

**Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and
Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK**

Recommendation: Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho. Distribute the 366th Fighter Wing assigned F-15Cs (18 aircraft) to the 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada (nine aircraft), to the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport AGS, Florida (six aircraft) and to retirement (three aircraft). The 366th Fighter Wing will distribute assigned F-16 Block 52 aircraft to the 169th Fighter Wing McEntire AGS, South Carolina (nine aircraft), the 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada (five aircraft) and to backup inventory (four aircraft). Realign Nellis Air Force Base. The 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada will distribute F-16 Block 42 aircraft to the 138th Fighter Wing Tulsa International Airport AGS, Oklahoma (three aircraft) and retire the remaining F-16 Block 42 aircraft (15 aircraft). The 57th Wing also will distribute F-16 Block 32 aircraft (six aircraft) to the 144th Fighter Wing Fresno Air Terminal AGS, California and to retirement (one aircraft). Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base. The 366th Fighter Wing, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho will receive F-15E aircraft from the 3d Wing, Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska (18 aircraft) and attrition reserve (three aircraft).

Justification: Military value was the predominant consideration in moving the F-15Es from Elmendorf (36) to Mountain Home (23) and F-16s to Nellis (12) and McEntire (48). Additionally, realigning the eight F-16 models and four F-16 engine types weighed in the final F-16 force structure laydown. Mountain Home currently operates several types of aircraft; this recommendation realigns Mt. Home to fly only F-15Es, streamlining operations at a location that is well suited for air-to-ground, low-level and air-to-air flight training. This recommendation also aligns common versions of F-16s and F-15Cs.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$74 million. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$21 million. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$38 million with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$389 million.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential decrease of 833 jobs (528 direct jobs and 305 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Mountain Home, Idaho, Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 5.77 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential decrease of 1,388 jobs (802 direct jobs and 586 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Anchorage, Alaska Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.65 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Nellis Air Force Base is in a National Ambient Air Quality Standards nonattainment area for carbon monoxide (serious), particulate matter (PM10, serious), and ozone (8-hr, subpart 1). A preliminary assessment indicates that a conformity determination may be required to verify that positive conformity can be achieved. Costs to mitigate this potential impact have been included in the payback calculation and this is not expected to be an impediment to the implementation of this recommendation. There are also potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to dredging; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$1.89 million in costs for environmental compliance and waste management. These costs were included in the payback calculation. There are no anticipated impacts to the costs of environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to the implementation of this recommendation.