

DCN: 3490

Date: June 18, 2005

To: Bob Cook, Deputy Director
Mike Flinn, Senior Analyst, Air Force
Timothy B. McGregor, Senior Air Force Analyst

From: Charles L. Holsworth, Western Pennsylvania BRAC Task Force Director

RE: Point Paper, Specific BRAC Impact Concerns- Air Force

I have attached the POINT PAPER you requested during our discussion on June 9, 2005 there at the BRAC offices. I hope that this paper explains in much more details what we discussed at that meeting.

Charles L. "Chip" Holsworth
BRAC Task Force Headquarters
1550 Coraopolis Heights Road
Coraopolis, PA 15108
412-490-5092
412-490-5048 (fax)
pitbrac@yahoo.com

SPECIFIC BRAC IMPACT CONCERNS – AIR FORCE
BRAC TASK FORCE OF WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

We of the Military Affairs Council of Western Pennsylvania BRAC Task Force have serious concerns about the nation maintaining an effective strategic reserve that are trained and ready to defend the nation in time of war or contingency. The impact to the Reserve Forces from proposals in the BRAC 2005 Report includes closing four C-130 Air Force Reserve (AFRC) Wings, two Air National Guard (ANG) C-130 Wings, two C-135 AFRC and five C-135 ANG and one AFRC A-10 Wing and two ANG A-10 Wings. All Air Force Reserve proposed changes in the Report are shown by unit and state in Appendix A, this White Paper, "DoD BRAC Announcement 13 May 05 – Impact on AFRC." This list excludes Wings that are remaining in place with new tasking.

Military policies for the United States must fairly support the long-term defense capability requirements of our Nation. The basic motivation of soldiers, sailors and airman is to continue their careers and make a contribution to U.S. national defense in the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). MAC of western Pennsylvania and the ROA do not believe that the BRAC 2005 proposals will not allow a majority of citizen soldiers of the AF Reserve and Air National Guard to continue to support the GWOT and in fact, works contrary to those motivations.

Specific concerns about the BRAC 2005 Report follow.

1. The proposed changes will impact Reserve Forces retention and future recruiting of reserve forces. By changing the demographics of Reserve Component bases, at current count, over 5,000 Air Force Reservists alone will be required to "commute" hundreds of miles to Unit Training Assembly (UTA) every month (and even more reservists from the Air National Guard.) If these changes are enacted, these servicemen and women will very likely not be able to afford the monthly travel expense/ travel time and many will leave the military. Appendix B, "AFRC Groups Moving – Distance Impact", shows that a total of over seventy million miles (70,000,000) per year un-reimbursed travel would be required for monthly UTA by Operation /Maintenance Groups (page 1) and Expeditionary Combat Support units (page 2). The current DoD definition of reasonable commuting distance is 100 mile radius from the drill site and none of the proposed locations comply with this DoD policy. Also, there is a lack of personnel to recruit and very likely also a lack of trained personnel that are required for the tasking at many of the new bases for "realigned" units. If these changes and "realignments" were directed for active duty units, personnel would be paid to move to the new base location. This does not occur for traditional reservists whose choice is "commute" a long distance usually at their own expense, find another Reserve or Guard position in another nearby unit, retire (only if they have 20 good years of service) or transfer to the Not Affiliated Reserve Section (NARS) of the Air Reserve Personnel Center.

2. The proposed changes will likely result in a loss of Air Force skills and experience that DoD and USAF desperately need to fight GWOT. Many of these BRAC 2005 recommendations ignore the cost efficiencies of a trained and ready reserve which contrasts with the cost of hiring new personnel, without any prior military training. Inexperience, increased training costs, increased recruiting incentives, and loss of community support in the short term will outweigh long term savings that are projected in the BRAC 2005 Report. DoD is relying heavily on Reserve and Guard personnel for mission tasking where there currently is insufficient active duty manpower available. Obviously jets and turbo-prop aircraft can travel distances faster than a truck convoy, but air travel and transport both need fully trained aircrew and aircraft maintenance personnel to launch and fly the airplane in a short period of pre-flight time. If these critical personnel do not live near their base, great delays will occur in launching/maintaining large numbers of airlift aircraft for quickly emerging tasking for GWOT.
3. Concerns relating to strategic issues that are stated in the DoD NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY (NDS), issued by SECDEF, 1 Mar 2005, follow.
 - a. NDS states that a “layered approach” capacity is needed to defeat missiles/WMD from a distance and defeat threats from a distance. Closing AFR/ANG bases and/or moving units to a few AFBs close to oceans/Gulf of Mexico do not contribute to the NDS goals. It appears to us that dispersed locations, with some consolidations, would better support U.S. national defense and the homeland defense scenarios of the USNORTHCOM.
 - b. A NDS goal is management of “Force management risks” for a ready force. We do not believe that the BRAC 2005 proposals help manage these personnel risks.
 - c. NDS desires “greater flexibility” to contend with uncertainty by not overly concentrating forces in a few locations. How do BRAC 2005 proposals contribute to this goal where multiple AFR/ANG units close or move to a few AFB’s? How does this lower the operational vulnerability for DoD military forces? ROA’s position is that strategic dispersal of aircraft is required for security of personnel, aircraft and facilities.
 - d. Nationally, a local example of “readiness” is the “Fire Station” which has a specific territory to cover. Regarding USNORTHCOM and readiness requirements from the Governors of each state across the country, the local “Fire Station” can not be 500 to 1,000 miles away.
4. Where is the “strategy to capability” linkage for the next twenty years? Documents such as the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), to be released in 2006, and the Mobility Capability Study “XX” (MCS XX is to update MRS05 in mid-2005) are crucial to effective, long-term “Transformation” of USAF and

DoD. Without access to these documents, the BRAC 2005 Report is premature and cannot be viewed as a comprehensive review of current military structure versus future needs.

The nation needs all the C-130 and C-135 aircraft capability from the current DoD inventory until replacement aircraft are produced and delivered to USAF. The BRAC 2005 Report states “documented imbalance in the active/reserve manning mix for C-130s.” Where is it documented? This has not been briefed to the Congress and funding requested for the “shortfall”. Therefore, the “shortfall” is not validated national policy and should be excluded from all discussion of the BRAC 2005 Report.

The Congress is concerned about potential USAF retirement of C-130 E and KC-135 aircraft and prohibited this action during FY06 by inclusion in the Senate Armed Services Committee FY 06 NDAA Mark in May 2005. USAF has requested the Congress to authorize and fund C-130J-30 aircraft under a multi-year contract beginning in FY06. In ROA’s opinion, no action should be taken to reduce the number of C-130 aircraft, aircrews and aircraft maintenance personnel until the QDR and MCS XX studies are released and future C-130 J aircraft become available to deploy to field units, including the AFRC and ANG. The C-130J-30 will have a lower life cycle cost for the next 30 years due to its 3 aircrew positions which replaces 5 aircrew positions in the C-130 E/H.

Further, with the large number of C-130s no longer based at Pope AFB, an AFRC Associate Wing of 16 aircraft can not fly enough daily Ft Bragg airborne training missions to meet Army requirements without aircraft flying in from other AFBs. By “Realigning” C130H aircraft assigned to AFRC to active duty bases, this allows active duty Air Force to “re-capitalize” AFRC assigned aircraft (and retire active C-130Es) that have been providing airlift support to the Air Force for decades to augment the heavy tasking by DoD for the over 40 year old fleet of 186 C-130E’s that are not assigned to the AFRC or ANG.

All current AFRC and ANG bases with C-130 assigned aircraft should remain open for training Reserve support personnel to meet on-going Air Force AEF deployment taskings, regardless of assignment/non-assignment of C-130 or other USAF missions Reserve Forces bases. To reduce infrastructure costs, AF Agile Combat Support transformation concepts should be considered. Examples might be regional mission support centers for personnel, budget, supply, and transportation to include part-time personnel and office supply vendors with direct delivery to offices at the reserve base.

In conclusion, the major flaw in the actions proposed in the BRAC 2005 Report, Air Force section, is the total disregard of the crucial factor in all military operations – “personnel.” The report in many places talks about retaining highly trained, experienced reserve personnel and the recruiting potential within the region. However, the proposed actions do not accomplish the goals of BRAC 2005. Therefore, dramatic changes need to be made to the proposals to provide the capability for reserve personnel to train and support DoD missions. Any changes should conform to DoD guidelines for a reasonable commuting distance of 100 miles from the training site.

Appendix A - DoD BRAC – Impact on AFRC

Appendix B – AFRC Groups Moving – Distances Impact

Appendix C- AFRC Exped. Combat Spt. (ECS) Moving- Distance Impact

DOD BRAC- IMPACT ON AFRC

State	Base / Page Wing	AIRCRAFT ACTION	ECS/WG HQ ACTION
AL -	Maxwell AF-39 908 AW	Gain 4 C130H	No change
AZ -	Luke AF-9 944 FW	Lose 15 F-16 New Mission	No Change
CA -	Beale AF-10 940 ARW	Lose 8 KC135 New Mission	No Change
	March AF-11 452 AMW	Gain 4 KC135	No Change
	Vandenberg AF-41 Portland 939 ARW	None	Wg HQ and ECS From
CO -	ARPC H&SA-33 Randolph; IMA Mgmt to Robins/HQ AFRC	None	Personnel Processing to
	Buckley AF-22	None New Gp	ECS From New Orleans
	Peterson AF-43 302 AW	Gain 4 C130H Build new AD Associate to AFR	No change
	Schriever AF-33 310 Space Gp	None	Partial ECS from Niagara (No APS, CE, or Aeromed)
FL -	Eglin (DON-21)	None from Willow Grove	Wing HQ and ECS
	Not in announcement – Willow Grove Wg HQ/ ECS to Eglin		
	Homestead AF-47, 50 482 FW	Gain 9 F16	No Change
	MacDill AF-10, 37 927 ARW	Build New Res Selfridge Assoc to 16 KC135 (AD)	ECS, WG HQ from

GA - Dobbins AF-52 94 AW	Gain 4 C130H	No Change
Robins H&SA-33	None Denver	ARPC IMA Mgt from
State Base / Page Wing	AIRCRAFT ACTION	ECS/WG HQ ACTION
LA - Barksdale AF-6, 22 917 WG	Gain 9 A10	No Change
N. Orleans (AFRC Close) Buckley; 926 FW AF-22	Lose 15 A-10 (ANG Remains)	926 ECS to 926 WG HQ to Nellis
MI - Selfridge (AFRC Close) 927 ARW AF-10	Lose 8 KC135 (ANG Remains)	ECS. WG HQ to MacDill
MO - Whiteman AF-22 442 FW	Gain 9 A10	No Change
NC - Pope/Ft Bragg AF-35, 52 Mitchell 440 AW/911 AW	Gain 16 C130H Build AD Assoc to Res	ECS, WG HQ from Gen
Seymour-Johnson 916 ARW AF-37	Gain 8 KC135R Build AD Assoc to Res	No Change
NE - Offutt AF-35 Pittsburgh 911 AW	None	ECS, WG HQ from
NV - Nellis AF-22 926 FW	None	WG HQ from New Orleans
NY - Niagara (Close) 914 AW AF-33	Lose 8 C130H Base Closes	ECS to Schriever; WG HQ to Langley CES to Lackland
OH - Youngstown AF-35 Pittsburgh 910 AW	None	Aeromed ECS from

OK - Tinker AF-23, 41 507 ARW	Gain 4 KC135R Build ANG Assoc to AFR	No change
OR - Portland (AFRC Close) Vandenberg 939 ARW AF-41	Lose 8 KC135R (ANG Remains)	ECS, WG HQ to 304 RQS to McChord
PA - Pittsburgh (AFRC Close) 911 AW AF-35	Lose 8 C130H (ANG Remains)	ECS, WG HQ to Offutt Aeromed to Youngstown
Willow Grove (Close) 913 AW DON-21	Lose 8 C130E (A/C loss and ECS move not in announcement)	913 ECS to Eglin
State Base / Page	AIRCRAFT	ECS/WG HQ
Wing	ACTION	ACTION
TX - Carswell AF-47 301 FW	Gain 9 F16	No Change
Lackland AF-33 914 CES	None	CES ECS from Niagara
Randolph H&SA-33 Processing from Denver	None	ARPC Personnel
UT - Hill AF-47 419 FW	Lose 15 F-16 New Assoc	No change
VA - Langley AF-33 914 AW	None	WG HQ from Niagara
WA - McChord AF-41 304 RQS	None	304 RQS from Portland
WI - Gen Mitchell (AFRC Close) 440 AW AF-52	Lose 8 C130H (ANG Remains)	ECS, WG HQ to Ft Bragg

DOD BRAC REPORT 2005
AFRC OPS/MAINT GROUPS MOVING – Distance Impact

STATE/CITY Unit Move	PERS		MILES Round-Trip	FY UTAs	FT TOTAL MILES
	FT	TR			
LA – N. Orleans					
Lose 9A-10s; OG/MG – BarksdaleLA	TBD	TBD	600	12	
Lose 6A-10s; OG/MG - Whiteman MO	TBD	TBD	1,400	12	
926 FW HQ to Nellis	30	60	1,500	12	1,050,000
MI – Selfridge					
927 ARW-Assoc. at MacDill FL	153	434	1,000	12	5,200,000
NY- Niagara					
Lose C130s; 914 OG/MG-L. Rock AR?	130	411	1,800	12	8,850,000
914 AW HQ to Langley VA	30	60	450	12	320,000
OR – Portland					
4 C135 OG/MG to Tinker OK	76	217	3,000	12	7,800,000
4 C135 OG/MG pers/ECS VandenbergCA	76	217	750	12	1,900,000
304 RS to McChord WA(O a/c)	TBD	TBD	120	12	
PA – Pittsburgh					
Lose C130s; 911 OG/MG-Ft Bragg NC	130	411	800		3,900,000
Aeromed AES to Y'town OH	8	210	60	12	150,000
Willow Grove NAS					
Lose C130s; OG/MG- TBD	130	411	TBD	12	TBD
WI – Gen Mitchell					
440 OG/MG to Ft Bragg NC	130	411	750	12	3,700,000
TOTALS:	351	1,175	N/A	N/A	32,870,000

DOD BRAC REPORT 2005
AFRC EXPED. COMBAT SPT. (ECS) MOVING – Distance Impact

STATE/CITY Unit Move	PERS		MILES	FY	FT TOTAL
	FT	TR	Round-Trip	UTAs	MILES
LA – N. Orleans 926 ECS to Buckley CO	30	277	1,100	12	3,650,000
MI – Selfridge 927 ECS to MacDill FL	75	499	1,050	12	6,250,000
NY – Niagara 914 ECS to 310 Space Gp/ AFRC/Schriever CO	85	259	1,400	12	4,350,000
914 CES to Lackland TX	2	89	1,500	12	1,600,000
OR – Portland 4 C135R OG/MG& ECS to Vandenberg CA	75	437	750	12	3,900,000
PA – Pittsburgh New Res. Wg; 911 ECS to Offutt NE Willow Grove	114	590	800	12	5,650,000
913 ECS to Eglin FL	94	585	900	12	6,300,000
92 APS to Eglin FL	3	138	900	12	1,500,000
WI – Gen Mitchell 440 ECS to Ft Bragg/NC	100	753	750	12	6,750,000
TOTALS:	578	3,627	N/A	N/A	39,950,000