

Air Force Logistics Support Centers

Recommendation: Realign Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma; Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii; Hurlburt Field, Florida; Langley Air Force Base, Virginia; Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas; Luke Air Force Base, Arizona and Scott Air Force Base, Illinois. Establish Air Force Logistics Support Centers (LSCs) at Langley Air Force Base and Scott Air Force Base by combining five major command (MAJCOM) Regional Supply Squadrons (RSS) into two LSCs.

Combat Air Forces (CAF): Establish a CAF LSC at Langley Air Force Base by realigning RSS positions from Hickam Air Force Base and Sembach, Germany (non-BRAC programmatic) as well as base-level Logistics Readiness Squadron (LRS) positions from Luke Air Force Base.

Mobility Air Forces (MAF): Establish a MAF LSC at Scott Air Force Base by realigning RSS positions from Hurlburt Field and Sembach (non-BRAC programmatic) and LRS positions from Little Rock Air Force Base and Altus Air Force Base.

Justification: This recommendation is a transformational opportunity consistent with eLog21 initiatives that will standardize Air Force materiel management command and control. This recommendation realigns RSS manpower (from three MAJCOM locations) and base-level LRS manpower (from three installations) into two LSCs in support of Combat Air Forces and Mobility Air Forces. Consolidation will provide a seamless transition from peace to war for 3,012 aircraft and weapons systems associated with CAF/MAF forces and the Airmen that use them. It also provides a single point of contact to the warfighter, whether at home station or deployed. This recommendation will also result in the disestablishment of the Air Force Special Operations Command Regional Supply Squadron, Pacific Air Forces Regional Supply Squadron, and the United States Air Forces in Europe Regional Supply Squadron.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$9.3 million. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$19 million. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$6.1 million with a payback expected in one year. The net present value to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$77 million.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 26 jobs (16 direct jobs and 10 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Altus, Oklahoma Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 0.16 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 269 jobs (151 direct jobs and 118 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Honolulu, Hawaii Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 98 jobs (54 direct jobs and 44 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011

period in the Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, Florida Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 28 jobs (16 direct jobs and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Little Rock-North Little Rock, Arkansas Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 28 jobs (16 direct jobs and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, Arizona Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is less than 0.1 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: There are potential impacts to air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; 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; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or noise. Impacts of costs include \$76 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.