

Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, MD

Recommendation: Realign Martin State Airport Air Guard Station (AGS). Distribute the eight C-130J aircraft of the 175th Wing (ANG) to the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands AGS, California (four aircraft) and 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport AGS, Rhode Island (four aircraft). The Aerial Port Squadron will move to Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. The 143rd and 146th Airlift Wings will each retire two C-130E aircraft (total of four).

Justification: Martin State (140) had a low military value ranking. This recommendation moves C-130Js to Channel Islands AGS (96), and Quonset State (125), both of which rank higher in military value and already operate the J-model C-130--avoiding conversion training costs. Additionally, this recommendation creates to right sized C-130J squadrons. The Aerial Port Squadron is realigned to a nearby base with a robust airlift mission, retaining these skilled and highly trained ANG personnel.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$9.4 million. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$14 million. Annual recurring savings after implementation are \$8.7 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 \$97 million.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 229 jobs (119 direct jobs and 110 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Baltimore-Towson, Maryland 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: 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; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; 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 waste management. Impacts of costs include \$89 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.