

## TAB 5 Description of Analyses

Bases were analyzed on the basis of all eight DoD selection criteria. For each criterion, a number of subelements were developed. All bases were evaluated under common subelements for Criteria II-VIII. Under Criterion I, individual subelements were developed to assist in the evaluation of each mission type. For example, some subelements measuring capability to support tanker operations have little relevance to support bases. While subelements measuring the quality of nearby ranges are important in comparing small aircraft flying bases and of some value to large aircraft bases, they are not relevant to some support bases. Functional experts from the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), Air Staff, and MAJCOMs all contributed to the development of these mission-unique subelements. These subelements were refined during the BCEG deliberation period.

Consistent with the Internal Control Plan, the members employed a color-coded rating scale to assist in evaluating each base for each subelement under Criteria I-III and VI-VIII. A "Green" rating meant more desirable for retention, "Red" meant least desirable, "Yellow" meant in between. For some of the subelements, the BCEG was able to apply quantitative data to the rating measurements. For other subelements the members evaluated qualitative data and an overall coding was agreed upon by the group. Then, for each of these six DoD selection criteria, each base was given an overall color-coded rating. Numbers were used for criteria IV and V, which were computed using the DoD COBRA cost model. The BCEG approved the COBRA products that comprised Criteria IV and V. The basic scoring employed all eight criteria, with priority given to military value with emphasis on Readiness and Training, Future, and Cost.

The bases in the operations subcategories of the flying category were subdivided into the following primary mission areas: Large Aircraft Bases which are bases that beddown large aircraft units and may have the potential to beddown small aircraft units; Small Aircraft Bases, which are bases that beddown fighter type aircraft units and have the potential to accommodate a few large aircraft, and Missile Bases.

Missile bases were first evaluated for their suitability to support a portion of a projected missile beddown (including the Peacekeepers). FE Warren AFB was previously excluded because it is the only Peacekeeper base. These five bases were then grouped with the remaining bomber/tanker aircraft bases and evaluated overall against bomber and tanker mission characteristics (Tab 9).

The bomber and tanker bases were evaluated in terms of their capability to support a bomber and tanker mission. Consequently, each base in this mission area received two

separate overall ratings under Criterion I. The large aircraft bases were rated and arrayed in three groups, from most to least desirable for bomber and tanker missions separately (Tab 10).

Airlift bases were initially grouped for comparative purposes with the bomber and tanker bases. Each of these bases was rated for its capability to support a bomber, tanker, and airlift mission, thus resulting in three overall ratings for each base under Criterion I. After conducting this analysis, the BCEG concluded that airlift bases could be better evaluated separately. Consequently, the seven airlift bases were evaluated separately from the bombers and tanker bases. These bases were then arrayed in three groups from most to least desirable (Tab 10).

All large aircraft bases were screened using a geographic filter to select the ones that could support a mobility mission on either the east or west coast of the United States. The selected bases were evaluated using the Mobility criteria developed by the Air Staff and MAJCOM and accepted by the BCEG. Those bases on both the east and west coast that could best support a mobility mission were identified.

Small aircraft bases were evaluated in terms of their capability to support a fighter mission. The small aircraft bases were rated and arrayed in three groups, from most to least desirable for fighter missions (Tab 11).

In the industrial/technical support category subelements to analyze depots under Criterion I were developed and applied. The bases were evaluated using the eight DoD Criteria, including the depot-unique subelements (Tab 12).

The BCEG evaluated those ARC bases which exceed the base closure law threshold. It was determined ANG and AFRES bases should not be compared against each other as were the active bases. Instead, bases were reviewed for potential cost effective realignment (Tabs 13 and 14). The BCEG analyzed several potential realignments but none proved to be cost effective. However, during this analysis the BCEG identified some cost effective ARC installation realignments that did not meet the base closure threshold (300 civilians) and recommended that they be included in the Air Force recommendations.

The two bases in the Cantonment Subcategory were evaluated for closure and neither is recommend for closure or realignment (Tab 15).

Based on the BCEG analysis, closure candidates were selected by the SECAF from among the lowest rated bases. Closure and realignment candidate bases in the flying operations subcategory were additionally evaluated for their capability to support another flying operations mission.