

Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY

Recommendation: Realign Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station (Air Guard Station), New York. The 109th Airlift Wing (ANG) will transfer four C-130H aircraft to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas.

Justification: This recommendation distributes C-130 force structure to Little Rock (17), which has higher military value. Adding aircraft to the ANG unit at Little Rock creates a larger, more effective squadron. The LC-130 aircraft (ski-equipped) remain at Schenectady (117).

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$3.5 million. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$3.3 million. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$ 0.56 million with payback expected in eight years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$2.4 million.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 39 jobs (19 direct jobs and 20 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: 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: There are potential impacts to air quality; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands that may need to be considered during the implementation of this recommendation. There are no anticipated impacts to cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Impacts of costs include \$35 thousand 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.