

March Air Reserve Base, CA

Recommendation: Realign March Air Reserve Base, California. The 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will distribute its nine KC-135R aircraft to the 452d Air Mobility Wing (AFR), March Air Reserve Base (four aircraft); the 157th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Pease International Tradeport Air Guard Station, New Hampshire (three aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee (one aircraft); and the 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas (one aircraft). The 163d Air Refueling Wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place.

Justification: This recommendation realigns aircraft and organizationally optimizes March Air Reserve Base. With the highest military value (16) of all air reserve component bases for the tanker mission, March Air Reserve Base is retained and streamlined from two wing organizational structures to one reserve component flying mission with a more effectively sized KC-135 unit of 12 aircraft. This action distributes the remaining Air National Guard force structure at March to the higher-ranking active installation, McConnell (15), and two ANG installations, McGhee-Tyson (74) and Pease (105). McGhee-Tyson, though rated lower in military value, receives one aircraft due to military judgment to robust the squadron to a more effective size of 12 aircraft. Military judgment also placed additional force structure at Pease to support the Northeast Tanker Task Force and also robust the squadron to a more effective size of 12 aircraft. All receiver installations are increased in operational capability with the additional aircraft because of their proximity to air refueling missions. March's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained and experienced Air National Guard personnel.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$11.0 million. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of \$1.9 million. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.8 million, with a payback expected in five years. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$15 million.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 201 jobs (111 direct jobs and 90 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 period in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, California Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.01 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: A review of the 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; 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 \$387 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.