

## **Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND, McConnell Air Force Base, KS**

**Recommendation:** Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), North Dakota. Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, Illinois (12 aircraft)--which retires its eight KC-135E aircraft; the 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour-Johnson AFB, North Carolina (eight aircraft)--which will host an active duty associate unit; the 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, Florida (four aircraft)--which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, Michigan; the 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, Hawaii (four aircraft)--which will host an active duty associate unit; and the 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, Kansas (eight aircraft)--which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling Group (AFR). Grand Forks will remain an active Air Force installation with a new active duty/Air National Guard association unit created in anticipation of emerging missions at Grand Forks.

Realign McConnell Air National Guard (ANG) Base by relocating the 184th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) nine KC-135R aircraft to the 190th Air Refueling Wing at Forbes Field AGS, Kansas--which will retire its eight assigned KC-135E aircraft. The 184th Air Refueling Wing's operations and maintenance manpower will transfer with the aircraft to Forbes, while the wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain at McConnell.

**Justification:** Grand Forks (40-tanker) ranked lowest in military value of all active duty KC-135 bases. However, of our Northern tier bases, Grand Forks ranked highest in military value for the UAV mission (43-UAV). Military judgment argued for a continued strategic presence in the north central U.S. (Grand Forks is one of the last remaining active military installations in the region). Military judgment also indicated the potential for emerging missions in homeland defense, particularly for border states. Therefore, Grand Forks is retained as an active installation, but realigned to distribute its KC-135R force structure to bases with higher value for the tanker mission--MacDill (36), McConnell (15), Seymour Johnson (25), and Scott (38). The additional aircraft at MacDill optimize the unit size, establish a new active duty/Air Force Reserve association to enhance unit capability, and preserve sufficient capacity for future beddown of the next generation tanker aircraft. Scott receives KC-135R model aircraft to replace older, higher maintenance KC-135E models, capture Scott's existing capacity, and increase its capability by robusting the ANG squadron. The additional aircraft at Seymour Johnson optimize the squadron, increase the wing's capability, and establish another new active duty/Air Force Reserve unit association. Additional aircraft at McConnell capitalize on available excess capacity at no cost and optimize three squadrons for greater total wing capability. The Air Force used military judgment in moving force structure from Grand Forks to Hickam (87), concluding that Hickam's strategic location argued for a more robust global mobility capability in the western Pacific. Increasing tanker force structure at Hickam robusts the unit and establishes an active duty/Air Force Reserve association to maximize Reserve participation. Realigning ANG KC-135R aircraft from McConnell to Forbes (35) replaces aging, higher maintenance KC-135E aircraft with newer models

while retaining the experienced personnel from one of the highest-ranking reserve component tanker bases.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$131 million. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$322 million. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$173 million, with payback expected in one year. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$1.98 billion.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4,929 jobs (2,645 direct jobs and 2,284 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Grand Forks, North Dakota-Minnesota Metropolitan Statistical economic area, which is 7.44 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; dredging; 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 marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. Impacts of costs include \$1.15 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.