

Chapter 3

The Air Force Process for Selecting Bases

Selecting Air Force bases to recommend for closure or realignment was an extremely difficult task because of the quality of our installations. Our installations are appropriately located for their missions and possess required facilities. Most of our bases have received substantial amounts of construction or renovation during the last decade as the Air Force continued to improve the support for Air Force operations and training and to maintain the quality of life for our uniformed members, civilian employees, and family members. Moreover, the level of community approval and cooperation we enjoy is excellent at all our bases.

The Air Force 1995 selection process shares the fundamental approach used in the 1991 and 1993 processes. The basis for selection of closure and realignment recommendations was the DoD Force Structure Plan approved in January 1995 by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the eight selection criteria approved by the Secretary of Defense on February 15, 1991, submitted to Congress, and reaffirmed for use in BRAC 95 by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on November 2, 1994.

The Secretary of the Air Force appointed a Base Closure Executive Group of six general officers and seven comparable (Senior Executive Service) civilians. Areas of expertise included environment; facilities and construction; finance; law; logistics; programs; operations; personnel and training; reserve components; and research, development and acquisition. The group met regularly from July 1994 to January 1995. Additionally, an Air Staff level Base Closure Working Group was also formed to provide staff support and additional detailed expertise for the Executive Group. Plans and Programs General Officers from the Major Commands met on several occasions with the Executive Group to provide mission specific expertise and greater base-level information. Also, potential sister-service impacts were coordinated by a special inter-service working group.

The Executive Group developed a Base Closure Internal Control Plan which was approved by the Secretary of the Air Force. This plan provides structure and guidance for all participants in the base closure process, including procedures for data gathering and certification.

The Executive Group reviewed all Active and Air Reserve Component (ARC) installations in the United States which met or exceeded the Section 2687, Title 10 U.S.C. threshold of 300 direct-hire civilians authorized to be employed. Data on all applicable bases were collected via a comprehensive and detailed questionnaire answered at base

UNCLASSIFIED

level with validation by the Major Commands and Air Staff. All data was evaluated and certified in accordance with the Air Force Internal Control Plan. As an additional control measure, the Air Force Audit Agency was tasked to continuously review the Air Force process for consistency with the law and DoD policy and to ensure that the data collection and validation process was adequate. A baseline capacity analysis was also performed which evaluated the physical capability of a base to accommodate additional force structure and other activities (excess capacity) beyond that programmed to be stationed at the base. This baseline capacity analysis represented the maximum potential base closures that could be achieved within each category.

The Executive Group occasionally questioned the data and where appropriate the information was revised or more detailed data was provided. Data determined to be inaccurate was corrected. All data used in the preparation and submission of information and recommendations concerning the closure or realignment of military installations was certified as to its accuracy and completeness by appropriate officials at base, MAJCOM, and headquarters level. In addition, the Executive Group and the Secretary of the Air Force certified that all information contained in the Air Force Detailed Analysis and all supporting data were accurate and complete to the best of their knowledge and belief.

The Executive Group placed all bases in categories, based on the installation's predominant mission. The results of the excess capacity analysis were used in conjunction with the approved DoD Force Structure Plan in determining base structure requirements. After the baseline capacity analysis was established, other factors were considered to determine actual capabilities for base reductions. The capacity analysis was also used to identify potential cost effective opportunities for the beddown of activities and aircraft dislocated from bases recommended for closure or realignment.

Bases deemed militarily or geographically unique or mission-essential were approved by the SECAF for exclusion from further closure consideration. Capacity was analyzed by category, based on a study of current base capacity and the future requirements imposed by the JCS Force Structure Plan. Categories and subcategories having insufficient excess capacity to allow the closure of any installation were recommended to and approved by the Secretary of the Air Force for exclusion from further study. These category and subcategory exclusions were: Administrative Support, Education and Training, and Space Support.

All non-excluded Active Component bases in the remaining categories were individually examined on the basis of all eight selection criteria, with over 250 subelements to the grading criteria. These subelements were developed by the Air Force to provide specific data points for each criterion. The Air Force analysis, accomplished by the Executive Group, is described in Chapter 4.

UNCLASSIFIED

Under Deputy Secretary of Defense direction, the Executive Group and the Secretary of the Air Force considered and analyzed the results of the efforts of Joint Cross-Service Groups in the areas of Depot Maintenance, Laboratories, Test and Evaluation, Undergraduate Pilot Training, and Military Treatment Facilities including Graduate Medical Education. The Joint Cross-Service Groups established data elements, measures of merit, and methods of analysis for their functional areas. The Services collected data as requested by the Joint Groups, following each Service's individual Internal Control Plan for the collection of data. After receiving data provided by each of the Services, the Joint Groups developed functional values and alternatives for the activities under their consideration. These alternatives were reported to the Military Departments for consideration in their processes. In turn the Military Departments responded with comments and cost analyses of the alternatives, and engaged in a dialogue with the Joint Groups regarding potential closure and realignment actions, consistent with the internal analytical processes of each Military Department.

The Air Reserve Component (ARC) category, comprised of Air National Guard (ANG) and Air Force Reserve (AFRES) bases, warrants further explanation. First, these bases do not readily compete against each other as ARC units enjoy a special relationship with their respective states and local communities. Under federal law, relocating Guard units across state boundaries is not a practical alternative. In addition, special consideration must be given to the recruiting needs of these units. However, realignment of ARC units onto active duty, civilian, or other ARC installations could prove cost effective. Therefore, the ARC category was examined for cost effective relocations to other bases.

Information, base groupings, excess capacity, and options resulting from the Executive Group analysis were presented to the SECAF and the CSAF by the Executive Group. Based on the force structure plan and the eight selection criteria, with consideration given to excess capacity, efficiencies in base utilization, and concepts of force structure organization and basing, the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Air Force Chief of Staff, and using the analysis of the Executive Group, selected the bases recommended for closure and realignment.

Category Descriptions

Operations

The primary purpose of bases in this category is to support operational missions based on predominant use and mission suitability. This category is divided into three subcategories - Missiles, Large Aircraft and Small Aircraft.

Missiles: Bases with missile fields

Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyoming
Minot AFB, North Dakota*

Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota*
Malmstrom AFB, Montana*

*Also considered under Large Aircraft subcategory

Large Aircraft: Bases with large aircraft units and potential to beddown small aircraft units

Altus AFB, Oklahoma
Andrews AFB, Maryland
Beale AFB, California
Dover AFB, Delaware
Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota
Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota*
Little Rock AFB, Arkansas
McChord AFB, Washington
McGuire AFB, New Jersey
Offutt AFB, Nebraska
Travis AFB, California

Andersen AFB, Guam
Barksdale AFB, Louisiana
Charleston AFB, South Carolina
Dyess AFB, Texas
Fairchild AFB, Washington
Hickam AFB, Hawaii
Malmstrom AFB, Montana*
McConnell AFB, Kansas
Minot AFB, North Dakota*
Scott AFB, Illinois
Whiteman AFB, Missouri

*Also considered under Missile subcategory

Small Aircraft: Bases with fighter type aircraft units; some have potential for a few large aircraft

Cannon AFB, New Mexico	Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona
Eielson AFB, Alaska	Elmendorf AFB, Alaska
Holloman AFB, New Mexico	Hurlburt Field, Florida
Langley AFB, Virginia	Luke AFB, Arizona
Moody AFB, Georgia	Mt Home AFB, Idaho
Nellis AFB, Nevada	Pope AFB, North Carolina
Seymour Johnson AFB, North Carolina	Shaw AFB, South Carolina
Tyndall AFB, Florida	

Undergraduate Flying Training

The primary purpose of installations in this category is to support undergraduate pilot and navigator training as well as instructor pilot training. The installations, airspace, and facilities are optimized for training pilots and navigators.

Columbus AFB, Mississippi	Laughlin AFB, Texas
Randolph AFB, Texas	Reese AFB, Texas
Vance AFB, Oklahoma	

Industrial/Technical Support

The primary purpose of installations in this category is to provide highly technical support for depot level maintenance, research, development, test and acquisition. This category is divided into three subcategories: Depots, Product Centers and Laboratories, and Test Facilities.

Depots

Hill AFB, Utah	Kelly AFB, Texas
McClellan AFB, California	Robins AFB, Georgia
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma	

Product Centers And Laboratories

Brooks AFB, Texas	Hanscom AFB, Massachusetts
Kirtland AFB, New Mexico	Los Angeles AFB, California
Rome Lab, New York	Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio

Test And Evaluation

Arnold AS, Tennessee
Eglin AFB, Florida

Edwards AFB, California

Education and Training

The primary purpose of installations in this category is to support training activities. It is divided into the Technical Training and Education subcategories.

Technical Training

Goodfellow AFB, Texas
Lackland AFB, Texas

Keesler AFB, Mississippi
Sheppard AFB, Texas

Education

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado

Space

The primary purpose of installations in this category is to provide technical support for national space operations. This category is divided into Space Support and Satellite Control subcategories.

Space Support

Patrick AFB, Florida
Vandenberg AFB, California

Peterson AFB, Colorado

Satellite Control

Falcon AFB, Colorado

Onizuka AS, California

Other

The primary purpose of installations in this category is to support administrative functions.

Administrative

Battle Creek Federal Center, Michigan
DFAS/ARPC, Colorado

Bolling AFB, Washington DC
MacDill AFB, Florida

Air Reserve Component

The primary purpose of installations in this category is to support Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve operations.

Air National Guard

Boise Air Terminal AGS, Idaho
Ft Drum Support Airfield, Rome, New York
Lambert Field IAP AGS, Missouri
Otis AGB, Massachusetts
Rickenbacker AGS, Ohio
Selfridge AGB, Michigan **
Tucson IAP AGS, Arizona

Buckley AGB, Colorado
Greater Pittsburgh IAP AGS, PA
Martin State APT AGS, Maryland
Portland IAP AGS, Oregon **
Salt Lake City IAP AGS, Utah
Stewart IAP AGS, New York

Air Force Reserve

Bergstrom ARB, Texas
Dobbins ARB, Georgia*
Greater Pittsburgh IAP, ARS, PA
Homestead ARB, Florida
Minn/St Paul IAP, ARS, Minnesota*
O'Hare IAP, ARS, Illinois*
NAS Willow Grove ARS, PA*

Carswell ARS, NAS Ft Worth, Texas
Gen Mitchell IAP ARS, Michigan *
Grissom ARB, Indiana
March ARB, California*
Niagara Falls IAP, ARS, New York *
Westover ARB, Massachusetts
Youngstown MPT, ARS, Ohio

*Air Reserve host with ANG Tenant

**ANG host with Air Reserve Tenant

UNCLASSIFIED

**Exclusions of
Geographically/Militarily Unique or Mission Essential Bases**

Andersen AFB, Guam:	Essential staging base for Combat Forces and Military Operations in the Pacific. Its geographic location provides an irreplaceable resource for overseas contingencies
Andrews AFB, Maryland:	Necessary base for Presidential/Congressional airlift support. The presence of an installation capable of airlift operations near the nation's capital is essential to this mission
Arnold AS, Tennessee:	One-of-a-kind Joint Service Center for wind tunnel and engine testing. Possesses unique and costly equipment, servicing all of DoD
Edwards AFB, California:	Supports an irreplaceable, extensive/specialized testing center and range complex. Natural features as well as facilities to support space shuttle operations are unique resources
Eielson AFB, Alaska:	Crucial to reinforcement of the Pacific and to the defense of Alaska; location is critical for ready access to irreplaceable specialized ranges and airspace
Elmendorf AFB, Alaska:	Necessary Port of Entry into United States; crucial to reinforcement of Pacific; provides GSU support to 21 remote sites including 18 long range radar sites crucial to the defense of the US, ready access to specialized ranges and airspace
FE Warren AFB, Wyoming:	Air Force's only "Peacekeeper" missile base; DoD Force Structure Plan reflects a requirement for Peacekeeper missiles through the period under which BRAC 95 actions must be taken; START treaty implications

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

Hickam AFB, Hawaii: Necessary Port of Entry into the western US: crucial to reinforcement of Pacific; key to support of USCINCPAC

Maxwell AFB, Alabama: Unique educational complex supports the Air University, Air War College, Air Command and Staff College, Squadron Officer School, Officer Training School, Senior NCO Academy and numerous other training and education programs

McChord AFB, Washington: Located with Fort Lewis, the primary deployment base for the US I Corps that provides support for rapid deployment of troops to the Pacific theater

Nellis AFB, Nevada: Supports an irreplaceable, extensive/specialized range complex and the Air Force Weapons Center. Range and airspace resources are vital to Air Force operations and training

Patrick AFB, Florida: Critical support to Cape Canaveral (the nation's sole equatorial orbit space launch facility); home of Eastern Space and Missile Center

Pope AFB, North Carolina: Collocated with Fort Bragg, this primary deployment base for the 18th Airborne Corps provides time critical deployment and essential joint training capability for the US Army's primary contingency corps

USAF Academy, Colorado: Unique facilities support all aspects of cadet training, including academic, athletic, summer encampment, airfield operations, and survival

Vandenberg AFB, California: Nation's sole polar orbit space launch facility and home of Western Space and Missile Center

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

Category/Subcategory Exclusions

Administrative Support: There are four installations in this category: Battle Creek Federal Center, Michigan; Bolling AFB, Washington DC; DFAS/ARPC, Colorado; and MacDill AFB, Florida. After a thorough capacity analysis of the facilities in this category, it was determined that no excess capacity exists within the category.

Education and Training/Technical Category: There are four bases in this subcategory: Goodfellow AFB, Texas; Keesler AFB, Mississippi; Lackland AFB, Texas; and Sheppard AFB, Texas. Two other Technical Training Center bases were selected for closure in 1988 and 1991. This resulted in 39 percent of technical training courses relocating to the remaining four bases. DoD's Force Structure Plan will require the Air Force to recruit and train approximately 100,000 personnel per year. This accession level will require approximately 80 percent of the remaining four bases' capacity with minimal peacetime surge capability. Closure of any one training center would reduce capacity to a level below that required to support programmed and contingent operations. Based on capacity analysis, there is no excess capacity in this subcategory.

Space Support: There are three bases in this subcategory: Patrick AFB, Florida; Vandenberg AFB, California; and Peterson AFB, Colorado. These installations provide logistical and administrative support for space functions in and around three locations. Patrick AFB provides critical support to both Cape Canaveral AS and Cape Kennedy Space Center (Nation's easterly space launch facility) and home of Eastern Space and Missile Center. Peterson AFB provides operating support for all space activities located in the Colorado Springs area to include support for two major headquarters involved in space operations. Vandenberg AFB is the sole polar orbit space launch facility and home of the Western Space and Missile Center. Since each base is critical to a different geographic location of space-related missions, there is no excess capacity in this subcategory.

UNCLASSIFIED