 August 2005

Inquiry Response

Re: BI-0199, CT-0831, Verify Data on Mitchell Field COBRA Run

Requester: Mr. Ken Small (BRAC Commission Staff)

Question:

Included in the payback section of the recommendation to close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station (p. AF-52 & AF-53 in Vol. 1 part 2 of 2) is the following statement: "The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$14 million." However, the COBRA data shows this amount to be a cost. Please verify.

Answer:

A review of the COBRA output for General Mitchell ARS indicates a net implementation cost of \$14 Million. The word "savings" in the report text is in error. The remainder of the General Mitchell ARS payback information in the report was checked against the COBRA output and is correct.

Approved


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

Library Routing Slip (24" B&C) New Materials

Title of Item: _____

Author: _____

Source: _____

_____ no _____

_____ received: _____

16 Aug 2005

Inquiry Response

Re: BI-0204 (CT-0837)

Requester: Ken Small, Air Force Team Leader, BRAC Commission R&A

Background: Thank you for your response to subject Tasker #0837C. In your response you stated that "Scenario S319 proposed moving only 4 PAA to General Mitchell ARS with the other 4 PAA recommended to move to Little Rock AFB. Therefore the end state at General Mitchell as proposed in S319 would be a total of 12PAA. No MilCon would be required to bed down 12 PAA at General Mitchell since 12 aircraft had been previously assigned there prior to recent force structure reductions."

However, a re-review of the BCEG minutes, scenario S319, shows that the candidate recommendation reads, "Close Mansfield Lahm Municipal Airport AGS. The 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) will inactivate. The wing's C-130H aircraft will be distributed to the 440th Airlift Wing (AFRC) General Mitchell ARS, Wisconsin (8 PAA) and 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock AFB (4 PAA)."

Question: Please Clarify.

Answer: Our original answer in BI-0204 was correct; the BCEG minutes were in error. After reviewing the briefing slides and historical spider charts, Mansfield Lahm Municipal Airport has only 8/PAA C-130H aircraft and as our answer stated, four aircraft were to be moved to General Mitchell, and four were to be moved to Little Rock.

Approved



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

17 Aug 2005

Inquiry Response

Re: BI-0244 (CT-0945)

Requester: Ken Small, Air Force Team Leader, BRAC Commission R&A

Question: The Wisconsin delegation and community representatives assert that \$1.138 million annual savings for General Mitchell ARS' depot maintenance were not factored into DoD's analysis. Please comment.

Answer: Many units do in fact perform intermediate maintenance and save depot costs. While noteworthy, these savings were not factored into the AF BRAC military value analysis since it specifically limited itself to analyzing an installation's facilities and infrastructure.

Approved



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

10 August 2005

Inquiry Response

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

Requester: Mr. Ken Small (BRAC Commission Staff)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Add/alter Sq ops	\$2.0M
Add/alter general purpose shops	\$1.8M
Add/alter support facilities	\$1.2M
Design	\$0.3M
Total Milcon	\$5.5M

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

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

Approved



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

Attachment:
Impact of Question 1235 Data Entry Errors

Impact of Question 1235 Data Entry Errors

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

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

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

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

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

Impact of Data Correction on General Mitchell ARS Recommendation:

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

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



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR FORCE RESERVES
GENERAL MITCHELL IAP-ARS**

16 Aug 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR: Maj. R. Stoeckmann
FROM: MSgt Todd A. Ramsey/440MXS/MXMC
SUBJECT: Depot Level Repair (DLR) Assets

Major Stoeckmann,

Our source for repair/overhaul authorization is determined by Source, Maintenance, and Recoverability (SMR) codes as defined in Air Force Technical Order 00-25-195. A 6 letter code is assigned to each aircraft part. Our aircraft specific SMR tables are found in Air Force Technical Order 1C-130H-4-00-1.

Attachment 2 of this document is a copy of the SMR code definition from the 1C-130H-4-00-1. Paragraph 1-21 states that "installations that have implemented two level maintenance concepts and retained the proper test equipment, trained personnel and current technical data may perform limited intermediate level maintenance".

In the past, our source for base level repair restrictions was the Air Force Technical Order 1C-130A-6, section IV. When requests for base level repair restriction changes were submitted and subsequently approved, the changes were listed in this Technical Order in plain text, exactly what the restrictions were by specific part number. This method has been replaced by the use of SMR codes and the statement I mentioned in my second paragraph.

This change facilitates repair authorization in the same manner as the 1C-130A-6, although it requires the unit to retain records in some cases, of approval for specific components being repaired. I have included in this package several submitted requests which were approved.

The SMR coding serves a twofold purpose in our case. At home station where we retain the equipment, training and technical data for individual components it allows us to best serve by repairing components locally. When we are deployed to a location where we do not have the repair capability, it authorizes us to return the item to depot for repair.

In the best interest of the Air Force, our unit procures authorization, technical data, trains personnel and makes every effort to reduce operating costs by the safe repair of authorized aircraft components.

Library BRAL Materials

Title of Report: *Memo Regarding Depot level Maintenance*

Installation: *Gen. Mitchell ARS*

Source: *Institution / Community*

Classified Material: *No*

Author/Provider: *T. CRUZ*

DCN: 11528

TODD A. RAMSEY, MSgt, USAFR
Aircraft Accessories Systems Flight